

2022 – 23 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Art	Date: 3.28.23
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: James Bockelman, Seth Boggs, Justin Groth, Aaron Nix, Don Robson	
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). Rubric/Evaluation Sheet (attached).	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): The presentation informs the department faculty of the students preparedness for moving into their chosen career field and if they have a sound understanding of their aesthetic. 2). Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.) The following criteria are used to assess student presentations: Presentation/Commitment/Quality/Developing Potential Presentation - 88% of students presenting scored at or above 80% Commitment - 88% of students presenting scored at or above 80% Quality - 63% of students presenting scored at or above 80% Developing Potential - 63% of students presenting scored at or above 80% 3). INTERPRETATION * - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Faculty expectations were 80% of the student artifacts would score 80% or higher. This did not happen in the Quality and Developing Potential criteria. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). NA	
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 3.27.23 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: NA b. Assignment/course: NA c. Program: NA d. Assessment: Faculty will discuss the potential subjective impact in scoring. 2. IMPACT *- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION * on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Faculty will discuss the results and focus specifically on the criteria that students underperformed in considering how /if these topics are implemented in all courses, if the questions need to be re-phrased, and if subjectivity in scoring plays a role. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION * 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 will assess this questions again next academi year.	
Submitted by: Don Robson	Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 5/30/23
Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: Approved 5/30/23	
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: NA	