Assurance of Student Learning			
2018-2019			
PCAL	ART		
509: BA Visual Studies with concentrations in Studio and Art Education			
Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be			
completed in the subsequent pages.			

Student Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate proficiency with the use of the elements and principles of art and design through creating visual works.

Instrument 1 Direct: Portfolio

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1. Met

**Student Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate proficiency in the use of multiple art materials and techniques.** 

Instrument 1 Direct: Portfolio

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.MetNot Met

Student Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate about their work and the work of other artists, both historic and contemporary, through both oral and written means.

Instrument 1 Direct: Artist / Designer Statement

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.MetNot Met

Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)

Overall, results from this assessment indicate SLO targets were not met, though two SLO targets were within 5 percentage points of the targeted goal. It is also very likely the small sample size (N=4) makes the results less reliable.

Program SLOs for AY 2019-2020 were evaluated and revised, but these SLOs still need to be further examined to ensure the instruments used to measure them are valid and the evaluators are addressing each measurement instrument with a similar set of expectations for what meets or exceeds each learning outcome. Specifically, appropriate rubrics to evaluate each artifact need to be developed and normed.

An additional SLO to assess the success of the 509 Art Education concentration needs to be developed.

Not Met

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>		Student Learning Outcon	ne 1			
Student Learning Outcome						
					0	
Measurement Instrument 1		SURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: PORTFOLIO				
		BA program, students create a variety of studio art				
		f their work (ususally $8 - 12$ pieces); these pieces a	are assembled into a portfolio, installed and d	isplayed in a fi	nal senior	
	exhibition in the	exhibition in the Main University Gallery.				
	To evaluate SLO	O 1, each student's body of creative works (pieces	in the portfolio) were evaluated on their form	al and conceptu	al strengths	
	in using the visu	al elements and principles of art and design.	- · · ·	-	-	
Criteria for Student Success	Success is defin	ed as 5.25 or higher out of a possible 7.				
Criteria for Student Success	Success is defin	ed as 5.25 of higher out of a possible 7.				
Program Success Target for thi	s Measurement	80%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		75%	
Mathada	All DA stradia a		10 (N_4) encoded and displayed a postfolio of	6 41a a in ann an Ia in a		
Methods		oncentration students in the program for Spring 20 on during their final semester. This exhibition is us				
		eimagined virtually. Studio and graphic design fac				
		score for each student was the average of all 7 eval				
	target.	score for each student was the average of an 7 eval	dations. Wear scores between 5.25 and 7 we	ie counted as ac	ine ving the	
	tai goti					
Based on your results, circle or	highlight whethe	r the program met the goal Student Learning O	utcome 2.	Met	Not Met	
	1. 1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Wiet		
Actions (Describe the decision-m	aking process and	actions planned for program improvement. The ac	ctions should include a timeline.)			
This SLO has been refined, and is	s an improvement of	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen	ts in this progra	ım.	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ens	s an improvement of sure our tools are r	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen	ts in this progra	ım.	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ens	s an improvement of sure our tools are r	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen	ts in this progra	ım.	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensite itself. For example, wide variation	s an improvement o sure our tools are r ns between faculty	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain.	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer	ts in this progra	um. the process	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensite itself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the si	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in	ts in this progra n are not due to both Fall and S	the process pring, which	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensitself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, or	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the si r reduced the inpac	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain.	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro-	ts in this progra n are not due to both Fall and Spogram evaluation	m. the process pring, which ons, but this	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensite itself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, on will depend on whether or not stu	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the sr r reduced the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the semented the sem	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L et of outliers, as happened in this case. We will lool esters produce similar artifacts (due to COVID and	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro changes made, this parity between semesters	ts in this progra n are not due to both Fall and S ogram evaluation remains uncert	m. the process pring, which ons, but this	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensite itself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, of will depend on whether or not stu	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the sr r reduced the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the inpacted the semented the sem	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L et of outliers, as happened in this case. We will lool	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro changes made, this parity between semesters	ts in this progra n are not due to both Fall and S ogram evaluation remains uncert	m. the process pring, which ons, but this	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensite itself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, or will depend on whether or not stu <b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timelin	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the si r reduced the inpaction idents in both seme e for follow-up. If	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L et of outliers, as happened in this case. We will lool esters produce similar artifacts (due to COVID and follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro- changes made, this parity between semesters above have resulted in program improvemen	ts in this progra a are not due to both Fall and S ogram evaluations remains uncert t.)	um. the process pring, which ons, but this ain).	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensitself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, on will depend on whether or not stu <b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timelin Based on last year's assessment,	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the si r reduced the inpaction idents in both seme e for follow-up. If	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L et of outliers, as happened in this case. We will lool esters produce similar artifacts (due to COVID and	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro- changes made, this parity between semesters above have resulted in program improvemen	ts in this progra a are not due to both Fall and S ogram evaluations remains uncert t.)	um. the process pring, which ons, but this ain).	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensite itself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, or will depend on whether or not stu <b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timelin	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the si r reduced the inpaction idents in both seme e for follow-up. If	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L et of outliers, as happened in this case. We will lool esters produce similar artifacts (due to COVID and follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro- changes made, this parity between semesters above have resulted in program improvemen	ts in this progra a are not due to both Fall and S ogram evaluations remains uncert t.)	um. the process pring, which ons, but this ain).	
This SLO has been refined, and is Work still needs to be done to ensitself. For example, wide variation It is also possible outcomes were likely gave us better reliability, or will depend on whether or not stu <b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timelin Based on last year's assessment, that this SLO is measurable. We still need to ensure our tool	s an improvement of sure our tools are r ns between faculty impacted by the sr r reduced the inpact idents in both seme e for follow-up. If work has been do	over last year: this SLO is specific and represents t neasuring what we say we are measuring. Specifica evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. nall sample size, which varies from year to year. L et of outliers, as happened in this case. We will lool esters produce similar artifacts (due to COVID and follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions	he fundamental learning outcomes for studen ally, we still can't be sure that any issues seer ast year we evaluated students graduating in k at including all graduates again in future pro- changes made, this parity between semesters above have resulted in program improvemen edge, and experience we want our students to ppropriate rubric addressing SLO 1 needs t	ts in this progra n are not due to both Fall and Spogram evaluation remains uncert t.)	m. the process pring, which ons, but this tain). graduating and	

A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know.

Student Learning Outcome 2					
Student Learning Outcome 2	Demonstrate proficiency in the use of multiple art materials and techniques.				
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT MEASURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: PORTFOLIO Throughout the BA program, students create a variety of studio art and / or design pieces. In the required capstone course, students select the best examples of their work (ususally 8 – 12 pieces); these pieces are assembled into a portfolio, installed and displayed in a final senior exhibition in the Main University Gallery. To evaluate SLO 2, each student's body of creative works (portfolio) was evaluated as a whole.				
Criteria for Student Success	<b>t Success</b> Success is defined as 5.25 or higher out of a possible 7.				
Program Success Target for this	Measurement	80%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		75%
Methods	All BA studio concentration students in the program for Spring 2019 (N=4) created and displayed a portfolio of their work in a virtual gallery exhibition during their final semester. This exhibition is usually physically presented, but due to the pivot to online learning, this exhibition was reimagined virtually. Studio and graphic design faculty (N=7) evaluated and scored each portfolio for this SLO on a scale of 1 - 7. The final score for each student was the average of all 7 evaluations. Mean scores between 5.25 and 7 were counted as achieving the target.				
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.   Met   Not Met				Not Met	
Actions (Describe the decision-ma	aking process and	actions planned for program improvement. The ac	tions should include a timeline.)		
Work still needs to be done to ensure our tools are measuring what we say we are measuring. Specifically, we still can't be sure that any issues seen are not due to the process itself. For example, wide variations between faculty evaluators' scores for this SLO remain. It is also possible outcomes were impacted by the small sample size, which varies from year to year. Last year we evaluated students graduating in both Fall and Spring, which likely gave us better reliability, or reduced the inpact of outliers, as happened in this case. We will look at including all graduates again in future program evaluations, but this will depend on whether or not students in both semesters produce similar artifacts (due to COVID and changes made, this parity between semesters remains uncertain).					
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)					
Based on last year's assessment, work has been done to ensure this SLO represents the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating and that this SLO is measurable.					
We still need to ensure our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. An appropriate rubric addressing SLO 2 needs to be developed and normed. Developing the rubric should take a year, but effective norming likely will take several evaluation cycles.					
A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know.					

		Student Learning Outco	ne 3		
Student Learning Outcome		the ability to effectively communicate	about their work and the work of ot	t <mark>her artists,</mark> b	ooth
3	historic and contemporary, through both oral and written means.				
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT MEASURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: ARTIST / DESIGNER STATEMENT In the required Portfolio and Capstone courses, students write an effective statement about their work.				
Criteria for Student Success	Success is defined as 5.25 or higher out of a possible 7.				
Program Success Target for this Measurement		80%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		50%
Methods	All BA studio concentration students in the program for Spring 2019 (N=4) developed an artist / designer statement in the Capstone course and displayed this statement as part of their Main University Gallery exhibition. Statements were assessed to address SLO 3.				
Measurement Instrument 2	DIRECT MEASURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: ORAL PRESENTATION In the required Capstone course, students deliver an effective oral presentation about their work, including historical and contemporary influences.				
Criteria for Student Success	By the end of the	e program, students should score a mean of at leas	t 5.25 on this outcome.		
Program Success Target for this	Measurement	80%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		50%
Methods		ncentration students in the program for Spring 20 esentation for later review by the assessment team			rse and
Based on your results, circle or l	nighlight whether	the program met the goal Student Learning C	utcome 3.	Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-ma	aking process and	actions planned for program improvement. The a	ctions should include a timeline.)		
		ond measurement instrument was developed, to a anecdotal feedback from multiple faculty, this see			and to ensure
		s target needs to be addressed. It is very possib opriate rubric addressing SLO 3 needs to be develo			e variance of

We also need to ensure that this program, shorter in length than the larger BFA program, is effectively teaching the skills needed for students to excel in this measure.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

Based on last year's assessment, work has been done to ensure this SLO was more effectively evaluated (a second measurement instrument was developed).

We still need to ensure our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. An appropriate rubric addressing SLO 3 needs to be developed and normed. Developing the rubric should take a year, but effective norming likely will take several evaluation cycles.

A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching these skills.