## 2022 - 23 & 2023 - 24 General Education Executive Summary

**Department:** Art **Date:** 3.27.23

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Jsmes Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Aaron Nix, Don Robson

## See General Education Assessment Plan for:

a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology

### **Analysis of artifacts:**

1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Rubric

# **Summary of RESULTS\*:**

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):

Are gen ed students able to translate verbal narrative into a visual zine. Can gen ed students think in terms of visualsequence (beginning, middle, end). Are students able to visually organize their story into a comprehensive, well–crafted result?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.

Out of 25 artifacts, 19 artifacts passed our threshold in the rubric, 76% of students. The rubric we used did nothave points, therefore each faculty member assessed the artifacts differently.

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).

Trying to interpret five different ways that each of faculty scored this artifact was incredibly difficult. I would recommend re—assessing Communication with these documents one more time on the next go—around. But toapply a rubric with a point system AND a rubric that only addresses the Communication portion within the Zineproject.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The Zine project is a good project in that pulls together a number of important aspecs of Art 101from drawing to design to color relationship.

Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 3.28.23

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email to faculty

Who were results shared with? (List names): James Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Aaron Nix, Don Robson

#### Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

- 1. ACTION\*- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:
- a. Teaching: The Zine is not taught in all gen ed art courses.
- b. Assignment/course: NA
- c. Program: NA
- d. Assessment: I would recommend re–assessing Communication with these documents one more time onthe next go–around. But to apply a rubric with a point system AND a rubric that only addresses the Communication portion within the Zine project.
- 2. **IMPACT\*-** What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION\*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? To receive a clearer assessment of the project.
- 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? We need to reassess before we can answer this question.

Submitted by: James Bockelman Assessment Committee Reviewed: 5/30/23

**Department Chair notified** – approval/additional action needed: Approved 5/30/23

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: NA