

2020 – 21 & 2021 - 22 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Art Date: 4/28/21
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Aaron Nix
See General Education Assessment Plan 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> The film director presentations were graded on the attached rubric that includes scores for these categories: speaker qualities, theory, visual literacy, materials, and time management.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> What percentage of students reach an acceptable level of knowledge and fluency in film theory, film history, terminology and visual literacy? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 73% (11/15) of the students received a B or higher on their director presentations. Breakdown of rubric scores of 4 (proficient) or higher: Speaker Qualities: 11/15 Theory: 11/15 Visual Literacy: 12/15 Materials and Content: 8/15 Time Management: 8/15 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Students did not reach our goal of 80% of students with a B or higher in terms of overall grade, but reached that mark in the Visual Literacy rubric category. Students scored higher in Speaker Qualities, Theory and Visual Literacy; reflecting areas practiced elsewhere in the class through activities such as writing, in-class discussions and lectures. Since Theory and Visual Literacy have more weight in the rubric, it can be seen as a positive that students developed and prioritized their presentations to fit the assessment goals. More time and consideration to teaching proper presentation materials and execution should be made a priority. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Due to the amount of weight given in the Theory and Visual Literacy rubric categories, grading fluctuates dramatically depending on those two scores. The weight percentages should be reconsidered. Another evaluation factor is how the assignment is spread across a significant portion of the semester, resulting in students having inconsistent research opportunities.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 4/28/21 <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> Don Robson, Justin Groth, Seth Boggs, James Bockelman, Aaron Nix
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> Continue to prioritize Theory and Visual Literacy but increase standards for visual representation and presentation logistics. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Revisit the fairness of spacing students' presentations throughout the semester. c. <i>Program:</i> N/A d. <i>Assessment:</i> Revisit rubric weights 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Increase students' professionalism and standards for analysis.

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).

N/A

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? na

Submitted by:Aaron Nix **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 7/6/2021

Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:Approved 7/6/2021

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na