School of Arts

School of the Arts

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

For Outcome I, which focuses on the School of the Arts’ educational and cultural programming, the School met targets for Measures 1 and 2, but it fell short of the target for Measure 3. Even though the School met its targets for Measures 1 and 2, the numbers that it was able to document did not match actual numbers due to circumstances related to the administration of two student-led organizations within the School.

The Visual Arts Club’s student leadership did not compile data for the 2016 - 2017 year. For this reason, the School used attendance numbers and day counts for the exhibitions that the student organization presented in the 2016 - 2016 year. A similar problem developed in the Department of Theatre and Dance as Center Stage’s student leadership did not compile data for the 2016 - 2017 year. The attendance number in the report is an estimate that the 2017 - 2018 student leadership developed after reviewing incomplete records from 2016 - 2017. This number (649) is less than half of the total for 2016 - 2017 productions.

The lack of information from the student groups had an impact on Outcome I, Measure 3. The actual number of events that highlighted student scholarly and creative research certainly was much higher than the one that appears in the report. Even so, 185 discrete events (an exhibition or theatrical production that runs for several days or has multiple performances counts as one event) were part of the 2016 – 2017 schedule. Of those events, 93 highlighted student scholarly and creative research, yielding a percentage of 50.27%. If the missing data had been available, the percentage would have been closer to and/or met the goal.

The chairs of the two departments in which the two student groups reside are aware of the problem and have indicated that they will ensure that the data are available at the end of the 2017 2018 year.

As a result of discussions within the Dean’s staff, the method for counting attendance (paid versus unpaid) for some events was different in the 2016 – 2017 year. For example, the School counted attendance for Friends of the School of the Arts events and certain member events that the Halsey Institute of Contemporary Art (HICA) hosted as having been paid for members of affinity groups that support the School and HICA. The change reflects an interest in tracking participation in affinity groups such as the Friends of the School of the Arts. At the same time, the School began to offer a more robust schedule of events for the Friends group in 2016 – 2017, and additional changes to that program are underway for the 2017 – 2018 year.

Given funding realities, the School probably will not realize increases in its State-funded operating budgets in the near future. For this reason, additional resources for programming will need to derive from earned income or gifts from donors.

In 2015 – 2016, the School of the Arts enrolled in the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP), which is “an annual online survey, data management and institutional improvement system designed to enhance the impact of arts-school education.” The SNAAP report became available late in the spring of 2016, and it has been a source of information that the School has used for communicating with a variety of constituent groups. The report, along with reports that SNAAP has named DataBriefs, support/ inform Outcome II.

For Outcome II, the School of the Arts met targets for Measures 1 and 2. The School will continue to pursue a modified version of Measure 1 (Over the course of the year, the School of the Arts will use the SNAAP report and/or SNAAP DataBriefs to develop at least one digital and/or print document for recruitment and/or other outreach.) in 2017 – 2018, but it has developed a new measure for Measure 2 in order to address a number of comments that appeared in the SNAAP report as alumni made about career/workforce preparedness. Additionally, this statement from a SNAAP research report indicates that alumni would like to have had more career and entrepreneurial training:

The majority of all alumni said they would have benefited from more knowledge of key career-related skills: 91 percent would have benefited from knowing how to market and promote their work and talents; 87 percent would have benefited from more finance management skills; and 84 percent would have benefited from knowing how to monitor legal and tax issues.

The chairs/directors will use the 2017 – 2018 year to discuss and formulate ways in which their academic divisions can support students’ development of career skills.
For Outcome III, which focuses on development/fundraising, the School met its targets for Measures 1 and 2. Data that the College of Charleston Foundation develops summarizes fundraising activities for each fiscal year. As that information becomes available, the Dean, the School’s development officer, and her staff meet to develop and refine the current year’s budget for the Dean’s Excellence Fund. The data also facilitate establishing overall fundraising goals.

While the School of the Arts has enjoyed a remarkable fundraising record for three years (more than $1 million in gifts for each of the past three fiscal years, with the 2016 – 2017 year yielding more than $2 million), the School has set its target for 2017 – 2018 at $500,000 in order to reflect a realistic budgeting approach.

The School has used data from previous years to establish targets for securing gifts to enhance two scholarship funds in the 2017 – 2018 year. One of those funds has not hit the $50,000 level which is necessary for an endowed fund. An additional $25,000 will allow the School to convert the existing fund to an endowed fund, so the School has set that amount as one of its targets for 2017 – 2018. A donor created the other fund in 2016 – 2017 to honor the Associate Dean, but the School will seek additional gifts to the fund in 2017 – 2018 in conjunction with the Associate Dean’s retirement. If the School reaches its target (an additional $50,000), it will match the original donor’s gift.

For Outcome IV, which documents one form of support for faculty research, the School met its targets for Measures 1 and 2. The 2015 – 2016 year was the first cycle in which the School of the Arts reviewed data to assess funding for faculty creative and scholarly research. The data that the School has compiled since that first cycle have indicated that there is an ongoing need for such funding. After a series of discussions among the Dean and her staff in the spring 2017 semester, the Dean’s staff developed new guidelines for faculty who wish to seek support from the Dean’s Excellence Fund for their scholarly/creative research projects.

The new guidelines will go into place in the 2017 – 2018 year. Changes include:

- Name, changing from Special Research and Development Funding to Dean’s Excellence Faculty Awards
- Funding levels, changing from “up to $250.00 for domestic projects and up to $500.00 for international projects” to “between twenty-five and fifty percent of the total/project/activity budget” with no stated limits
- Budget, changing from $6,000.00 (projected) per year to $20,000.00 per year

**Art History - BA/Minor**

ARTH Report (in Process)

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

The School of the Arts at the College of Charleston plays a distinctive role in the lives and education of the students of the College as well as the community by developing artists, art scholars, and art leaders within a liberal arts setting. The education in the arts that we provide stimulates creativity and critical thinking skills, activates the whole learning process, and motivates a life-long love for the arts for all students. Within a city known for its cultural heritage, this superior education marks the School as a national flagship undergraduate arts program.

**Arts Management - BA/Minor**

ARTM BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

**Halsey Institute**

Halsey Institute of Contemporary Art Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Over the last several years, we have seen increases in membership income, visitor traffic, and tour participation. In fiscal year 17, we saw a decrease in these categories for the first time.
Our annual membership party, held each November, had lower attendance than usual, impacting our membership target. Many of our members renew each year at the membership party. In 2016, the event was a few days after the Presidential election, which impacted attendance.

The lower than expected tour participation numbers is due to internal staff changes and restructuring which took away time from this program, as well as Hurricane Matthew and other bad weather days that caused groups to cancel their tours. We are back on track staffing wise and should see tour participation start to increase again in fiscal year 18.

The audience in FY17 was lower than it has been in some time. We believe that there are several causes for the decrease including internal staffing changes, improved record keeping (our attendance records are more accurate and detailed), and last fall’s hurricane and a few snow days that caused us to close to the public.

**Historic Preservation & Community Planning - BA/Minor**

**HPCP BA**

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

ALL SLOs AVERAGES

In-depth reporting of assessment results for HPCP 199, HPCP 299 and HPCP 415 was undertaken starting in the Spring 2017 Semester. Results for the Fall of 2016 were not reported.

**HPCP 199**

A total of 200 students were enrolled in HPCP 199 in Spring 2017. Sixty-four point five percent or (N=129) were assessed based on Student Learning Outcomes communicated in course syllabi. The assessed assignment was a research paper on a historic building in Charleston, SC that was a common assignment across all sections of the course. The goal was to assess 100% of HPCP 199 students however, a new adjunct faculty member did not report results correctly before moving to Kentucky.

This section of the assessment report communicates all SLOs assessment results under the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation policy. The lowest score was 1 while the highest was 5 on a scale of 1-5. The average score for all SLOs in HPCP 199 was 3.59 out of 5.

**HPCP 299**

A total of 15 students were enrolled in HPCP 199 in Spring 2017. One-hundred percent or (N=15) were assessed based on Student Learning Outcomes communicated in course syllabi. The assessed assignment was a research paper and oral presentation on a neighborhood in Charleston, SC that was a common assignment across all sections of the course. The goal was to assess 100% of HPCP 299 students which was successfully accomplished.

This section of the assessment report communicates ALL SLO assessment results. The lowest average score was 0 while the highest was 4.7 on a scale of 1-5. The average score for ALL SLOs in HPCP 299 was 3.38 out of 5.

**HPCP 415**

A total of 24 students were enrolled in HPCP 415 in Spring 2017. One-hundred percent or (N=24) were assessed based on Student Learning Outcomes communicated in course syllabi. The assessed assignment was a research paper and oral presentation on 19th Century Historic Architecture in Charleston, SC that was a common assignment across all sections of the course. The goal was to assess 100% of HPCP 415 students which was successfully accomplished.
This section of the assessment report communicates ALL SLO assessment results. The lowest average score was 3 while the highest was 5 on a scale of 1-5. The average score for ALL SLOs in HPCP 415 was 4.18 out of 5.

SUMMARY

We would expect some improvement in SLO results over the course of a student’s career. The initial results reported here indicate that this has happened for HPCP Majors. A slight decrease in average SLO results is found in HPCP 299 however this returns to a higher average in HPCP 415. Over the course of two years when all faculty have cycled through teaching the Senior Seminar HPCP 415, we can expect to see more rigorous data recovery and analysis.

Music - BA/Minor

Music BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

Based on last year’s positive assessment of instrumental students’ application of music fundamentals outcomes, we decided this year to focus on our vocal students’ application of those same skills, assessing both music fundamentals and solo performance outcomes through performance-based rubric assessment of solo vocal performance.

Our vocal students’ performance, on the whole, demonstrated less mastery of music fundamentals than did their instrumental peers last year. We believe this is in large part due to the differences in pre-college training that instrumentalists and vocalists receive; it is far more frequent that individual instrument lessons and secondary-level music ensemble classes for instrumentalists (band, orchestra) emphasize music theory and music literacy skills than their equivalents for singers. Therefore, vocal majors’ under-preparedness is a systemic and ongoing challenge that is difficult for us to entirely resolve from a curricular standpoint.

Fortunately, as our assessment results demonstrate, our vocal students are making substantial progress over the course of their first year, particularly those that study with our roster faculty. As a result of measuring the substantial lacunae in incoming freshmen vocal majors’ training in music fundamentals and musical study skills, the voice faculty are now devoting more time to discussing these issues and introducing practice/study strategies to improve on them both in individual lessons and in group repertoire classes.

Our assessment of music fundamentals through our aural skills (Theory Lab) classes demonstrated that we needed to develop a more sophisticated instrument to differentiated between two components of a single skill. As a result, we re-designed the rubric for assessing this outcome, which we will apply as we re-assess this area during the 2017-18 school year.

Studio Art - BA/Minor

Assessment Report: Studio Art

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

Using assessment results, the Department of Studio Art implemented new changes to our curriculum starting in fall 2017. These changes include requiring the ARTS 119-Drawing I course as the pre-requisite and foundation for all Introductory studio courses. The ARTS 430-Independent Study course now formally requires the completion of 4 levels of one area of study prior to proposed individual projects. Also, through annual ongoing assessments of the work being exhibited in the ARTS 418-Senior Seminar Course, the faculty recognized that some of our senior students were not receiving enough in-depth instruction and practice in one area of study. So, for the Studio Art major, the department now requires 6 credit hours taken at, or above, the ARTS 335 level. This will ensure that majors go beyond the intermediate level of instruction, build on their skills and expand their knowledge of the possibilities of a given discipline. The faculty believes that in the future this depth of experience will be reflected in the quality of our senior majors creative output for the ARTS 418 senior capstone exhibitions. The number and range of Art History course offerings were also substantially increased for our students’ elective Art History requirement.

For the AY 2016-2017, the outcomes for our assessment rubrics were revised in order to make assessment more concise and comprehensive. With faculty input, new outcomes were developed for the Introductory courses taught in four areas of study: Drawing, Painting, Photography and Sculpture. Three new general departmental outcome categories were created as well as specific sub-categories for assessing each area. The common Student Learning Outcomes, written for each Introductory course syllabus, were converted into these sub-categories, thus becoming, the department’s benchmarks for Intro-level assessment. The outcomes for Adjunct Faculty review were also updated (see Assessment report). They will aid in supporting more comprehensive teaching guidelines for our adjunct faculty.
These revisions reflect the need felt by the faculty to make the assessment rubrics less generic and more useful for pinpointing our strengths, priorities and weaknesses in regards to the contents of our courses and structure of our curriculum. There is evidence of progress being made in all areas of assessment. So, for each of the assessment measures, the outcomes were changed in AY 2016-2017 and the target percentages for success have increased to 85% Meets Expectations and 15% (or more) of Exceeds Expectations and/or Superior. Therefore, the targets were not met this year. However, using the performance target of 80% Meets Expectations or above from the previous year’s assessment plan, there has been improvement.

The full-time faculty met this fall (2017) and, based on the revised assessment outcomes for the ARTS 418 Senior Seminar Exhibition course, have decided to allow each uppermost level of the five areas of study in the department, ARTS 339-Drawing IV, ARTS 331-Painting IV, ARTS 333-Sculpture IV, ARTS 332-Advanced Printmaking and ARTS 334-Advanced Photography, to be repeatable once for a total of 6 credits. This will be another curricular change that encourages greater depth of study in the semesters leading up to the senior seminar course. In the past two years, there is definite progress in the senior student artwork exhibited in the ARTS 418. The exhibitions are more professional looking and the artist statements are more focused and articulate. Therefore, the faculty also agreed that the studio component of the ARTS 418 course will remain in place and the exhibitions for the course will be scheduled as late in the semester as possible in order to maximize time for students to produce their artwork for their exhibitions.

Full Assessment Report 2016-2017: Studio Art

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Full Assessment Report 2016-2017: Studio Art

Program Name: Studio Art

Program Type: Undergraduate Degree

Start: 07/1/16

End: 06/30/17

I. Department Mission Statement

The studio art program at the College of Charleston is designed to develop and give depth to the student’s artistic point of view by combining material, historical and conceptual training within the context of a liberal arts education. Our classes function as active learning environments where academic and creative growth is fostered through practice. Students learn how to shape materials, explore traditional and contemporary themes and become creative and analytical problem-solvers. Most studio courses meet for approximately four contact hours per week, allowing for class discussion, the acquisition and evolution of skills and concepts, and individual instruction between student and faculty. With steady practice and exposure, students will reach an advanced level of engagement and the confidence to think critically and create their own responses to the traditions and possibilities of a variety of media.

School Mission Statement

The School of the Arts plays a distinctive role in the lives and education of students of the College as well as the community by developing artists, art scholars and art leaders within liberal arts setting. The education in the arts that we provide stimulates creativity and critical thinking skills, activates the whole learning process and motivates a life-long love for the arts for all students. Within a city known for its cultural heritage, this superior education marks the School as a national flagship undergraduate arts program.

II. Assessment Process: The assessment process description should present a clear understanding of how the program/unit utilizes assessment data for continuous quality improvement.
For program assessment, the Studio Art Department utilizes our students’ artwork at the beginning and end of their academic careers and the performance of our adjunct faculty. Each year, the roster faculty refines our review methods, updates our rubrics and use the resulting data and observations to improve our teaching strategies. Ultimately, our goal is to strengthen our student output, course content and adjunct faculty performance.

Starting in the spring of 2017, the faculty now assesses our Introductory courses: Drawing I, Painting I, Sculpture I and Introduction to Film Photography. The contents of our introductory courses form the foundation on which the sequential evolution of skills and knowledge is built. The campus-wide requirement of developing Student Learning Outcomes for each course, is a logical place to affirm benchmarks and to assess the effectiveness of introductory course instruction. New assessment rubrics, employing three new general outcomes plus specific sub-categories originating from each area’s introductory course SLO’s, were written and approved by the faculty and implemented in April 2017. The goal for these changes is to ensure more thorough review and consistent results in the Introductory courses thus strengthening the platform on which the upper levels of all five of our areas of study are built.

The Senior Thesis/Exhibition ARTS 418 course is designed to function as a “bridge” between undergraduate study and a professional career in the arts. For it, all senior Studio Art majors are required to install an exhibition of their work that best represents their achievements during their undergraduate careers. Professional practice skills, such as writing an artist statement, documenting artwork and creating a personal website are also taught in the course. Through faculty discussion and review of previous senior artwork, this course evolved in 2016-2017, to include a studio component whereby the enrolled senior students create a coherent body of art work during, and outside of, the class period specifically for their class exhibition(s). A new ARTS 418 assessment rubric was developed in the fall of 2016 based on faculty input and the new direction of the course.

All adjunct faculty are reviewed by the entire faculty on an annual basis. This is critical because a large number of studio art courses are taught by adjuncts. The rubric for Adjunct Faculty evaluations was also re-written in spring of 2017. Review of student coursework is now only one of the criteria by which the performance of individual adjunct faculty is assessed. Other more specific measures of assessment are employed as well, including evidence of improvement in course work and materials for returning adjuncts and the integration of art historical references into the course materials. Digital files of student work are now being requested and put on file for the individual adjunct faculty reviews and program assessment.

III. OUTCOMES for Introductory Courses:

The following Outcomes, Assessment Methods and Assessment Reports were specifically developed in the Spring of 2017 for the assessment of these Studio Art Introductory Courses: Drawing I, Painting I, Sculpture I and Introduction to Film Photography

OUTCOME A. VISUAL COMPETENCY: Overall, the student work displays an understanding of basic 2-D or 3-D concepts and principles of visual organization.

OUTCOME B. BASIC TECHNIQUES, MEDIA & PROCESSES: There is evidence, in the student work, of thoughtful and proficient use of media, media specific techniques, concepts and formats.

OUTCOME C. CRITICAL THINKING & CREATIVE PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS: The artwork reflects students’ ability to explore possibilities with subjects, concepts and media, develop original ideas and arrive at creative solutions.

D. ASSESSMENT METHODS. Measures and Performance targets:

The full-time faculty assessed artwork produced by students enrolled in adjunct taught introductory classes: Drawing I, Painting I, Intro. to Film Photography and Sculpture I. They employed rubrics using the three listed departmental assessment outcomes as well other specific area of study outcomes developed from the required SLO’s for each introductory course. In each review, faculty evaluated the work and assign a score 1-4 based on how well they believe the work meets the 3 intended departmental outcomes.
For each introductory course, a goal of 15% exceeds expectations and/or superior and 85% meets expectations was established for the three departmental assessment outcomes.

Measure 1. ARTS 119 Drawing I: Student Work & Introductory Course Assessment

Measure 2. ARTS 216 Painting I: Student Work & Introductory Course Assessment

Measure 3. ARTS 215 Introduction to Film Photography: Student Work & Introductory Course Assessment

Measure 4. ARTS 220 Sculpture I: Student Work & Introductory Course Assessment

E. ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

Measure 1. ARTS 119 Drawing I.
Out of 186 students enrolled in Drawing I, artwork of 88 students was reviewed (47%).

Outcome A.: Visual Competency, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome B.: Basic Techniques, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome C.: Critical Thinking, Meets Expectations, 100%

Target met for measure 1? No
Did results for measure 1 demonstrate improvement? Yes

Measure 2. ARTS 216 Painting I
Out of 80 students enrolled in Painting I, artwork of 63 students was reviewed (79%).

Outcome: Visual Competency, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome: Basic Techniques, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome: Critical Thinking, Meets Expectations, 100%

Target met for measure 2? No
Did results for measure 2 demonstrate improvement? Yes

Measure 3 ARTS 215 Introduction to Film Photography
Out of 46 students enrolled in Introduction in Film Photography, artwork of 46 students was reviewed (100%).

Outcome: Visual Competency, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome: Basic Techniques, Meets Expectations, 50%, Exceeds Expectations, 50%

Outcome: Critical Thinking, Meets Expectations, 50%, Exceeds Expectations, 50%

Target met for measure 3? No
Did results for measure 3 demonstrate improvement? Yes

Measure 4. ARTS 220 Sculpture I
Out of 60 students enrolled in Sculpture I, artwork of 55 students was reviewed (92%).

Outcome: Visual Competency, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome: Basic Techniques, Meets Expectations, 100%

Outcome: Critical Thinking, Meets Expectations, 100%

Target met for measure 4? No
Did results for measure 4 demonstrate improvement? Yes

F. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS:
The results were discussed in the first fall faculty meeting. The faculty will continue to refine the Introductory course goals and assessment rubrics.

IV. OUTCOMES for ARTS 418 Senior Exhibition Course
The following Outcomes, Assessment Methods and Assessment Results were specifically developed in the Fall of 2016 for the assessment of the ARTS 418 Senior Exhibition Course. The outcomes were written into the ARTS 418 assessment rubric which was utilized by the full-time faculty throughout the AY 2016-2017.

OUTCOME A. ARTIST STATEMENT: The statement coherently describes the premise behind the student’s artwork.
OUTCOME B. PRESENTATION: The installation of the artwork is professional and contributes to the artwork’s visual and conceptual impact.

OUTCOME C. CRAFTSMANSHIP: The artwork demonstrates a high level of craftsmanship and technical mastery of the material.

OUTCOME D. FORMAL COMPETENCY: The artwork demonstrates a high level of competency with formal elements, composition and visual structure.

OUTCOME E. SUBJECT MATTER and MEDIA: The artwork demonstrates a thoughtful and sophisticated engagement with the subject matter and media.

OUTCOME F. AWARENESS of REFERENCES: The artwork exhibits the student’s awareness of relevant historical, contemporary and/or cultural references.

G. ASSESSMENT METHODS. Measures and Performance targets:

The full-time faculty assessed artwork produced by every senior student enrolled in the fall 2016 and spring 2017 sections of the ARTS 418-Senior Exhibition Course. They employed rubrics using the outcomes specifically developed for the course.

In each review, faculty evaluated the work and assign a score 1-4 based on how well they believe the work meets the 4 intended departmental outcomes.

4 = Superior, 3= Exceeds Expectations, 2= Meets Expectations, 1= Below Expectations

For each introductory course, a goal of at least 15% exceeds expectations and/or superior and 85% meets expectations was established for the three departmental assessment outcomes.

Measure 1. ARTS 418 Senior Exhibition Course, Individual Assessment 2016-2017

H. ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Out of the 50 students enrolled in the ARTS 418 course in AY 2016-2017, 50 students were assessed (100%).

Outcome A: Artist Statement
Exceeds Expectations, 100%

Outcome B: Presentation
Superior 6%, Exceeds Expectations 54%, Meets Expectations 40%

Outcome C: Craftsmanship
Superior 6%, Exceeds Expectations 40%, Meets Expectations 42%, Below Expectations 12%

Outcome C: Formal Competency
Superior 6%, Exceeds Expectations 34%, Meets Expectations 48%, Below Expectations, 12%

Outcome D: Subject Matter and Media
Superior 10%, Exceeds Expectations 40%, Meets Expectations 42%, Below Expectations 8%
Outcome E: Awareness of References

Superior 2%, Exceeds Expectations 36%, Meets Expectations 52%, Below Expectations 10%

Target for Measure met? No
Did results measure improvement? No

I. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

Motivated by the ARTS 418 assessment results, the department has made curricular changes to the studio art major requirements. In order to better prepare senior students and give greater depth to their learning and output, our student majors are now required to take 2 courses above the ARTS 335 level. This new requirement begins in the fall of 2017.

The full-time faculty met this fall (2017) and, based on the revised assessment outcomes for the ARTS 418 Senior Seminar Exhibition course, have decided to allow each uppermost level of the five areas of study in the department, ARTS 339-Drawing IV, ARTS 331-Painting IV, ARTS 333-Sculpture IV, ARTS 332-Advanced Printmaking and ARTS 334-Advanced Photography, to be repeatable once for a total of 6 credits. This will be another curricular change (scheduled to begin in fall 2018) that encourages greater depth of study in the semesters leading up to the senior seminar course. In the past two years, there is definite progress in the senior student artwork exhibited in the ARTS 418. The exhibitions are more professional looking and the artist statements are more focused and articulate. Therefore, the faculty also agreed that the studio component of the ARTS 418 course will remain in place and the exhibitions for the course will be scheduled as late in the semester as possible in order to maximize time for students to produce their artwork for their exhibitions.

The assessment results will continue to be used to implement curricular changes and to strengthen and refine the ARTS 418 course content, goals and assessment rubrics.

V. OUTCOMES for Adjunct Faculty Evaluations

The following Outcomes, Assessment Methods and Assessment Results were specifically developed for the evaluation and assessment of the performance of our Adjunct Faculty. All adjunct faculty are reviewed by the entire full-time faculty on an annual basis. This is critical because a large number of studio art courses are taught by adjuncts and thus, they have a substantial impact on our program. The rubric for Adjunct Faculty evaluations was re-written in spring of 2017. Review of student coursework was formerly the primary means the department used to evaluate adjunct faculty. Now it is only one of the outcomes by which the performance of individual adjunct faculty is assessed.

OUTCOME A. SYLLABUS: The syllabus is articulate and creates a coherent structure for class problems as well as adhering to the college-wide syllabus policy.

OUTCOME B. STUDENT ARTWORK: The student artwork reveals in depth engagement with the course SLO’s (student learning outcomes) and effective solutions for the problems set out in the syllabus. The work also corresponds to the appropriate course level.

OUTCOME C. ASSIGNMENTS: The assignments are intelligible and successfully incorporate class content. The student examples clearly exhibit the goals of the assignments.

OUTCOME D. EXPOSURE TO RELEVANT EXAMPLES IN THE DISCIPLINE: There is clear evidence that the faculty member is exposing students to significant historical achievements and important directions in the field of study.

OUTCOME E. STUDENT EVALUATIONS: The student evaluations reflect appropriate ratings for the course.
OUTCOME F. IMPROVEMENT: For returning faculty members, there is solid evidence of sustained growth and development of course materials (syllabi and assignments) and student work.

G. ASSESSMENT METHODS. Measures and Performance targets:

The full-time faculty assessed artwork produced by students in adjunct-taught introductory classes. They also viewed course materials and course evaluations provided by each individual adjunct faculty member. A total of 10 adjunct faculty taught 252 introductory students, or 68% of the total number of students enrolled in introductory classes in the department in AY 2016-2017.

In each review, faculty evaluated the artwork and course materials and assigned a score 1-4 based on how well they believe they met the 4 intended departmental outcomes.

4 = Superior, 3 = Exceeds Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, 1 = Below Expectations

For each adjunct faculty member, a goal of at least 15% exceeds expectations and/or superior and 85% meets expectations was established for the departmental assessment outcomes.

Measure 1. Adjunct Faculty Evaluation 2017

H. ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Out of the 10 adjunct faculty members who taught for the Studio Art Department in AY 2016-2017, all 10 were assessed (100%).

Outcome A: Syllabus

Exceeds Expectations 35%, Meets Expectations 65%

Outcome B: Student Artwork

Exceeds Expectations 5%, Meets Expectations 95%

Outcome C: Assignments

Exceeds Expectations 25%, Meets Expectations 70%, Below Expectations 5%

Outcome D: Exposure to Relevant Examples in the Discipline

Exceeds Expectations 20%, Meets Expectations 70%, Below Expectations, 10%

Outcome E: Student Evaluations

Exceeds Expectations 42%, Meets Expectations 53%, Below Expectations 5%

Outcome F: Improvement

Exceeds Expectations 12%, Meets Expectations 82%, Below Expectations 6%

Target for Measure met? No
Did results measure improvement? No
I. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

The results were discussed in the first fall faculty meeting. The faculty will continue to refine our introductory course content, SLO’s and assessment rubrics for adjunct faculty performance. The assessment results will be used to implement individual area changes for strengthening and giving depth and focus to our introductory courses. They will also aid in supporting more comprehensive teaching guidelines for our adjunct faculty.

Dance - BA/Minor

Dance BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Theatre - BA/Minor

2016 - 2017 Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

We have instituted the practice of repeating and adjusting the outcomes we assess on a yearly basis until we're able to make substantive changes in the curriculum that result from the assessment. This year we are able to rotate one of our outcomes out of the assessment cycle because we have made changes to the course based on two years of assessment. The other two outcomes will be assessed again in the coming year, with adjustments made to the assessment process.

Our assessment of the outcome “Students will describe the responsibilities of the members of the production team and demonstrate the ability to perform in at least one of those capacities” was connected to two courses: THTR289 (Design Production) and THTR201 (Technical Practicum). A rubric was created for each class that measured the outcome. In the process, the administration of these courses, which had differed amongst faculty members due to the one-on-one nature of the course, was standardized and formalized. A new course, THTR411, was created to take the place of THTR289 for Design Production, which allows THTR289 to be used solely for its intended purpose of Special Topics. The rubric that was created for THTR201 is serving as a model for the other practicum courses, one of which will be assessed in the coming year.

The difficulty we had in assessing the Script Analysis course last year prompted us to have a discussion about the curriculum map, since the course is considered a gateway course to the major and several upper-level courses assume that students come in with particular knowledge from the Script Analysis course. We discovered that students were learning different terminology for concepts depending on who was teaching the course and what textbook they were using. This year we’re attempting to standardize that information without constricting how faculty members teach or what books they use.

For the Introduction to Theatre class, our assessment revealed that faculty are requiring a wide variety of types of papers from section to section. Since this is a general education course that is not a prerequisite for any other course, we don’t want to make any requirements of faculty beyond that they require written responses of some sort. So we have abandoned that method of assessment for this particular course.

The quiz results led to a lengthy discussion during our faculty retreat this year about the areas of theatre we want students to encounter in the course. That led to significant changes in the quiz. We’re hoping that this semester we see more consistency between sections in the quiz results.