



Students will produce work that is substantial and well developed in a chosen medium.
Students will be able to utilize drawing as a means for conceptual development.
Students will be able to compose in two and three dimensions.
Students will create work with awareness and application of the creative process.
Students will demonstrate the ability to create artwork independently.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

Portfolio reviews are conducted at the end of Sophomore Seminar and Senior Seminar. Rubric scores from reviews are averaged and compared. Portfolio images are kept on file. Full time Studio Art faculty members meet with each student. The students present and discuss their portfolio of artwork. We did the meetings by Zoom for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022. Faculty complete a rubric for each student. Professors Amy Bautz, Jim Burwinkel, Deb Douglas, Nila Petty, and Martin Brief were present for the portfolio review process.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

Portfolio review scores are totaled for each student. These scores are compared and averaged. The scores are also compared across each category on the rubric so that we can see how the students are progressing with the learning outcomes as expressed in the portfolio rubric. We compare data about exhibition participation from previous to current semesters to track participation numbers and the numbers being accepted to show work. Results are shared with faculty and feedback is given to students. Fulltime Studio Art faculty members meet with each student for the portfolio review process. We discuss the portfolio reviews, student exhibitions, and student progress.

Please see Senior and Sophomore Portfolio Review Rubrics on shared Google Drive documents for Studio Art.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

Fall 2021

We had 7 sophomore portfolio reviews. Average total for sophomores this year was 17.5, with the highest score being 19 and the lowest 14.5. The lowest score was partly an issue of a language barrier / communication skills.

Student exhibition fall 2021: 71 accepted entries, 25 declined (So 71 accepted out of 96 entries.) 30 were by majors, 9 by minors and 2 by visual communication minors.

Students will produce work that is substantial and well developed in a chosen medium:

In general, technical skills were strong in the portfolios. Sophomores have less development in one medium, of course. They have taken most of the foundational level courses and will be focusing more in their chosen medium as they progress in the major. Representational skills were strong, particularly for 6 of the 7 portfolios. Form and craftsmanship were very good.

Students will be able to utilize drawing as a means for conceptual development:

For some of the portfolios, the use of drawing was less evident. We need to require students to present more sketchbook examples. This was somewhat of an issue on our Zoom meetings for the portfolio reviews. The majority presented a good level of conceptual development and the ability to articulate it. Two of the students demonstrated consideration of concept development and show commitment to developing their work further. One student, as noted, has language barrier issues, so that will need to be considered and addressed for that student's progress.

We are reworking our portfolio review rubric. We will make the checklist about (student) need to

well as in the work submitted for exhibition.

Students will create work with awareness and application of the creative process:
This was strongly evident in the majority of portfolios and the students' discussion of their work and the process they engaged in.

Students will demonstrate the ability to create artwork independently:

Students create work outside of required class assignments and discuss individual goals in their work. This was evident in the portfolios and work submitted for exhibition.

It was noted that we need to request a separate list of labels for work presented in portfolios.

Spring 2022

We had three senior portfolio reviews. No sophomore-level reviews.

Seniors:

Student 1

Computer Art focus

15 (all 3's computer) 15 (all 3's) 15 (all 3's) Tw (-) T: 20 (MCID) T101 apex 62 Tw 0g 0.2 /MCID-29.9

We will be discussing any adjustments needed in response to the new University core and how this is working for our majors. We have a plan to make adjustments to our major and minor requirements.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

We will make a few adjustments to our portfolio review rubric.

Freshmen, Sophomore, and Senior Seminars are working well.

We are continuing to discuss an adjustment to our curriculum, simplifying the foundation-level sequence and allowing more room for students to explore other media or take an additional course in their chosen medium.
