

## 2018 – 19 Departmental Executive Summary

<b>Department:</b> Art	<b>Date:</b> 5.1.19
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Jim Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Aaron Nix, 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> 90% or above did not achieve core competencies (score of 4 or higher) as stated and unanimity of acceptance by faculty for resolving and researching criteria. Resolving - 5/10 = 50% Researching - 6/10 = 60%  3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> BFA candidates did not perform at acceptable level. Results are flawed due to the inherent subjectivity in defining. Mentor(s) typically assess higher in regard to their mentee(s) potentially due to better understanding the candidate's work. Since the BFA candidates' work is not complete by the time of the Senior Exit Review, the criterion Resolving cannot be assessed properly.  4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> Perhaps BFA candidates should present at the symposium the spring semester of their junior year, prior to the Senior Exit Review, to better prepare and be judged by a neutral party. Perhaps the department should assess the same criteria at the symposium the spring semester of the senior year and after the BFA Thesis Exhibition is on display to more accurately determine based on the finished product.	
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5.1.19 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Met as department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Bockelman, Boggs, Groth, Nix, 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:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> NA b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> NA c. <i>Program:</i> NA d. <i>Assessment:</i> Department will assess during the symposium 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. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> NA	
<b>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</b>	
<b>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</b> Re-examine this question, but at the symposium the spring semester of the candidates' senior year and after their BFA Thesis work has been installed.	
<b>Submitted by:</b> Don Robson	<b>Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):</b> 5/10/19
<b>Department Chair notified/additional action needed:</b> na <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na <b>Approved &amp; Posted to Assessment site:</b> 5/15/19	

