March 1, 2021

Dr. Gabriel Grant
Program Coordinator, Digital Media Technology

RE: Year 2 Program Assessment Review

Documents submitted and reviewed:
1) DGT Assessment Report Summary SP20 – word document
2) DGT Assessment Plan SP20 – excel file
3) DGT Assessment Rubrics SP20 – excel file (five worksheets – Critical Thinking, Oral Presentation, Writing, Responsible Citizenship, and Technical Skills)
4) DGT Assessment Score Sheet SP20 – excel file (five worksheets to match rubrics)
5) DGT Exit Survey SP20 – word document

Additionally, the following document was submitted but not included in the review:
6) DGT IBHE Short Progress Report – word document

Evaluated Aspects of Program Assessment	Stage of Maturity (Beginning, Developing, Acceptable, Exemplary)
A. Student Learning Outcomes	Acceptable
B. Measurement Tools and Assignments	Acceptable
C. Data Collection and Integrity	Acceptable
D. Expectations and Results	Developing
E. Discussion and Analysis	Beginning
F. Use of Assessment Results for Program Improvement	Beginning
G. Faculty Engagement in Assessment	Developing

Summary of Assessment Evaluation:
Program is well positioned to be successful at utilizing the assessment process for program feedback and improvement. Thank you for the evidence of many hours of work and thought put into these materials. I've recommended some areas to review as cycle progresses and you have data and can see how it is being used and analyzed. In subsequent pages, I've provided specific comments on aspects that I evaluated.

Melody L Wollan, PhD, SHRM-SCP
Associate Dean, Lumpkin College of
Business and Technology
mlwollan@eiu.edu

Academic Program	Digital Media Technology
Evaluation Point	Year 2 (AY 2020) of 4
Program-level Accreditation	None
Academic Years in Reporting Cycle	AY19 - AY23
Reviewer Name, Title	Melody Wollan, LCBT Associate Dean

A. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

Specific statements that articulate the discipline-specific content, skills, and/or dispositions students should gain or improve through engagement in the program

• SLO does not specify what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and/or at what point(s) in their progression through the program they will do so. • SLO contains only imprecise verbs (e.g., "know," "understand"), and thus is difficult to measure. • SLO is too broad or vague to guide the assessment process.	• SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it (e.g., majors, students in the program), but not at what point in their progression through the program they will do so. • SLO contains action verbs that reflect an inadequate depth of knowledge for the program. • SLO contains a general description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions to be measured, but the description is not discipline-specific.	• SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and at what point in their progression through the program they will do so (e.g., "seniors," "graduates"). • SLO contains precise, measurable, and observable verbs that reflect an appropriate depth of knowledge for the program. • SLO contains a discipline-specific description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions that students will demonstrate.	• A reasonable number of SLOs are identified — enough to adequately accomplish the mission of the program while still being manageable to assess on an annual basis. • Overall SLOs reflect appropriate level of expectation for the program type/level. • Overall SLOs stated in student-centered terms, reflecting what students should know, do, and/or think as they engage in the program of study.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☒	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:

The DGT program has four learning outcomes (communication, quantitative reasoning and critical thinking, ethics and social responsibility, and industry operational skills) that are each broken into 1 – 3 learning objectives. Learning objectives are specific as to what knowledge or skills are being measured: 'critically', 'effectively', 'present', 'engage', 'explain', 'produce', 'analyze', and so forth appear throughout the learning objectives. The Program faculty may want to further segregate learning outcomes by student level (FR, SO, JR, SR; often FR/SO or SR are utilized for a benchmark measure and then a capstone measure of program learning). At this stage of the assessment cycle, without having data to fully interpret if the measures are providing valuable results, these learning outcomes and objectives are acceptable but should be re-evaluated in next four-cycle as the program further matures.

B. Measurement Tools and Assignments

Description of the measurement tool and the associated assignment, how they align with the SLO, and their validity

• SLO is assessed with only indirect measure(s) (i.e., surveys).
 	
• No information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.
	• SLO is assessed with direct measure(s) (i.e., objective tests, rubrics).
	
	• General description is provided of the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s).
	
	• General information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.
		• Detailed description of measurement tool(s) and its alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes:
		  o for an objective test measurement tool, individual questions are identified and valid to the SLO (or element of the SLO), and expected levels of mastery are indicated;
		  o for an analytic rubric measurement tool, each trait is mapped to the SLO (or element of the SLO) and each level details expectations.
		
		• Detailed description of the assignment(s) and alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes:
		  o for an objective test assignment, representative test items are described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery;
		  o for a performance-based assignment evaluated with an analytic rubric, the assignment prompt is described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery.
		
		• Measurement tool(s) will provide a direct/observable result and are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.
		
		• Assignment(s) are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.
			• Direct measures may be supplemented with indirect measures.
			
			• Includes both formative and summative measures.
			
			• A description of the development process for the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) is included to illustrate their appropriateness to the SLO.

BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☒	EXEMPLARY ☐

Assessment Methods: What type of assessment methods does the program use?	☒ **Direct Measures** Measures that require students to demonstrate knowledge and skills. Provide tangible, visible, and self-explanatory evidence of what students have and have not learned. Actual student behavior or work is measured or assessed		☒ **Indirect Measures** Assessments that measure opinions or thoughts about student's knowledge, skills, attitudes, learning experiences, perceptions of services received or employers' opinions. Do not measure students' performance directly

Measurement Tools: What type of measurement tools does the program use?	☐ **Objective Test** Measure that has right or wrong answers and can be quickly and unambiguously scored by anyone with an answer key.	☒ **Analytic Rubrics** Measures that are subjective for performance-based assignments. Resembles a grid with criteria for student project listed in the leftmost column and with all levels of performance listed across the top row. The cells within the center contain descriptions of what specified criteria look like for each level of performance. Each of the criteria is scored individually	☒ **Surveys** Measures for collecting data from a pre-defined group of respondents to gain information and insights on a topic of interest	☐ **Other** Could include a holistic rubric (single scale with all criteria being considered together), or a checklist (only two performance levels possible and no descriptions included).

Comments:	1. Five rubrics were provided: Critical Thinking, Oral Presentation, Writing, Responsible Citizenship, and Technical Skills. The first four appear to be adaptations of EIU General Education Rubrics and are fully developed. The DGT Quantitative Reasoning Rubric planned for use in SLO 2 has not been provided and is likely being developed. All provided rubrics were linked as measurement tools for program SLOs.

2. The DGT Responsible Citizenship Rubric is (mis)identified as an Indirect Measure in the program assessment plan, whereas I believe it is a direct measure given the rubric data is collected by the course instructor (an indirect measure would be a student's self-assessment of the categories).

3. DGT Technical Skills Rubric is the least developed but likely the most critical and unique to the major and SLOs. As it is put into practice and data collected, I would encourage faculty members evaluate this rubric prior to Year 4 to ensure that the rubric adequately provides measurement and data that is actionable and specific to learning outcomes. Additionally, in the assessment plan, a DGT Quantitative Reasoning Rubric is cited as an instrument being used to measure SLO 2.

4. The program has wisely chosen to integrate university-level collected data at both the summative (EWP, Senior Seminars) and formative (CMN 1310G) stages, in addition to data being collected in program courses. I would encourage the faculty to consider including earlier formative assessment work (at the 1000-/2000- level) for writing, since the current formative measurement is planned for a senior-level (DGT 4333). For SLO 4, consider using DGT 4933 and/or DGT 3813's final projects as summative comparisons to data collections in lower-level classes.

C. Data Collection and Integrity

When measurement tools are applied, to whom, at what point in the program, and how the program ensures consistency across multiple administrations of the tools and assignments (reliability)

• It is unclear how the information provided relates to this assessment cycle.	• Information is provided about the data collection process in this cycle, but not enough to generate confidence in the findings (e.g., sample size is too small, student motivation conditions are inconsistent, rubric is not normed with raters, etc.) • Process will provide limited information for guiding instruction and curriculum.	• Enough information is provided about administration of the measurement tool and data collection process to generate confidence in the findings. This includes: ○ adequate student population targeted with an assignment and measurement tool; ○ sufficient sample size for statistically significant results (especially if different than the student population), with a rationale for representative sampling (if appropriate); ○ consistent student motivation conditions across multiple administrations of the assignment and measurement tool; • Process will provide useful information for guiding instruction and curriculum.	• Information provided demonstrates that data collection occurs throughout the curriculum and involves multiple faculty members. • Information is included about how data are collected and responsibility is shared among faculty members. • An ongoing, inclusive, systematic process is in place for collecting data to make decisions and improve learning within the program, appropriate to the program's internal and external constituencies.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☒	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:	The program has created reporting worksheets for rubric data that can be used by all and data can be input by the categories found on each rubric. Please note that in your reporting data, having counts of the number of students achieving your thresholds (#Exemplary, #Achieving) is the expected result, not the average score of the students' collective performance. I recommend identifying the expected results (your thresholds) right on these worksheets, to aid faculty with these counts, as well as clearer identification of assignment and specific SLO to which the counts will be assigned.

D. Expectations and Results

SLO have clearly identified expectations that reflect size and maturity of the program. Clear and concise illustration/presentation of data collected. Includes narrative or table/figure with sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges as appropriate to the assessment tool

• No expectations are presented, or it is unclear how the expected results relate to the SLO. • No results are presented, or it is unclear how the results relate to the SLO.	• Expectations and results are presented and relate to the SLO, but a lack of specificity does not allow useful conclusions to be drawn. • Presentation is insufficiently detailed; only overall student scores or averages are presented.	• Expectations and results are presented by SLO. • Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool. • For objective tests, results are presented according to items or groups of items connected to a SLO. • For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait and level, including counts and percentages. • Results include all applicable locations and/or delivery modes.	• Expectations and results are easily understood, as well as their implications. • Results are presented for all locations and/or delivery modes showing an equivalent level of rigor and detail.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:

NOTE: This YEAR 2 report does not include any reported data given age of the program

Some program expectations of data results (labeled as 'desired level') may be too generalized to be informative to make curricular adjustments. The desired levels intended are "At EIU average" and "2.5" or "3", as measured by various rubrics and the senior exit survey. It is noteworthy that the senior exit survey did not have "desired levels" included in the plan – I suspect you recognized that there were multiple measures in an exit survey and different scales for different items/constructs being collected. There is a missing level of analysis – yes, you are using an instrument – a rubric or survey – but within those devices, there may be multiple dimensions being assessed. As such, the instrument may not always be what you are holistically measuring (i.e., a single score), but rather as you begin to use the rubrics and report your data, you may find reason to refine your expectation of results specifically to item(s) within these rubrics especially in the DGT Technical Skills Rubric where students may have varying scores across each criterion (ability to follow directions, demonstrated knowledge of tools, task completion, student preparedness, time management).

E. Discussion and Analysis

Explains the meaningfulness of the data presented (interpretation of results) with a clear, complete, and succinct analysis focusing on the interpretation of and reflection on the assessment data

• No interpretation is attempted, or the interpretation does not relate to the SLO and/or the results.	• Interpretation is attempted, relates to the SLO and/or results, but the interpretation is either: o insufficient to support programmatic decisions, o not aligned with the program's previous action plans, o offering excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations leading to improvements in student learning.	• Interpretation is aligned with the program's SLOs. • Interpretation is explained in terms of the desired levels of student performance and is based on student achievement of those levels. • Interpretation is justified through current disciplinary standards, previous results and/or benchmarks. • Interpretation includes how courses, experiences, and/or the assessment process might have affected results. • Interpretation indicates the appropriate collaboration and consensus of multiple internal stakeholders (e.g., program faculty, committees, staff, and/or students). • Interpretation is detailed enough to justify programmatic decisions concerning changes in instruction and/or curriculum.	• Interpretation directly addresses the program's SLOs and action plans. • Interpretation addresses past trends in student performance, as appropriate. • Strengths and weaknesses in student learning are easily identified. • New findings are compared to past trends, as appropriate. • Interpretation identifies possible areas of improvement, thus initiating future actions.
BEGINNING ☒	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐
Comments:	Not applicable for this program's 2020 Year 2 Evaluation – Reported summary of curricular actions taken in AY19-20 were not taken based on assessment results as an assessment plan was being drafted and as noted in report "program coordinator has decided to restart data collection effective Fall 2020".		

F. Use of Assessment Results for Program Improvement
Strategies planned and/or in progress for program improvement; actions designed to improve instruction and curriculum; rationale for action is based on data and analysis of results

• No actions proposed for the next cycle. • Proposed actions are not based on the data captured through the assessment process. • Proposed actions are unrelated to the improvement of the educational program, and therefore student learning.	• The connection between proposed actions, results/discussion, and/or SLOs is not clear. • Proposed actions are too broad or vague to guide the improvement of the educational program and student learning. • Proposed actions do not demonstrate evidence of input from more than one person. • Proposed actions pertain only to assessment plan changes (process/measure only).	• Proposed actions are directly connected to the SLOs. • Proposed actions are data-driven, directly related to the results/discussion. • Proposed actions focus on the improvement of the educational program and student learning. If modifications are made to the assessment process, they are data-driven. • Proposed actions contain a process for evaluating their effectiveness. • Proposed actions demonstrate evidence of input from multiple internal stakeholders. • Carryover actions from the previous cycle are noted. • If a SLO is not addressed by any proposed actions, justification is given for maintenance of ongoing curriculum and instruction.	• Proposed actions are specifically detailed, including who will be responsible for implementation, approximate dates of implementation, and notes about where in the curriculum and in what specific classes they will occur.
BEGINNING ☒	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:	Not applicable for this program's 2020 Year 2 Evaluation

G. Faculty Engagement in Assessment

Faculty engagement individually and collectively in the assessment process such as review of the outcomes data, revisions and updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs.

• Assessment is done primarily by program coordinator/assistant chair. • Data is primarily collected in capstone activities.	• The assessment reporting and analytical processes are conducted by the program coordinator or assistant chair with data being collected by faculty. • Faculty review outcomes and resulting data at least once per year.	• The program has an organized systematic plan in which all faculty participate in at least one stage of assessment. • Analysis of results informs faculty decision-making related to curricular and program improvements. • Faculty review outcomes and resulting data at least once per year collectively, but those discussions influence other program discussions made throughout the year.	• Program faculty are highly engaged throughout the assessment process as demonstrated at all stages. • Faculty recommend interventions and participate in revising assessment activities for continuous program improvement.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments: At this stage, faculty engagement has begun and will be more evident as the assessment plan matures in this cycle.

Please list all of the student learning outcomes for your program as articulated in the assessment plan.

1. Demonstrate effective communication skills for the digital media technology industry using written, oral, and technological formats.
     I.   Write critically and effectively in the discipline of digital media technology by developing an argument and evaluating evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from multiple perspectives.
     II.   Present information using a technological tools, engage in discussion of digital media concepts, explain the ideas of others, and express their own ideas with clarity.
2. Analyze problems and apply digital media technology solutions utilizing quantitative reasoning and critical thinking skills.
     I.   Produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate estimating and costing systems used in digital media environments.
     II.   Apply critical thinking skills to interpret digital media trends.
     III. Apply critical thinking skills to design and manage digital media production environments.
     IV.   Create and justify cost effective digital media campaigns using various technological tools.
3. Develop an awareness of ethical values and social responsibility in a multicultural environment.
     I.   Interact sensitively and ethically with people from diverse backgrounds and demonstrate understanding of the sociocultural contexts that influence individual differences in digital media studio and professional environments.
     II.   Implement values and systems in production environments that will lead to positive outcomes in digital media environments and a society responsive to multicultural and global concerns.
4. Demonstrate functional and operational skills relevant to the digital media technology industry.
     I.   Apply digital media knowledge and technical skills in the content areas of digital media technology.

Overview of Measures/Instruments	Wednesday, May 13, 2020			
DRAFT: Digital Media Technology Assessment Plan				
Learning Outcomes	**Learning Objectives**	**Undergraduate Learning Goals**	**Measures**	**Data**
Demonstrate effective communication skills for the digital media technology industry using written, oral, and technological formats	Write critically and effectively in the discipline of digital media technology by developing an argument and evaluating evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from	W	EIU EWP Ratings	
		W	DGT 4333: Digital Media Improvement Report	
	Present information using a technological tools, engage in discussion of digital media concepts, explain the ideas of others, and express their own ideas with clarity.	S	EIU Speaking Ratings	
		S	DGT 4763: Costing and Planning System Project	
		NA	DGT Senior Exit Survey	
Analyze problems and apply digital media technology solutions utilizing quantitative reasoning and critical thinking skills	Produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate estimating and costing systems used in digital media environments.	Q	DGT 4763: Costing and Planning Midterm	
	Apply critical thinking skills to interpret digital media trends.	C	DGT 4333: Digital Media Improvement Report	
	Apply critical thinking skills to design and manage digital media production environments.	C	DGT 4353: Digital Media Production Environment Simulation Reports	
	Create and justify cost effective digital media campaigns using various technological tools.	Q	DGT 4814: Digital Media Strategy Tech Integration proposal	
		NA	DGT Senior Exit Survey	
Develop an awareness of ethical values and social responsibility in a multicultural environment	Interact sensitively and ethically with people from diverse backgrounds and demonstrate understanding of the sociocultural contexts that influence individual differences in digital media studio and professional environments.	R	DGT 2123: Studio Work	
	Implement values and systems in production environments that will lead to positive outcomes in digital media environments and a society responsive to multicultural and	R	DGT 4353: Lab Work	
		NA	Senior Exit Survey	
Demonstrate functional and operational skills relevant to the digital media technology industry	Apply digital media knowledge and technical skills in the content areas of digital media technology.	NA	DGT 1363: Final Project	
			DGT 2123: Final Project	
			DGT 3303: Final Project	
			DGT 3813: Final Website Project	
			DGT 4933: Final Project	
			DGT Senior Exit Survey	
* F or S = Formative or Summative Measures				
* I or D = Indirect or Direct Measures				
**Assessment plan, data, and rubrics are to be evaluated by faculty twice during the academic year.				

Overview of Measures/Instruments	Wednesday, May 13, 2020						
DRAFT: Digital Media Technology Assessment Plan							
Learning Outcomes	**Learning Objectives**	**Desired Level**	**Instrument Used**	**Collected By**	**F or S***	**I or D***	**When Collected**
Demonstrate effective communication skills for the digital media technology industry using written, oral, and technological formats	Write critically and effectively in the discipline of digital media technology by developing an argument and evaluating evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from	At EIU average	EWP rating rubric		S	D	Annually
		2.5	DGT Writing Rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
	Present information using a technological tools, engage in discussion of digital media concepts, explain the ideas of others, and express their own ideas with clarity.	At EIU average	Primary Trait Rubric	CMN 1310G	F	D	Annually
		At EIU average	Primary Trait Rubric	Senior Seminar	S	D	Annually
		2.5	DGT Oral Presentation Rubric	Course Instructor	S	D	When course is offered
			DGT Senior Exit Survey	Program Coordinator	S	I	Each semester
Analyze problems and apply digital media technology solutions utilizing quantitative reasoning and critical thinking skills	Produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate estimating and costing systems used in digital media environments.	2.5	DGT Quantitative Reasoning Rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
	Apply critical thinking skills to interpret digital media trends.	2.5	DGT Critical Thinking Rubric	Course Instructor	S	D	When course is offered
	Apply critical thinking skills to design and manage digital media production environments.	2.5	DGT Critical Thinking Rubric	Course Instructor	S	D	When course is offered
	Create and justify cost effective digital media campaigns using various technological tools.	2.5	DGT Quantitative Reasoning Rubric	Course Instructor	S	D	When course is offered
			DGT Senior Exit Survey	Program Coordinator	S	I	Each semester
Develop an awareness of ethical values and social responsibility in a multicultural environment	Interact sensitively and ethically with people from diverse backgrounds and demonstrate understanding of the sociocultural contexts that influence individual differences in digital media studio and professional environments.	2.5	DGT Responsible citizenship Rubric	Course Instructor	S	I	When course is offered
	Implement values and systems in production environments that will lead to positive outcomes in digital media environments and a society responsive to multicultural and	2.5	DGT Responsible citizenship Rubric	Course Instructor	S	I	When course is offered
			Exit Survey	Program Coordinator	S	I	Each semester
Demonstrate functional and operational skills relevant to the digital media technology industry	Apply digital media knowledge and technical skills in the content areas of digital media technology.	3	DGT Technical Skills rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
		3	DGT Technical Skills rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
		3	DGT Technical Skills rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
		3	DGT Technical Skills rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
		3	DGT Technical Skills rubric	Course Instructor	F	D	When course is offered
			DGT Senior Exit Survey	Program Coordinator	S	I	Each semester

* F or S = Formative or Summative Measures

* I or D = Indirect or Direct Measures

**Assessment plan, data, and rubrics are to be evaluated by faculty twice during the academic year.

Improvements and Changes Based on Assessment

1. Provide a short summary (1-2 paragraphs or bullets) of any curricular actions (revisions, additions, and so on) that were approved over the past two years as a result of reflecting on the student learning outcomes data. Are there any additional future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or still pending?

During FY 19-20 the Digital Media program underwent a significant revision that required the removal and addition of multiple courses and have thereby impacted the look and features of the academic program. Many of the revisions that took place were to aid in student achievement and management of the degree program. A summary of the curricular revisions are below.

Courses Removed	Courses Added
BUS 3100 - Survey of Marketing Principles.	CMN 2500 - Production I.
OPD 4835 - Supervision in Organizations.	DGT 4353 - Digital Media Production Management.
OPD 4845 - Improvement in Organizations.	DGT 4814 - Digital Media Strategy.
DGT 4749 - Capstone Project in Digital Media.	DGT 4933 - 3D Animation and Motion Capture.
CMN 2520 - Introduction to Mass Communication.	
BUS 2810 - Business Statistics I.	
or	
MAT 2250G - Elementary Statistics.	

In addition to the core course revision several changes were made to the focus area electives. Due to the drastic changes to the program and concerns that any previous data collected might not accurately reflect the current outcomes of the program the program coordinator has decided to restart data collection effective fall 2020.

Significant revisions at this time are not planned to give the program coordinator time and the opportunity to assess the overall picture of student learning outcomes.

2. Please provide a brief description or bulleted list of any improvements (or declines) observed/measured in student learning. Be sure to mention any intervention made that has not yet resulted in student improvement (if applicable).

Data is insufficient with the significant program revision.

3. Using the form below, please document annual faculty and committee engagement with the assessment process (such as the review of outcomes data, revisions/updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs).

History of Annual Review		
Date of Annual Review	Individuals/Groups who Reviewed Plan	Results of the Review (i.e., reference proposed changes from #1 above, revised SLOs, etc...)
5/12/2020	Gabe Grant, Ian McCormack, Jay Grabiec	Student learning outcomes established, assessment rubrics agreed upon, and data collection method established.