

**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 (MA) and Fine Art (MFA) **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><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></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 gallery, independent of any course.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The students had much to say about handbooks, conflicting information about committee meetings and preparation for work in their profession. 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.</p>	<p>Meredith Lynn, Gallery Director conducted focus group and redacted the results.</p> <p>William Ganis, Chairperson, analyzed the results.</p> <p>Brad Venable, Assessment Coordinator parsed the results and delivered them to the faculty members/areas discussed by the students in the focus group.</p> <p>William Ganis, Brad Venable, and Nancy Nichols-Pethick, Portfolio Review Coordinator met to discuss the results, biases and better practices.</p>
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>



## 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. The present report represents an interim step and a test of a focus group suggested by Dr. Herrington-Perry.**

### **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 problems we’ve experienced with our graduate programs, especially those surrounding our graduate-program handbooks and our committee processes.

Specifically, students have reported that:

- a. the handbooks are confusing and important information is sometimes not obvious
- b. that they desire more instruction about requirements and would like us to draw their attention to processes.
- c. that being a graduate student in our programs can seem isolating and some would like to see more “community” opportunities.
- d. that they would like more specific preparation for the professional world.

### **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**

Work is underway to rework and redesign the MFA and MA handbooks. The Chairperson is working with the Graduate Committee to make the handbooks far for clear and concise, have a better graphic presentation and better illustrations.

The Chairperson has made an assessment of all graduate student progress and has written to each student advising them of their status and how (if necessary) they should catch up. The Chairperson has advised faculty in graphic design and ceramics to be far more proactive in managing their graduate students’ progress.

The Graduate Committee chair and the Department Chairperson will host a meeting with all graduate students and graduate faculty. This meeting will take care of business first, imparting information about the programs and handbooks and allowing opportunities for questions and dialogues. The meeting will also become an opportunity for a community gathering where graduate students can interact with each other and with faculty outside of their direct areas of study.

We have efforts underway to improve professional opportunities for undergraduate students—graduate students will be included in efforts to attend AIGA and other design/networking meetings. We expect to invite a graphic-design alumni to campus next year—this person will work with both graduate and undergraduate students.

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

We expect to focus on improvement of the above issues and measure these improvements. We expect to look to professional organizations, accreditation and peer institutions for standards and comparables germane to our graduate programs and especially competencies we’d expect graduate students to master.

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

Degree Program:      Date:

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are 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 necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.  <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.  <input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
<p><b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <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.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
<b>3. Results</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.  <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.  <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.  <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.  <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<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.  <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.  <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
<b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b>	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.  <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.  <input 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"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.  <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <b>Will be</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <b>Will be</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific,	<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 standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.  <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	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.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped +</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

## 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. Also, the Curriculum Map only shows that outcomes are practiced, never reinforced or mastered?

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program is redeveloping its assessment plan, and this year employed just one indirect measure. Again, it makes sense that you have not yet set performance expectations for the focus group, but you'll need to do so in order to gauge future improvement. Options include asking questions such as "How well did your program prepare you to meet your future goals?" and giving them ranges such as "Extremely well," etc. But other answers simply won't be quantifiable.

#### 3. Results

Even with the focus group, you can be more explicit about the results. How many students participated? What were the general categories of questions posed to them? How were their responses recorded and analyzed? Did their responses generally indicate that they were satisfied with the program?

#### 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 the focus group. I look forward to learning more about your direct assessment efforts 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!