

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2020-21 Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: Art and Design Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Alden Cavanaugh alden.cavanaugh@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities 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 were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1. Advanced technical Expertise in Concentrations- an advanced level of technical expertise within the students' concentration. 3.1 Conceive, designs, and creates works in the chosen concentration [NASAD H.IX.h.3c]</p>	<p>Direct Measure: BFA/BA Senior Exhibition/ Senior Portfolio Assessment.</p> <p>Students participate in a required, public exhibition of their best, exhibition-ready works, selected with Advisor; students install exhibition, create signage/labels, marketing materials.</p> <p>Note: Gallery Director resigned at end of Fall 2020 semester. No replacement was able to be put in place. Search currently underway. This made exhibition more challenging for all.</p>	<p>All Senior student portfolios (work installed in the exhibition is a portfolio) are scored by small faculty team using a rubric (holistic). Score is from 1 to 6 possible points, with 1 being "Poor" and 6 being "Excellent" Quality.</p>	<p>Fall 2020: GD: 6 students, avg score 4.50 ARTED: 4 students, avg score 4.56 2D: 2 students, avg score 4.50 INT: 3 students, avg score 4.00 3D: 1 student, avg score 5.25 AH: no students Grand total: 16 students, avg score 4.67</p> <p>Spring 2021: GD: 8 students, avg score 4.50 ARTED: 1 student, avg score 3.25 2D: 2 students, avg score 4.50 INT: 2 students, avg score 5.00 3D: 2 students, avg score 5.25 AH: 1 student, score 6.00</p>	<p>Faculty teams take notes/discuss when deliberating on what factors made scores higher; find ways (adjust rubric from wholistic to analytical, see below) to track thematic/content as well as skill in execution; what skills need improving in order to achieve higher evaluations: what problems recur across a majority of portfolios? What proficiencies are more successful across the board/why? Find ways that faculty are not scoring their own students. ***New Rubric should have a <i>target score</i> ("portfolios must score # or above to be considered proficient/passing" rather than "below average/poor" since it is unclear whether "below average" is a passing score or not).</p>

<p>2. Note: Focus group assessment does not appear presently to be mapped to Outcomes—and likely should be.</p>	<p>Indirect Assessment: Focus Groups (2). Moderator met with students taking ARTP 609 (graduate required research course taken late in program) and ARTH 371 (undergraduate required course).</p>	<p>There are no stated expectations; however, department is looking for student opinion on various questions about our programs.</p>	<p>Results included comments in several key areas: Graduate: Students want more career preparation help. Suggested advisory board for GD. Value of graphic design grad class group meetings questioned. Committee experience generally good. Undergrad: Students don't understand how FS fits into their degrees. Too much art history required, not enough variety. Not prepared for what comes after University and need help with next steps.</p>	<p>Align focus group questions to Graduate Outcomes (ARTP 609-Graduate class).</p> <p>Observations from students: Graduate: Graphic Design graduate area needs curricular change/overhaul. More career mentoring is needed in graduate areas.</p> <p>Undergrad: Much focus in undergrad survey on the core, but students seem to lack an understanding of what they are supposed to gain from those foundational courses. We are evidently not making the importance of art history evident to them. The Focus Group can sometimes become a “complaint session” where one or more students vent about their negative experiences with a professor or professors in a semi-public way. The focus group meeting may not be the appropriate venue for such complaints (see Chairperson). Students note more one on one time in Drawing (ARTS 101) as a positive.</p>
<p>3.</p>				

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.

- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency*** (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

- 1) Cohort Sizes Art& Design: 195; Art(0321):123; Art (0361): 0; Art Ed: 29; BFA: 31; MFA: 13
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention Art& Design: 72.92% to 60.93%; Art (0321): 74.29% to 68%; Art Ed: 71.43% to 62.50%; Fine Art (0324): 66.67% to 20%
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate) 63.16% (cohort total 38); Average time to completion (graduate) : 2.8 years (3 is typical with MFA)

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Obviously this was an extremely challenging pandemic year for all when students needed extraordinary levels of support in terms of instruction and guidance. Faculty split larger/studio classes for safe distancing and provided virtual attendance to those with medical issues as required. This was safer but extremely demanding in terms of time. Students reported that the 3 Art & Design facilities provided helpful levels of sanitizing materials (as opposed to many other learning environments), promoting security and the ability to focus on their work. Faculty were accommodating regarding student pandemic anxieties and challenges. Many faculty members developed creative and imaginative ways to engage virtually or in a hybrid manner. BFA/BA Senior exhibition and /MA/MFA exhibition openings were virtual with Gallery staff doing a walk-through of the exhibition, and then allowing for discussions, which allowed students to engage with audience members asking questions. This was positively received and provided a space for in-depth discussion of the works of art. Normally, in a crowded gallery, this is not possible, so it was a positive change created by necessity. Similarly, other exhibition openings such as the Digital Student Exhibition were also virtual, allowing for alums and members of the community to participate virtually. Students (and faculty) were impressive in their creativity and problem-solving.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

- 1-Department needs to immediately update our assessment practices so they are in line with University standards. Need to transform our scoring rubric for Senior Portfolio Assessment from holistic to analytical model, allowing for deep analysis of student performance in individual areas/skills/competencies, rather than general level of achievement of the portfolio *as a whole*. Analytical model will allow Analytical rubric could even allow students to receive feedback on their portfolios.
- 2-Find ways to implement assessment of student competencies at *earlier* level/s (like Sophomore ARTP 296), do not wait until Senior Exhibition. This would allow students to use assessment developmentally, as well as provide department with more information. Could also assess in core classes, or ARTS 101s specifically to track *mastery of specific skills/*where things are causing problems.
- 3- **Create a new Assessment Plan as soon as possible** and decide now which programs to assess for Fall, 2022; decide on how to differentiate BFA/BA and MFA/MA, if applicable. Since they are different/more professional and intensive degrees with more credits, it would make sense that assessment would reflect this fact. Students tend not to understand the benefit of the BFA, only that it takes longer/costs more and we as a department need to do a better job of representing this. The Graduate Program MFA/MA may need to have its own assessment process, (although

the individual work of each MA/MFA student is assessed as they progress through the program by periodic required meetings) outside of the indirect/Focus Group assessment as that information tends to be anecdotal and does not measure specific competencies.

4-Department has discussed the need for a 'gateway' to BFA degree with Sophomore Portfolio Review course (required by accreditation). This could be another point of assessment and provide a baseline for later measures of competencies.

5-Need to increase cohort retention in all areas to align with CAS numbers where they fall short.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? Because we are using a wholistic rubric rather than an analytic one, it is not possible with out notes from the faculty teams' viewing of portfolios to determine this information in terms of skills/competencies. At next Senior Portfolio Assessment (and ideally other assessments we initiate) this information will be actively sought. It would be helpful to identify deficiencies in craftsmanship or skill OR in thematic/theoretical areas.

In our department, Graphic Design will need a different manner of assessment due to the very different competencies needed for success in this field, which is different from most of the traditional studio/Fine Arts. Ideally, Graphic Design digital portfolios (as opposed to selected printed elements from those portfolios) would be evaluated by external reviewers for competencies and career-readiness, and ideally the reviewers should be able to conference with students. This portfolio review (and mock-interviewing) takes place already in ARTD 490-Portfolio class taught by Prof. Cela, making use of virtual visitors; however, it has not yet been codified into our departmental assessment practice.

- 2) What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?).** We are unfortunately unable at this time to demonstrate such evidence, due to the need for updating of our Assessment practice and instrument/s.
- 3) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
- 4) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year** *Please see above, in table and narratives.*
- 5) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders.** A goal is to have assessment information on department website.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2020-21 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: Art & Design B.A.	Overall Rating: Mature (2.00/2.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcome is clear, specific, and measurable, aligning directly with accreditor standards as shown. • Strong direct measure of student learning is paired with rubric for evaluation. Discussion stresses the need for faculty notes to accompany current holistic rubric and recommends transition to analytical rubrics in the future for improved feedback on specific areas for student improvement. • Good notes to provide context about how covid changes affected student assignments. • Clear information is provided about the holistic rubric and its levels. • Data is clearly provided for each concentration area. • Indirect measure of student focus groups is used to provide insight into the student experience, their needs, and ideas for overall program improvement. • Thoughtful discussion is provided about how program assessment can continue to evolve to support better analysis through portfolio assessment and the use of analytical rubrics. • Assessment is shared with the faculty, and there is a plan to share information on the website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As already observed in your report, setting a target expectation for student performance is a good idea. It will help faculty quickly reference student progress over time. • As assessment takes on more of a rhythm over time, consider adding additional outcomes for assessment to make the timeline more manageable.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<p>Analysis & Results</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<p>Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided.</p>
<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Developing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped</p>