Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1
Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: ___Art (BS) 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

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome*** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)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?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
All Outcomes	Focus Group, with general questions about the program and curriculum. For this trial, the focus group invited all students and was conducted in the art gallery, independent of any course.	Since this was a new assessment practice, we didn't set expectations, rather we are taking the opportunity to look at the instrument as well as the information collected.	The students had much to say about the difficulties encountered in one of our concentrations—especially with graphic design courses and pedagogy. There was no negative feedback about other concentrations or areas. Additionally, we realize that though we thought the gallery director would be a "neutral" non-faculty emcee, that in fact, certain students are comfortable with her and this likely has introduced a bias.	Meredith Lynn, Gallery Director conducted focus group and redacted the results. William Ganis, Chairperson, analyzed the results. Brad Venable, Assessment Coordinator parsed the results and delivered them to the faculty members/areas discussed by the students in the focus group. William Ganis, Brad Venable, and Nancy Nichols-Pethick, Portfolio Review Coordinator met to discuss the results, biases and better practices.
Outcome 3.2: Demonstrates appropriate use of tools and technology in the creation, of art / reproduction and distribution of visual messages	Examination of presentation of student work in culminating exhibition. Also, student interaction with gallery director.	That students will have "professional" skills necessary to exhibit in juried, group, or solo exhibitions—these include preparing work for exhibition	The results varied mostly by program areas. Photography and printmaking students, for instance understood very well how to mount, mat and frame	Meredith Lynn, Gallery Director was primarily responsible for helping students to install their culminating exhibition. She made direct observations, and

		and installation.	their artworks for presentation. Graphic design students, on the other hand, generally have none of these skills and have scant knowledge about how to pint, mount or otherwise create quality, physical realizations of their work.	shared these with the Chairperson and faculty.
(NASAD H.IX.J.3d				
New "Portfolio Reviews" Outcome	Sophomore portfolio review	Students will have technical skills and competencies necessary for advancing to upper-level work.	This portfolio review is being created for implementation next year.	Nancy Nichols-Pethick is leading effort to design review. William Ganis is assuring compliance with NASAD standards and alignment with university assessment needs.

Summary

The Department of Art and Design is finishing an assessment hiatus that is meant to "reboot" past unused assessment practices. We are coming back to assessment practices with the help and advice of University Accreditation and Assessment Coordinator, Dr. Mary Herrington–Perry and expect to submit our first full report for AY 2016-17. While the present report appears robust, it represents an interim step.

1) discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself

The results of the focus group fit a context of abiding problems with the graphic design programs. The programs are not functioning, as students in this assessment group through other means consistently report:

a. that quality instruction is lacking—one instructor is cited as "teaching" very little in terms of delivering content, and that courses consist more of group "critiques" or reactions to student assignments completed or in-progress. Students seeking aid from this same instructor are often directed to read books or watch videos or use tutorial software;

b. that students are not learning fundamental skills in lower-level courses, so they cannot succeed in upper-level courses.

c. that "stacked" courses (multiple courses with the same time meeting) do not work and that the instructor does not have enough time to dedicate to each of the particular courses. Students report an overall lack of structure and that they are required to meet for only short periods of time despite courses scheduled for 6 hours per week.

d. that grading seems arbitrary—students report receiving grades for work never submitted, or the same grades for greater or lesser efforts.

As above, the culminating exhibitions have demonstrated disparity and heterogeneity (mostly divided by program areas) in student preparedness for final exhibitions.

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

Already changes are underway: the Chairperson, working in conjunction with CAS and ORR has eliminated most possibilities for non-art-and-design majors to take graphic design courses so that the instructors may focus on students in the major.

For Fall 2016, the Chairperson has directed the graphic design instructors to map graphic design competencies to be learned, and show in which course these competencies are learned and through which assignments.

The Chairperson has directed all department instructors to abide by the University Handbook requirements and to keep in mind students success issues regarding syllabi and performance feedback and include:

a. All assignments, tests and other grading criteria listed, dates items are due/taken, and weights (usually expressed as percentages, or points out of a total number) towards calculating the final grade.

b. Reporting grades in Blackboard that correspond to the assignments listed on the syllabus.

c. Project and final grading must reflect the criteria laid out in the syllabus (giving all or a great preponderance of "A"s shows little assessment of student work, or extremely skewed criteria).

d. An attendance policy.

e. A recording of attendance and making sure that students are staying for the duration of the class in order to meet federal credit-hour standards.

To address the output/professional presentation/ exhibition issues, the department is investing in dry-mounting equipment dedicated to graphic design students. Professor Charles Armstrong is incorporating instruction on the use of the equipment into his courses. Also, all second-year students will receive instruction in output for their portfolio review. Gallery Director, Meredith Lynn, continues to educate students about how to make quality exhibition installation efforts.

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

Per a requirement set forth by NASAD accreditors, the department will establish and conduct second-year portfolio reviews that will be repeated on an annual basis. These reviews represent opportunities to assess student learning of art-foundational competencies and may also establish a comparison between work produced before and after upper-level work. (Portfolio review compared to culminating exhibition). The Department had an assessment hiatus in recent years and is looking forward to returning to assessment with meaningful instruments and results. The focus group and examination of culminating work have been excellent and useful reintroductions to the hows and whys of meaningful learning assessment.

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

Degree Program: <u>BS/BFA in Art</u>   Date: <u>8.14.16</u>

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	**Level 1 – Developing**	**Level 2 – Mature**	**Level 3 – Exemplary**
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☒ Outcomes were identified. One was. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☒ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ 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. ☒ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☐ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☐ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics,

				checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☒ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ 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. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. Will be ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust

	(planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. ☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	the results of assessment. Will be ☒ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ 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. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 - Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   No specific outcomes are identified for the focus group measure—does it truly assess all of them? You can determine that by examining the results. The other outcome is clear and measurable.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   Two discrete measures were used to assess student achievement this past year, the culminating exhibition and a focus group (which means the program already has its indirect measure in place). I understand why you might not yet be able to set performance expectations for the focus group, but you'll need to do so in order to gauge improvement. Options include asking questions such as "How well did your program prepare you for work or graduate education?" and giving them ranges such as "Extremely well," etc. But other answers simply won't be quantifiable.

   For the exhibitions, the expectations need to be more explicit, so gear them to your rubric—100% of students will earn a rating of X (meets standards).

3. **Results**
   Please be more explicit about what the results mean (at least for outcome 3.2). How many students participated? What sort of checklist or rubric was used to evaluate their performance? What were the actual numerical results, as well as the key strengths and weaknesses identified? Include the rubrics among your Blackboard documents next year.

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   Multiple faculty members participated in collecting, analyzing, and sharing results, and even though the assessment program still is "rebooting," you've identified some important changes to make as a result of your work this past year. I look forward to learning more from your next report, which should focus on providing details of the methods and results and plans for improvement. Ultimately, your goal is to document that learning continuously improves.

   Thanks!