



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2017-2018

Program: _ART BA (all ART BA degrees: studio art, art history, art education) **(Due: June 1, 2018)**

Date report completed: ___May 31, 2018___

Completed by: __Leticia Steffen, interim Art Department chair___

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _Avina, R. Hansen, V. Hansen, Peters___

Please describe the 2017-2018 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> assessed? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	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? Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.	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?
SLO 2: Students will distinguish the role of art in a global society.	Spring 2017	Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached (Questions 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 of the ART 410	5 BA students in ART 410	85% of students will score "yes"	4 out of 5 students (80%) averaged a "yes" score in this area.	The majority of students met the expectations but the number was just short of the 85% expected achievement	The Art Department will be fully staffed in 2018-19 with the hiring of a new department chair and art historian, so program changes/improvements can now be strategized with full

		Faculty Assessment rubric)					input.
SLO 3: Students will employ creative skills associated with interdisciplinary learning.	Spring 2012	Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached (Question 7 of the ART 410 Faculty Assessment rubric)	5 BA students in ART 410	85% of students will score "yes"	100% of students averaged a "yes" score in this area.	Students are meeting expectations in this area.	The Art Department will be fully staffed in 2018-19 with the hiring of a new department chair and art historian, so program changes/improvements can now be strategized with full input.
SLO 5: Students will create original work suitable for entry into a juried exhibition.	Spring 2017	Direct measure, faculty review, rubric attached (Questions 4, 8 and 9 of the ART 410 Faculty Assessment rubric)	5 BA students in ART 410	85% of students will score "yes"	3 out of 5 students (60%) received "yes" scores	Students did not meet expectations in this SLO; this area needs strengthening. Question 4 is related to how well a student shows "maturity of expression" and this is an area that was identified in last year's assessment as a possible weakness, especially related to how faculty define "maturity."	The Art Department will be fully staffed in 2018-19 with the hiring of a new department chair and art historian, so a robust discussion of the concept of "maturity" can occur with the full department faculty in 2018-19. Faculty also need to revisit rubric to determine evaluation language regarding juried exhibitions and the quality of work.

Comments on part I: We may want to revisit the scoring on the rubric used (see below) to include a wider scale than just "yes" or "no" and modify our department assessment plan to determine what scores we would consider acceptable (proficient) vs. unacceptable. We also anticipate growth in the number of BA students in the future, especially in the Art History emphasis given our new hire of an art historian, so we look forward to having more BA students to include in this group (there were no art historians graduating this year).

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2017-2018 cycle. These are those 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 to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
SLO 5: Students will create original work suitable for entry into a juried exhibition. (Specifically, question 5 in the ART 410 Faculty Assessment rubric: "Does the work shown indicate a critical awareness of contemporary trends/practices?")	Spring 2017	Recommendation: "This has been discussed in recent department meetings. We are going to continue discussion when a new chair is hired."	Search for Art Department chair was modified this year to be a Digital Art/Photographer.	Search for Art Department chair was successful. Incoming chair has background (including contemporary focus) in Digital Art and Photography.

Comments on part II:

410 Faculty Assessment

Student's name: _____ Transfer Student: Yes No

Degree Program BA BA Art ED BFA

1. Does the work shown relate to the artist's stated intention/conceptual claims?
 Yes No
2. Does the work shown indicate a critical awareness of contemporary trends/practices?
 Yes No
3. Does the work contain demonstrable strengths in foundation skills?
 Yes No
4. Does the student's concept and its presentation show maturity of expression?
 Yes No
5. Overall does the work convey the clarity of purpose and innovation one might expect of a four-year art student?
 Yes No
6. Does this student's work manifest qualities associated with the best practices of their emphasis area?
 Yes No
7. Is the student able to discuss their work with a measure of depth using appropriate terminology and an understanding of form, content and technique?
 Yes No
8. Does the student's creative momentum show potential for an ongoing career in the arts?
 Weak
 Acceptable
 Superior
9. Rate your overall perception of this student's professional presentation.
 Weak
 Acceptable
 Superior

Additional Comments on Reverse