

## **#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes**

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

<b>Department:</b> Art	<b>Date:</b> 5.12.17
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Jim Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Don Robson	
<b>See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:</b> a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</b> * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> The digital portfolios and oral presentations were scored using the rubric and scoring sheet developed for the Senior Exit Portfolio Review. In addition, scores were calculated to present an average for each candidate.	
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Is the BFA candidate capable of presenting his or her work clearly and with astute personal insight?  2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Did not reach goal. Creating - 3/5 students = 60% Resolving - 2/5 students = 40% Researching - 2/5 students = 40% Communicating - 3/5 students = 60%  3). <b>INTERPRETATION</b> * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> a. Department did not consistently use rubric appropriately due to philosophical differences. b. BFA candidates did not perform at acceptable level. Students might not fully understand the definitions of the two most problematic criteria - Resolving & Researching.  4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> NA	
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> Friday, May 12, 2017 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Met as a department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Jim Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Don Robson	
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b>  1. <b>ACTION</b> *- <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?</i> a. Department will use the rubric appropriately and objectively. b. Department will ensure BFA candidates understand the definitions of the criteria: Resolving & Researching and how to apply them resulting in acceptable performance.  2. <b>IMPACT</b> *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Improved scores by BFA candidates.	

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION\*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). NA

*If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.*

*What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? Re-examine this question to ensure the standards are met with corrected measures.*

Submitted by: Don Robson  
5/16/17

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/16/17