

Degree/Certificate: Studio BA and BFA; Art History BA

Major/Option:

Submitted by: Art Department

Date: October, 2014

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2013-14

Part I – for the 2012-13 academic year: Except for the formatting, this section **nearly identical** to previous years' templates for the Program SLO Assessment reports. Because we have begun asking Deans to create College-Level Summary Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

The Student Learning Outcome assessed in this report is one that is recorded in all departmental programs. It is that students, *“Interprets and critically evaluates visual arts through oral [and written] discussions.”*

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

_____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;

_____ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

 X SLO met without change required

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

Students were asked to interpret and critically evaluate visual arts through oral discussion, via a Sculpture class critique as led by Professor Greg DuMonthier and witnessed by Assistant Professor Jodi Patterson and Helen M. Bergland, Office of Academic Planning. This assessment method (the oral critique) was chosen because it is the tool that all Departmental faculty utilize; as does the professional art community as a whole.

The Sculpture class was selected because students from ALL departmental programs attend such a course.

The critique was performed during the last week of class. Students had already participated in several critiques in Professor DuMonthier’s class, however, the rules for the critique were still clearly visible on the door. These are expectations are: 1. Respect everyone’s Opinion, 2. The artist receives feedback first, 3., Never critique the critique, 4. Don’t remake the artwork (and only critique finished work), 5. No sitting, and 6. One at a time.

Assignment critiqued: Students were to create sculpture using a medium unfamiliar to them.

Space: Exhibits were located in a single room, where the critique was held. Projects were spotlighted—an element that was not an afterthought, but very much part of the showcasing of several of the pieces.

Students: Approximately 12 students participated—from beginning to advanced.

Assessment Rubric:

Competency: Interprets and critically evaluates visual arts through oral [and written] discussions.	Students significantly contributed to oral discussion	Students mildly contributed to oral discussion.	Students did not contribute to oral discussion.
	7/12	3/12	2/12

This assessment protocol did not include written discussion.

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
 - a. **Findings:** Approximately 83% of students significantly or mildly contributed to a group discussion that involved the interpretation and critical evaluation of visual art. Approximately 16% of students did not contribute to the oral discussion.

Analysis of findings: Students who did not contribute to the oral discussion may need more time to develop their thoughts and could be asked to write down their ideas – probably not for the individual artist’s pieces of work, but more as a summation of what the class is noticing about their colleagues’ work. This will offer them a way to bring a, perhaps, slightly more divergent and/or perceptive interpretations to the critique. Furthermore, it allows their contribution to not be tied to a grade and/or the grade of a peer, while still allowing their “voice” to be heard.

Professor DuMonthier has, however, performed several critiques with this same group of students and realizes that student participation in critiques can increase or decrease depending on several factors.

Both written and oral evaluations are extensively performed department-wide.

5. What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?

- a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

No program changes are proposed. However, we do highly suggest that any professor who is having trouble assessing a student’s ability to interpret or critically evaluate the visual arts through oral discussions might be prompted to ask for a written evaluation.

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

N/A.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

N/A

NEW: PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP
FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2012-13 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

In response to the university's accrediting body, the [Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities](#), this section has been added. This should be viewed as a follow up to the previous year's findings. In other words, begin with findings from 2011-12, and then describe actions taken during 2012-13 to improve student learning along, provide a brief summary of findings, and describe possible next steps.

Working definition for closing the loop: *Using assessment results to improve student learning as well as pedagogical practices. This is an essential step in the continuous cycle of assessing student learning. It is the collaborative process through which programs use evidence of student learning to gauge the efficacy of collective educational practices, and to identify and implement strategies for improving student learning.* Adapted 8.21.13 from <http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html>.

1. **Student Learning Outcome(s)** assessed for 2011-12

N/A

2. **Strategies implemented** during 2012-13 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2011-12 assessment activities.

N/A

3. **Summary of results** (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.

N/A

4. What **further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery**, etc. are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

The Department will “Close the Loop” in the 2014-15 academic year based on the attached assessment.

Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.
2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.
4. **Observations gathered from data:** This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.
5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.
6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.

Some elements of this document have been drawn or adapted from the University of Massachusetts' assessment handbook, "Program-Based Review and Assessment: Tools and Techniques for Program Improvement" (2001). Retrieved from http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/program_based.pdf