

2021 – 22 Departmental Executive Summary

Department:	ART	Date:	5.6.22
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Robson, Bockelman, Boggs, Groth, Nix			
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology			
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). The cylinders students created were assessed by Professor. Each received a grade and the grades were averaged together to create the total grade for the assignment. Cylinders were scored according to the attached rubric.			
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): What percentage of students who take Ceramics are able to learn how to use the potter's wheel at a minimum acceptable level? Can the introduction of a more rigorous assignment help students reach the minimum acceptable level of throwing a six inch cylinder? 2). Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.) This past semester there were 11 students in ART 243. The first assignment was to work on the process of throwing by having the students objectively complete 50 cylinders on the wheel. These cylinders were graded purely on completion, but improvement was encouraged. This assignment is fundamental in building a foundation for many students to train themselves to learn the wheel throwing skill before being asked to complete particular cylinders. The second assignment was to create fifteen 6 inch cylinders. A 6 inch cylinder was deemed to be the minimum acceptable level for being able to effectively use the potter's wheel. The students were given 3 separate due dates with five 6 inch cylinders being due on each respective date. On these days the professor would assess each cylinder individually and relay the grades to the student talking through what was successful and what is deficient. At the end of the assignment all students were able to reach at least a B, 85%, proficiency in throwing a 6 inch cylinder and all students achieved throwing at least one cylinder of 6 inches of A quality. See attached documents for grades. After the 6 inch cylinder project there was an introduction of an 8 inch cylinder project. Students were required to throw five 8 inch cylinders. All students were able to achieve throwing an 8 inch cylinder and the average of the class was 95%. 3). INTERPRETATION * - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). As assessed by the professor the students cylinders improved with each successive due date. For example, Student 8 went from having 0 cylinders of A quality to having 5 at the end of the assignment. It would also appear that by being required to throw the 8 inch cylinders greatly improved student's ability and confidence on the potter's wheel. It did take another week of class for students to reach this milestone as well. It would not appear that the 8 inch cylinder project would be needed to reach the minimum acceptable level, but is instrumental in helping most students improve. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). Of the 11 students who took ART 243, 8 were non-art majors. This is mostly notable since it did not seem to be instrumental as a predictive measure for success. Students seem to tire of throwing cylinders by the time the 8 inch cylinder project was assigned. Motivation then seemed to wane. The class was structured in a non traditional way with the first part of the class being from 10AM-10:50 and then a second part of the class 12:40PM-1:30PM. Students were able to manage the first cylinder projects, but later projects (which are not a part of the scope of this assessment) seemed to suffer due to the set up and clean up and drying of clay.			
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 5.6.22 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email and then later in a department meeting Who were results shared with? (List names): Don Robson, Jim Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Aaron Nix			
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION *- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact: a. Teaching: The current method of teaching the foundational level skill for wheel throwing: centering and pulling clay, is sufficient. There is potential to implement a similar teaching method with other skills. But research would be needed. b. Assignment/course: The assignment will stay the same, but potentially the expectation of finishing the assignment sooner will be thought through as a way to further improve the course. c. Program: No discussion on the affect for the program as a whole. d. Assessment: The assessment is sufficient. Potential to push students			

<p>2. IMPACT*- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Students will continue to learn the foundational skill of wheel throwing at the minimal acceptable level.</p>	
<p>3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> None</p>	
<p><i>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</i></p>	
<p><i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i> Potentially moving up the due dates to increase efficiency of the assignment.</p>	
<p>Submitted by: Justin Groth</p>	<p>Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/14/2022</p>
<p>Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: 6/14/22</p>	
<p>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na</p>	