

#2. 2017 – 2018 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Art Date: 5.11.18
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Jim Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Don Robson
See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Rubric/evaluation sheet – attached.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> The student will be able to effectively and objectively examine and analyze a work of art based on the four steps of art criticism. Note: These are the changes the department made to last year's inquiry: If the students do not turn in a color reproduction along with the first step of the paper (Description) it will not be accepted. Students will be given the opportunity to resubmit with proper information. Student must earn a 4 or above for the 1st Step - Description before moving on to the 2nd Step - Analysis as the Description and Analysis steps were the lowest scores in the four step process and establish the foundation for the 3rd Step - Interpretation and 4th Step - Judgment. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The class average was 88%, but 100% of students did not score 80% or higher. 20 out of 25 students scored 80% or higher on the 4 Steps of Art Criticism paper. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The expectation of 100% of all students scoring 83% or higher on the 4 Steps of Art Criticism paper was not due to deficient scores on the Description and Analysis steps, but rather writing conventions. Making the adjustments for the Description and Analysis steps proved to be effective, but some students were not successful with spelling, punctuation, capitalization and grammar. 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
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> May 11, 2018 <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
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> NA b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Don Robson will allow students to correct conventions, with reduced points, in order to encourage students to proofread their papers prior to the submission due date and to achieve a higher score on their paper. c. <i>Program:</i> NA d. <i>Assessment:</i> Some students are weak in writing conventions. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Scores will improve in the area of conventions on the 4 Steps of Art Criticism paper. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> 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? The Department of Art would like to assess a different student outcome for general education.

Submitted by: Don Robson **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 6/18/18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na **Approved & Posted to**

Assessment site: 6/18/18