

Program: Art BA (All Art degrees: studio art, art history, and art education) Date report completed: 5/15/2017

Completed by: Dr. Carol L. Langer, Interim Chair

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): Dalton, R. Hansen, V. Hansen, Peters

**PART I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning.**

| A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b> | B. When was this SLO last assessed? | C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b> | D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved. | E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level? | F. What were the results of the assessment? | G. What were the department’s conclusions about student performance?  | H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?                                  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| 4. Does the student’s concept and its presentation show maturity of expression?   | Spring 2016                         | Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached  | 9 BA seniors— all were same modality and same site— face-face, Pueblo   | 85% of students will score “yes”   | 70.3% of the students scored “yes”          | While there was a low score in this area, it may be reflective of the disparate interpretations of the word, “maturity.” Or, it may be that this particular group of BA students did not evidence as much | Department will undertake a discussion of the meaning of “maturity” and arrive at a mutual understanding of expectations. |

|   |             |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|---|-------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
|   |             |   |   |  |  | growth as past cohorts have. The conclusion is to monitor this score.   |   |
| 2. Does the work show indicate a critical awareness of contemporary trends/practices?     | Spring 2016 | Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached | 9 BA seniors—all were same modality and same site—face-face, Pueblo | 85% of students will score “yes”                     | 66% of the students scored “yes”                     | This has been discussed in recent department meetings. We are going to continue discussion when a new chair is hired. | It is expected that courses will examine their content areas for contemporary content, making certain that it is inserted. The Department may need additional resources in some areas in order to allow the production of contemporary work. For example, the Department could benefit from a printer of professional quality for digital images. |
| 8. Does the student’s creative momentum show potential for an ongoing career in the arts? | Spring 2016 | Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached | 9 BA seniors—all were same modality and same site—face-face, Pueblo | 85% of students will score at Acceptable or Superior | 96% of the students scored at Acceptable or Superior | Potential can be identified for majors, thus validating a career choice and further growth                            | Continue the visiting artists in addition to regular coursework to challenge and expand student growth  |
| 9. Rate your overall perception of this student’s professional presentation.              | Spring 2016 | Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached | 9 BA seniors—all were same modality and same site—face-face, Pueblo | 85% of students will score at Acceptable or Superior | 96% of the students scored at Acceptable or Superior | Student performance is as expected  | Continue  |

Comments on part I:

**PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.**

| A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.                                  | B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year. | C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?   | D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why? | E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations? |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Art 410 rubric question #6: Does this student's work manifest qualities associated with the best practices of their emphasis area | Spring 2016  | Administer assessment earlier   | No; department could not agree                                  | Follow up when chair is hired   |
| Art 410 rubric question #8: Does the student's creative momentum show potential for an ongoing career in the arts?                | Spring 2016  | Review this SLO—note that the last reported score was 81% of students scoring at or above Acceptable; the 2016 score was 96%. | No; decision was to wait for chair to be hired                  | Follow up when chair is hired   |

Comments on part II: