

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: Art (BA) and Fine Art (BFA)

Contact Name and Email William V. Ganis william.ganis@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>All Outcomes</p>	<p>Focus Group, with general questions about the program and curriculum. For this trial, the focus group invited all graduate students and was conducted in the art ARTH 371 course, since the course is required of all BA and BFA students.</p>	<p>While we could use the survey expectations, the focus group tends to be more holistic and identifies programmatic strengths and opportunities often not captured in defined learning objective and outcomes. We expect our programs to be highfunctioning and that students graduate feeling that they are prepared for graduate programs or work opportunities.</p>	<p>Generally speaking, the students in the studio art programs stated that they had adequate challenges and preparation. They mostly understood the purpose of the core curriculum and found it helpful.</p> <p>Students in both studio and design areas cite facilities issues as a concern, noting that equipment is old or in one instance students can't access it because it's not installed.</p> <p>A preponderance of the negative comments come from students in the graphic design program who feel the program doesn't address new (electronic) media and is much too print focused. Students don't feel prepared for the working world, don't feel</p>	<p>Thomas Steiger, Professor of Sociology conducted focus group in the ARTH 371 course, since the course is required and most of the students are Juniors and Seniors in the BA and BFA programs.</p> <p>Jodi Lynn McCoy, Gallery Assistant, recorded the focus group discussions.</p> <p>William Ganis, Chairperson, analyzed and parsed the results and delivered them to the faculty members/areas discussed by the students in the focus group.</p>
---------------------	---	---	---	---

			<p>encouraged to produce excellent work and feel many of the projects are busy work. Given all of the applications of graphic design, perhaps the program is too general to truly</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			help students prepare for postgraduation work.	
Outcomes: 1.1 2.3 3.1 3.2 4.3	Surveys, administered through Qualitrics. Survey responses were invited from graduating seniors,	75% "Agree" or above 90% "Agree" or above 90% "Agree" or above 90% "Agree" or above 90% "Agree" or above	Expectations Studio Graphic Design Met Met Met N/A Met Not Met Met Not Met Met Not Met	The Department's Assessment Committee assembled the surveys with input (especially regarding questions) from the faculty. The Assessment Committee invites student responses that are then directed to the Chairperson, William Ganis. Questions germane to particular program areas, such as graphic design, are further automatically directed to faculty within each of those disciplines.

<p>Outcomes: 2.1 2.3 3.2 4.1</p>	<p>Student Portfolio</p>	<p>The expectation is for students to average across questions at 2.5 or above. For admission to the BFA program, students must score an average of 3 (12 of 16 points). The simple rubric for each portfolio review competency is as follows: 4: Accomplished 3: Competent 2: Developing 1: Inadequate</p>	<p>Generally, students scored above the 2.5 threshold. These scores measure competencies and it's obvious that some students are excelling while others struggle. That the lowest scores are generally in "critical thinking" perhaps means we could be doing a better job integrating conceptual practices along with foundation technical skills.</p>	<p>The portfolio is administered in the one-credit ARTP296 Foundation Portfolio Review, S/U course. This past semester, Fran Lattanzio was the instructor of record. Students make online portfolios that are then evaluated by all faculty members using a Qualitrcs survey and using the rubric presented to the left. The ARTP296 instructor collects survey information and this information is shared with the greater department faculty.</p>

Summary

The department is glad to return to full assessment reporting after a hiatus. We feel our instruments, namely focus groups, graduating-senior surveys and assessments of sophomore-level art portfolios will help us to gather meaningful information about our programs that will lead to positive changes. We realize already that the instruments and implementation thereof can be improved.

1) discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself. New instruments such as the Qualtrics survey and the improved focus group mean that we have to better align the questions with the objectives and outcomes, perhaps even rewriting these. We must map each question to specific outcomes.

2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary. We worked to eliminate bias in our focus-group instrument. Rather than having students self-select for participation, upper-level students now participate in a focus group in the ARTH 371 course required of all students—this fuller participation gives a much more robust sample size.

Because the portfolio review is new, we have to both evaluate the results and the instruments. We need to reflect on this data and discuss what we might do with it. We have already made a scholarship award based on someone showing excellence in this review process (we're hoping a potential scholarship will motivate students to perform in this course). However, we still have to decide what it means for a student who submits a portfolio but scores very poorly. More broadly, we might define what aspects of the portfolio demonstrate aptitude for certain concentrations/areas of study.

We have efforts underway to improve professional opportunities for undergraduate students who will be included in efforts to attend NCECA (ceramics) AIGA (graphic design) and other design/networking meetings. We expect to invite art-and-design alumni to campus next year—this person will work with both graduate and undergraduate students. We expect to continue to take students on field trips to arts institutions.

3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

The portfolio review is still being rolled out—many more incoming students experience it in a newly required ARTP296 course. This past year, a group of 7 studentvolunteers took the course, there will be more students in the course next year and in 2018-19 all students will be taking the course. We hope to use these two years with reduced numbers to troubleshoot questions and process. For instance, we realize that students are not ready at this point to write artist statements, so we have to evaluate the instrument itself—is it a baseline for future comparison? Do we introduce these writing concepts earlier?

As above, we must align survey and focus group questions with specific outcomes and edit questions or outcomes as appropriate.

We already recognize the need for more student participation in the surveys so that we have statistically significant data sets.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: Art (BA) and Fine Art (BFA) Date: 01.03.17

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if

				<p>necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to</p>

				<p>substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to</p>

				pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

Thanks for submitting your 2017 Student Learning Report!

There are two key issues that next year's Student Learning Summary Report needs to address. One is the need for additional detail, starting with actually listing, by name, the outcomes that were assessed; providing specifics about the measures (to demonstrate their alignment with outcomes) and results; etc. The other key issue is the over-emphasis on indirect assessment (and the complete lack of direct assessment). There is a direct measure here—the portfolio—but as you note, it is "still being rolled out." Once you have solidified your assessment plan, I also encourage you to separate the reports for the BA and the BFA so that you can demonstrate the quality of each program.