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The 2011-2012 annual assessment reports are based on the learning outcome assessment template prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs in support of the IPP (Instructional Program Priorities) process in 2012. This memo offers a summary of the documentation provided by the Department, a description of the assessment strategies used to assess these learning outcomes, and feedback for improving assessment practices in the future.

We have used appropriate WASC rubrics (See Appendix 1, 2a, and 2b) for guidance on good effective practices in several areas, including the quality of the learning outcomes, assessment plans, methods/data/analysis, and the use of assessment data for curriculum improvement, academic planning, and budgeting. This report and appendices can be used to help a department determine the extent to which such an assessment system is in place (See Appendix 3), and what additional components or processes may need to be developed or improved for the programs in the department. If you have any questions about the content of this report, please contact Dr. Amy Liu, Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment.
Executive Summary

The BA Studio Art and Art History Programs in the Department of Art have made great strides in developing its assessment plans. We commend the Department for the recent efforts.

As the department moves forward, we would encourage it to:

1. Significantly simplify the program assessment process by focusing on program (not course) learning outcomes not on assessing all the courses and by assessing one or two program learning outcomes each year;
2. Look at modeling other rubrics, such as the VALUE rubrics, to develop more sophisticated rubrics that would better capture the key elements of each of the complex program learning outcomes the department plans to assess, including critical thinking, written communication, oral communication, and information literacy;
3. Make sure that program learning outcome and criteria are measurable by using specific action verbs based on Bloom’s taxonomy;
4. Consider creating a portfolio system to assess student learning, particularly in Studio-based disciplines.
5. Develop an effective and efficient assessment plan to assess the program learning outcomes for its graduate and Art Education programs;
6. Clarify the differences in expectations for the program learning outcomes for its BA Studio Art and Art Education;
7. Collect and present data, especially from external constituents such as alumni and employers to assess the short and longer-term effect of program learning outcomes;
8. Provide more information on how data is collected and evaluated by each method including inter-rater reliability, sample size, response rate, and sampling methods for the selection of student work;
9. Update the department assessment plan to include the above information and to make sure all the learning outcomes from all the programs in the department will be assessed within 5 years with the 6th year for the self-study.

This report is focused on the key assessment questions in bold below.

1. Have formal program (not course) learning outcomes been developed and/or assessed for all the programs in the department?

Two of the undergraduate programs in Art, Art History and Studio Art, have developed formal assessment plans. The Studio Art concentration has undergone a major revision of the assessment plan following a change in the units required for the concentration. Likewise, the Art History concentration has also recently been revised to increase the units required for the degree and a formal assessment plan has been developed for the concentration. However, no formal data has been collected because the plans are too new. Both of these programs are accredited through the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD).

The Art Education concentration has not completed a formal assessment plan although an assessment of the program is scheduled for the 2012-13 academic year. Unlike the other two concentrations, this program is not accredited through NASAD.
The graduate program in Studio Art does not currently have a formal assessment plan in place. However, this is forthcoming.

To date (when the department handed in their assessment report to the Provost in early 2012), no formal program assessment plans have been developed or conducted for any of the minors.

### Table I: Department Assessment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Data Used for Change</th>
<th>Impact of Changes Assessed</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Enrollment</th>
<th>Accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Studio Art</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>799 (225)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Art History</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>767 (42)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Art Education</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>102 (14)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BA/BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1668 (281)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Art Minor</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Minor</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education Minor</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Art</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1698 (335)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the quality of these outcomes based on the WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes” (Appendix 1)?

Based on the criteria in “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Assessment Program Learning Outcomes”, the undergraduate and graduate programs in Art are between “initial” and “emerging”.

For both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, recent changes have been implemented based on faculty discussion to improve student learning and in facilitating transfer students from community colleges. For both the Studio Art and Art History programs, learning outcomes have been developed based on NASAD standards. The learning outcomes in Studio Art are loosely linked to the baccalaureate learning goals whereas the Art History outcomes are explicitly linked to the baccalaureate learning goals.

The learning outcomes, as currently assessed, are embedded within course assessment. However, the report does not make it clear which assignments may be used to ensure that such
assignments provide comparable evidence among classes. We suggest considering modifying or developing rubrics that will allow for better comparison among classes. Furthermore, we suggest making strategic choices in assessing learning outcomes to ensure that sampling of student work is randomized so that the process is both sustainable and informative, particularly in the Studio Art classes. Not all learning outcomes are clearly linked with assessment strategies that enable students to demonstrate learning. The Department of Art has made an attempt to document student work, particularly in the Studio Art concentration. However, this report indicates that the top five assignments are documented for each class at three points during the semester. We are concerned that this may not represent a true assessment of student learning in the program. For the purposes of program assessment, we recommend choosing a random sampling of student work from the studio courses.

Furthermore, the assessment of student work is currently conducted in a qualitative manner with faculty discussing this work on a yearly basis. Learning outcomes 1 & 4 are assessed in studio art courses and learning outcomes 2 & 3 are assessed in upper division courses. While these outcomes all seem to be assessable, we are concerned that the data collection is not directly assessing the outcomes. For example, to assess learning outcome 1, the faculty are viewing a subset of the best works of art produced by students in each studio class. However, the outcome states that “students will articulate the content of their work and become confident in discussing it with others.” While the data collection methods allow the department to address methodological issues, there is no direct assessment of this learning outcome. We would suggest collecting some evidence to address this outcome in each class to truly assess this outcome.

In addition, we suggest considering the development of a rubric that could be used to assess learning outcome 4 for the program, not just for the classes. It may also be appropriate to consider the use of a Portfolio assessment of Studio Art majors. Please refer to the “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes” in Appendix 1. This may also allow an assessment of scaffolding of student learning in the transition from lower division to upper division courses.

In the Art History concentration, the four learning outcomes presented are assessable as they are presented. However, it would be helpful to clarify the link between the data collection and how this relates to the long-term strategic planning within the concentration. The AAC&U VALUE rubrics may be helpful in development of assessment strategies (Appendix 4). These rubrics may be modified to help program assessment rather than course assessment.

There is currently no formal assessment plan for the Art Education concentration. Students in this concentration take many of the same courses as students in the other two concentrations.

There is currently no formal assessment plan for the MA program. However, learning outcomes have been developed.

3. Are the program learning outcomes aligned closely with the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals (UBLG)?

Yes. The undergraduate program learning outcomes are aligned closely with the University
Baccalaureate Learning Goals, particularly in the Art History concentration.

4. What methods are used to collect the data for EACH of the learning outcomes? Is the data collected of high quality (valid and reliable)?

For the Studio Art concentration, two methods are used to address four learning outcomes. Student work is imaged and archived for future faculty discussions. Qualitative assessment of student work is used to modify program outcomes. For the Art History concentration, three different methods are used to address three of the four listed learning outcomes. In all cases, there are direct measures of student learning. However, there is no indication that the criteria for student performance are explicitly agreed upon by the faculty. While implicit, we suggest making these criteria explicit. There is no check for inter-rater reliability in assessing student learning. In addition, LO 1 for the Studio Art concentration and LO 10 for the Art History concentration are not assessed using the current assessment strategy. We are also not sure about how the data collected will be used to inform curricular changes in a systematic manner.

One way to address student development would be to create a portfolio to document student learning over time. We suggest considering the “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes” (Appendix 2) to evaluate student development through the curriculum.

5. Has the program used alumni surveys to collect data to assess the longer-term effects of the program learning outcomes? Are the methods/results reliable and/or valid?

Faculty regularly keep in touch with graduates of all programs. However, there is no formal data collection at this point.

6. How have the findings from the learning outcomes assessment been utilized to revise or maintain elements of the curriculum?

Data for studio art projects are discussed by Studio Art faculty at regular faculty meetings. Results are largely discussed in a qualitative manner. Currently, assessment of the Art History program has not been completed, but anecdotal evidence is regularly discussed by Art History faculty.

7. What are the other future considerations?

In the future, please keep the following questions in mind when the department reflects on assessing student learning outcomes and improving each of the programs:

1) Is an assessment plan for each program in place? Has it been recently updated? Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed and used? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time, such as within a six-year program review cycle? Is the plan sustainable in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Is the assessment plan revised as needed?
2) Are the program learning outcomes in the annual assessment report aligned closely with the most updated assessment plan?

3) Is each program learning outcome aligned closely with pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, the co-curriculum, or relevant student support services?

4) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that your graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree (BA/BS or MA/MS)? Are the data, findings, or analyses from learning outcomes skillfully presented so that they are easy for people to understand and/or for multiple audiences to use?

5) Is the data used not only in the course where the data is collected, but also used for the program curriculum and for budgeting or strategic planning for the program, the department, the college, or the university?

6) Has the program conducted follow-up assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of program changes made based on assessment data? If yes, how effective are those changes? If no, what’s your plan to assess the effectiveness of those changes?

7) Where are the program learning outcomes published, e.g., across programs, with students, in the course syllabus, the department websites or catalogs? Are students aware of these learning outcomes? Are they widely shared?