



Art [ART]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

Program Name: Art [ART]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

No

2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

3 Example of Program Improvement

2017-2018:

ART 261 Art History I - Content

In 2015-2016 students were not meeting expectations of 85% earning 85 or above on embedded questions for content knowledge as 76% earned 85 or above. Content delivery and updated research was added in 2016-2017 showing some improvement with 80% earning 85 or above. Instructional delivery/research were modified again in 2017-2018 and expectations met with 85% earning 85 or above.

2018-2019:

CRITICAL THINKING: ART 200 Analytical Writing Assignment

In 2016-17 students were not meeting expected goals of 85% achieving a score of 80% on the critical thinking analytical writing assignment, with 20% failing to meet expectations. Scores trended down in 2017-18 and the assessment committee worked with faculty to identify and reinforce CT content within a revised Art 217 curriculum structure. In 2018-19 expected achievement met for the first time since assignment initiated with 90% meeting or exceeding expectation and the average score increased by 6% from previous year and the highest score achieved since assessing this area.

6-Year Comparison Average scores:

13/14 = 60% 14/15=69% 15/16=82% 16/17=80% 17/18=80% 18/19=83%

2019-2020:

PRAXIS CONTENT PASS RATE/ ART CONTENT KNOWLEDGE - ART EDUCATION

In 2017-2018 the benchmark was not met, with a first time percentage pass rate of 0%. In 2018-2019 as the art professors redesigned the art education program, they revisited both the topics covered on the content Praxis exam to ensure the appropriate course content and the course sequencing when students would be most prepared to complete the Praxis exam successfully. A new course ART 335 was created to address the content that 5134 covers, with Praxis exam to be scheduled after taking ART 335 in Junior Fall semester. In 2019-2020 the benchmark was met, with 100% passing on the first try.

2020-2021:

ART 217 CONTENT ACHIEVEMENT: ART 217 students exceeded course content benchmark for the first time in a 5-year period. ART 218 was removed from the Art Core for the Fall 2017 term. The assessment team noted ART 217 content knowledge be monitored for five years and evaluated by curriculum committee. In 2017-2018 the Benchmark was not met, with 81% scoring 80%, and the average content knowledge score on ART 217 decreased by 14% during the same period. Assessment committee met with ART 217 faculty, and content (along with CT) was reinforced within the curriculum structure. The original plan to reassess the course after a five-year trial was changed to three years. In 2018-2019 the benchmark was met; the individual concept falling below 80% was value, so subsequent assignment content emphasized value. In 2019-2020 the expected achievement was not met, with only 72 % of students meeting the goal both terms. Perspective was falling short both in exam responses and in the portfolio. Exams were redesigned to address both understanding and application; new teaching demos were

implemented to assist the understanding and application. In 2020-2021, ART 217 Drawing I was imbued with numerous video demos and other supportive online content. Students MET and exceeded benchmark and improved remarkably from previous semesters, with 100% of students meeting benchmark for the first time.

2021-2022:

ART 400 QEP PRESENTATIONS

100% of students met the benchmark of receiving a 51/60 or higher on the presentation rubric. This is a 40% increase from 19/20 and an 8% increase from 20/21. To improve low scores verbal practice opportunities significantly increased with additional preparatory assignments including informal discussions in class, a formal presentation in class, a one-on-one interview discussion of work, and a verbal video presentation. The verbal video, adopted in fall 2020 due to pandemic /hurricane situation, will be a continued assignment as most students will likely encounter presentations through a digital/video format post-graduation.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2017-2018:

MSU/SOWELA Memorandum of Agreement:

The first student successfully completed transition into the BA in Art via the McNeese/Sowela Memorandum of Agreement [6/7/17] and the ART 200 transfer review, earning 18 AP credit hours in Art. A second student has entered for the fall 2018 term.

2018-2019:

- Arrowmount-McNeese Program -A scholarship program has been established in cooperation with the prestigious *Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts*, with McNeese State University matching funds for two annual awards. 2018 marked the 1st year two McNeese art students were funded to attend these summer artist workshops. During the Fall term the two students gave lectures on the workshops and work completed. Two more students attended in 2019.
- Louisiana Art Education Association State Conference – McNeese Visual Arts hosted the 2018 Fall LAEA Conference, with art teachers from around the state in attendance. Faculty and student studio assistants presented workshops in photography, papermaking, bookmaking, photography, ceramics, and creative thinking. A partnership with the Calcasieu Parish School Board and LAEA brought a presentation by nationally known author Austin Kleon to the Triticco Theater.

2019-2020:

- Teacher of the Year - The Post-Baccalaureate Certification Program in Art K-12 allows students who hold the BA to return and complete state certification. Katy Geymann received the BA in Art with a concentration in Printmaking in 2017. While completing her student-teaching internship with East Beauregard High School, Katy Geymann was named the school's Teacher of the Year for 2020.
- Visiting Artist - C.F. Payne - C.F. Payne, nationally celebrated artist-illustrator whose work has appeared on the covers of *Time Magazine*, *Readers Digest*, *Sports Illustrated*, *MAD Magazine*, *U. S. News and World Report*, and *The Atlantic Monthly* presented a lecture and two-day workshop for McNeese students.

2020-2021:

- BA ART Graphic Design Candidate Published Illustrator/ MFA Acceptance : Elizabeth George (S '21 BA ART Graphic Design)is the illustrator for the published children's book *A Different Kind of Brave*. Written by 11 year old, Mary Alice Eringman, it is an inspiring story about an ordinary girl who ends up being brave in a way you won't suspect. Some topics are tough to talk to kids about, including the dangers of online predators. Elizabeth George has been accepted into the MFA program in Illustration by Marywood University.
- BA ART Printmaking Alumni & MFA Candidate Featured: Taylor Hickey (F'17 BA ART Printmaking) is a Spring '21 MFA Candidate in Printmaking at U.Mass-Dartmouth and is featured by the Boston Globe article as one of the *5 art-school grads to watch for 2021*. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/2021/05/05/arts/5-art-school-grads-watch-2021/>

2021-2022:

EP Classroom Studio

Upgrade classroom to reflect a studio environment that students would encounter in the workforce. This included new paint, electrical drops, flooring, butcher block style modular workspaces, a communal creative zone, and additional technology funded through an endowed professorship.

ASPIRE program --a Visual Arts mentorship program started in 2020 but stymied due to pandemic /hurricane was fully functional in-person with 5 mentors and 15 mentees working together weekly. ASPIRE's goals are retention and engagement.

5 Program Mission

The mission of the Department of Visual Arts is to provide education that will enable graduates to develop their talent and potential as creative artists and future art educators within a liberal arts framework. The Department of Visual Arts offers the Bachelor of Arts in Art with studio and art education concentrations. Through a curriculum that provides a breadth of experience and understanding in studio art, graduates learn to analyze the history of art and its function within the evolution of contemporary culture and to develop competency in a select area of art studio concentration. Students cultivate skills in critical thinking and effective communication and analyze global community issues to become better citizens of the world and the community.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

This degree supports McNeese State University's primary mission as a teaching institution responsible for the successful education of the undergraduate students and services to the employees and communities in the southwest Louisiana region.

7 Assessment and Benchmark Sophomore Portfolio Evaluation

Assessment 1: Visual sensitivity and literacy.

Student competencies in visual sensitivity/literacy and visual communication/expression are assessed via the sophomore portfolio reviews conducted upon completion of the visual arts core (ART 101, 102, 105, 217). The review serves as a midpoint assessment of student learning and instructional strengths within the BA Art program. A team of faculty advisors conducts the review with and gives individual feedback/guidance to students regarding educational and professional direction.

Faculty review team evaluations portfolio of 30 projects from each student for fundamental ability to synthesize knowledge of concept and design into resolved visual solutions in all categories: basic design, color theory, creative and representational drawing, computer applications, and artist statement.

Assessment 2: Visual communication and expression.

Communication skills encompass the process of generating, interpreting, and exchanging information through verbal and nonverbal methods. Information is communicated formally and informally through oral discussions, written documentation, and the use of technology.

Visual Arts portfolio/project evaluations serve to assess communication skills by appraising a student's ability to develop visual, technological, verbal, and written responses to visual phenomena and organize perceptions and conceptualizations both rationally and intuitively (NASAD).

Benchmark 1: 85% of students are expected to achieve a score of 80% or above on the sophomore portfolio evaluation.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was that 75% of students would achieve a score of 70% or above.

Benchmark 2: 85% of students will meet/exceed score of 80% total score on Sophomore Portfolio Review in the three categories related to written and oral communication and technology application/communication.

Outcome Links

Visual Communication and Expression [Program]

Graduates possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual

organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in one or more media. Graduates must possess an ability to make workable connections between concept and media. (NASAD)

Visual Sensitivity and Literacy [Program]

Students develop visual sensitivity and demonstrate competency in visual literacy.

7.1 Data

E - Exceeded expectations

M - Met expectations

F - Failed to meet expectations

Sophomore Review -Visual Sensitivity and Literacy

Performance Area	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Basic Design	0%	19%	81%	100%	0%	9%	91%	100%
Color Theory	0%	23%	77%	100%	0%	41%	59%	100%
Drawing	0%	27%	73%	100%	6%	35%	59%	94%
Computer Applications	0%	7%	93%	100%	0%	26%	74%	100%
Artist Statement	0%	11%	89%	100%	0%	17%	83%	100%
Verbal Skills	0%	7%	93%	100%	0%	29%	71%	100%
Averages	0%	16%	84%	100%	1%	26%	73%	99%

Performance Area	2018-2019				2019-2020			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Basic Design	0%	19%	81%	100%	0%	19%	81%	100%
Color Theory	0%	44%	56%	100%	0%	18%	82%	100%
Drawing	3%	54%	43%	97%	0%	54%	46%	100%
Computer Applications	0%	22%	78%	100%	0%	27%	73%	100%
Artist Statement	0%	39%	61%	100%	0%	33%	67%	100%
Verbal Skills	0%	43%	51%	100%	0%	11%	89%	100%
Averages	0.5%	37%	62%	99.5%	0%	27%	73%	100%

Performance Area	2020-2021				2021-2022			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Basic Design	0%	29%	71%	100%	0%	36%	64%	100%
Color Theory	0%	25%	75%	100%	4%	52%	43%	95%
Drawing	0%	69%	31%	100%	17%	35%	48%	83%
Computer Applications	0%	33%	67%	100%	0%	27%	73%	100%
Artist Statement	0%	25%	75%	100%	0%	39%	61%	100%
Verbal Skills	0%	50%	50%	100%	4%	39%	57%	96%
Averages	0%	39%	61%	100%	4%	38%	58%	97%

Outcome Links

Visual Sensitivity and Literacy [Program]

Students develop visual sensitivity and demonstrate competency in visual literacy.

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievement met: 99% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review.

Recommendation: Develop strategies in critiques to increase verbal participation. While performance level meeting benchmark, spring reviews were not at the level seen previously.

Action: Discussion held concerning the repercussions of deleting ART 218 from core, as was visible in the spring 2018 portfolio reviews, and adjustments made to the ART 217 course content in an effort to improve skill development in line, value and form.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement met: 99.5% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review.

Analysis/Recommendation: Drawing continues to score low due to the removal of ART 218. As of Fall 2019, ART 217 will no longer be a GE course thus allowing a more skill specific focus. Based on the additional results of Vis Art Content in Drawing, faculty will reinforce concepts revolving around value and perspective.

Action: Course content revised to reinforce emphasis on value and perspective.

2019-2020:

Expected achievement met: 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review

Analysis/Recommendation:

The overall average is a 1-2 percentage points difference from last year. Efforts to improve drawing are showing improvement. Students who enter ART 200 with completed portfolios tend to have stronger outcomes.

Action: Advising note issued to all visual art advisors to wait until students complete ALL core courses before enrolling in ART 200 if possible. Some students are taking in the second semester of first year, and have not had time to reflect on core courses in relation to other courses or degree as a whole.

2020-2021:

Expected achievement met: 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review

Analysis/Recommendation:

Decreases of 10%+ overall in those achieving highest scores directly related to loss of lab space and absence face-to-face instruction. This particular cohort mostly began college Fall 2019 and therefore the first half of their college experience significant disrupted in 2020 due to the pandemic and hurricanes.

Action:

Foundations faculty noted any areas of deficiency on in-progress art major course portfolios. Follow-up in Art 200 for the 2021-22 terms will include individual early review of work, with notes on projects in need of revision of content and/or presentation.

2021-2022:

Expected achievement MET: 97% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review

Analysis/Recommendation:

Decreases in verbal skills, drawing, and color theory attributed to courses taken online during the 2020-21 academic year. This cohort did the bulk of the core courses which comprise the portfolio for Soph. Review online.

Action: Suggest faculty add a self-reflection and assessment form at or around midterm within core courses to allow students to ascertain strengths and weaknesses. The form would mirror the Sophomore Review rubric and be scored by both students and faculty.

7.2 Data

Sophomore Review - Visual Communication and Expression

Performance Area	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Technology A/C	0%	7%	93%	100%	0%	26%	74%	100%
Written Communication	0%	11%	89%	100%	0%	17%	83%	100%
Oral Communication	0%	7%	93%	100%	0%	29%	71%	100%
Communication Skills	0%	8%	92%	100%	0%	24%	76%	100%

Performance Area	2018-2019				2019-2020			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Technology A/C	0%	22%	78%	100%	0%	27%	73%	100%
Written Communication	0%	39%	61%	100%	0%	33%	67%	100%
Oral Communication	0%	43%	57%	100%	0%	11%	89%	100%
Communication Skills	0%	35%	65%	100%	0%	24%	76%	100%

Performance Area	2020-2021				2021-2022			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Technology A/C	0%	33%	67%	100%	0%	27%	73%	100%
Written Communication	0%	25%	75%	100%	0%	39%	61%	100%
Oral Communication	0%	50%	50%	100%	4%	39%	57%	96%
Communication Skills	0%	36%	64%	100%	1%	35%	64%	99%

Outcome Links

Visual Communication and Expression [Program]

Graduates possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in one or more media. Graduates must possess an ability to make workable connections between concept and media. (NASAD)

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievement met: 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review in the three categories related to written and oral communication and technology application/communication.

Action: Final project assignments in ART 101 and 102 were amended to reflect oral component of the review.

Recommendation: Assessment committee met with foundations faculty to ascertain where communication skills might be best supported within art core curriculum. Faculty recommended the oral skills Q&A component utilized in the ART 200 sophomore review be applied to the final critique in the art core.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement met: 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review in the three categories related to written and oral communication and technology application/communication.

Analysis/Recommendation: While scores remain in the meet/exceed range, oral and written communication show significant drops. Examine foundation courses to identify opportunities to develop skills.

Action: Reinstate a preparatory artist statement assignment in Art 217 - no longer a GE course, focus will be on the art major and preparation for ART 200 reviews.

2019-2020:

Expected achievement met: 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review in the three categories related to written and oral communication and technology application/communication.

Analysis/Recommendation: Improvement is shown in both oral and written communication with written statement in ART 217. Note- Verbal scores only from F19 as Covid-19 shift to online prevented spring assessment.

Action: To address and improve oral communication skills , the online Art 200 course structure will include a recording of the oral presentation as part of portfolio review.

2020-2021:

Expected achievement met: 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review in the three categories related to written and oral communication and technology application/communication.

Analysis/Recommendation: While overall assessment goals met, the individual areas demonstrate inconsistent performance. Written statements showed an increase in achievement. Oral responses fell to 50%, the lowest in five years. Online components provided students with support in practicing oral skills, but it must be noted the Art 200 reviews were the first and only time most students were on campus. Face-to-face interactions with both faculty and classmates must be encouraged as part of oral skill development.

Action: Art 200 will continue to offer online support resources in communication, with priority given face-to-face practice of oral presentation in course structure.

2021-2022:

Expected achievement met: 99% of students achieved a score of 80% or above to meet or exceed expected performance on the Sophomore Review in the three categories related to written and oral communication and technology application/communication.

Analysis/Recommendation/Action: Percentages reflect the challenges of shifting back into face-to-face instruction and recovery of the building. Action: Explore an additional verbal skill practice in ART 200 where students can work in small groups and work with integrating effective and expressive language.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Analytical Writing Assignment

Assessment: Critical Thinking Defined.

The process that involves the cognitive ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize knowledge through observation, experience, reflection, and reasoning.

Visual Arts: Portfolio/artifact evaluation serves to assess CT skills by appraising a student's fundamental ability to synthesize knowledge of concept and design into resolved visual solutions (NASAD)

ART 200 Analytical Writing Assignment - Critical Thinking prompt asks students to analyze and interpret their own work in the context of why the work is successful.

2011 - Pilot of critical thinking assignment in ART 200.

2012 - Revised assignment prompt.

2013 - Revised rubric.

2014 - Benchmark set .

Benchmark: 85% of students are expected to achieve a score of 80% on the ART 200 Analytical Writing assignment.

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students demonstrate cognitive ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize knowledge through observation, experience, reflection, and reasoning.

8.1 Data

8.1.a Art 200 Analytical Writing

Student	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
#	2	2	6	8	3	6	1	7
%	20%	20%	60%	80%	30%	70%	10%	80%

Student	2018-2019				2019-2020			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
#	1	6	3	9	2	4	4	8
%	10%	60%	30%	90	20%	40%	40%	80%

Student	2020-2021				2021-2022			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
#	4	1	5	6	2	3	5	8
%	40%	10%	50%	60%	20%	30%	50%	80%

8.1.bART 200 5-YR Average scores

	Academic Year Ending					
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Ave. Score	58%	60%	69%	82%	80%	80%

	Academic Year Ending					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024

Ave. Score	83%	93%	80%	85%		
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students demonstrate cognitive ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize knowledge through observation, experience, reflection, and reasoning.

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievement is not met, with 80% of students meeting/exceeding a score of 80% or above on the ART 200 analytical writing assignment.

The average score decreased slightly by 5% from the previous year. This could be reflective of individuals, however, it should be noted that many of the students in ART 200 for 2017-2018 only had four art core courses due to the removal of ART 218 from the art core.

Recommend/Action: Encourage/facilitate appropriate critical thinking application in the core courses. ART 217 critical thinking content reinforced within revised curriculum structure. Fundamental concepts to be covered by week nine in semester, with weeks 10-15 emphasizing synthesis and application.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement MET, with 90% of students meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above on the ART 200 analytical writing assignment.

Analysis: The average score increased by 6% from previous year, and is the highest score achieved since assessing this area. While there is an increase in the average score for ART 200 critical thinking, students are weaker in demonstrating how to use terminology of the principles of design.

Recommend/Action: Emphasize principles of design concepts in the course and adjust the critical thinking assignment to promote demonstration of understanding and application of the design principles.

2019-2020:

Expected achievement is not met, with 80% of students meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above on the ART 200 analytical writing assignment.

The average score decreased 4% from the previous year. Assessors noted that while students demonstrated an increase in the use of terminology, many students still struggle with the analysis portion of the critical thinking assignment.

Recommended Actions:

Work with faculty to implement or revise critical thinking assignments in the core courses *before* students reach ART 200

2020-2021:

The average score increased 1% from the previous year.

While the average score increased 1%, it should be noted that the percent of students failing to meet expectations increased (compared over the last 4 years.) This is most likely a direct result of this cohort of students which began college in Fall 2019, and subsequently had 3 of their semesters primarily online and disrupted due to the pandemic and hurricanes.

Recommended Actions:

Students taking ART 200 for the next 2 or 3 semesters will have been affected by the pandemic and hurricanes. Increased emphasis on critical thinking both in writing and speaking will be implemented in the course to address deficits with this skill.

2021-2022:

Analysis:

5% increase from previous year. Again, this cohort largely consists of students entering in Fall 2020, with several core courses (which ART 200 is a reflection of) conducted online. The percentage of failing students has decreased by 20%.

Action:

Emphasis when writing/speaking about work focuses on what is working/ what needs improvement within the framework the principles of design and art elements. Faculty will explore additional ways of discussing work to increase student engagement.

9 Assessment and Benchmark Core Content Knowledge

Assessment: Core courses in BA Art include:

- Art 101 Basic Design I
- Art 102 Basic Design II
- Art 217 Drawing I
- Art 105 Art and the Computer

Each course contains embedded questions and/or quizzes to determine achievement of student learning.

Benchmark: 85% of students are expected to achieve a score of 80% or above on content knowledge.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

217-218 content_ terminology quiz

Art 101, 102 Course Content Assessment Questions

Outcome Links

Visual Sensitivity and Literacy [Program]

Students develop visual sensitivity and demonstrate competency in visual literacy.

9.1 Data

Core Content Knowledge

Course	2016-2017		2017-2018	
	<80%	≥80%	<80%	≥80%
Basic Design I 101	0%	100%	2%	98%
Basic Design II 102	10%	90%	5%	95%
Drawing I 217	5%	95%	19%	81%
Drawing II 218	6%	94%	—	—
Computer 105	0%	100%	6%	94%
Average	6%	94%	8%	92%

Course	2018-2019		2019-2020	
	<80%	≥80%	<80%	≥80%
Basic Design I 101	7%	93%	0%	100%
Basic Design II 102	5%	95%	0%	100%
Drawing I 217	4%	96%	28%	72%
Computer 105	11%	89%	20%	80%
Average	7%	93%	12%	88%

Course	2020-2021		2021-2022	
	<80%	≥80%	<80%	≥80%

Basic Design I 101	1%	99%	0%	100%
Basic Design II 102	5%	95%	0%	100%
Drawing I 217	0%	100%	10%	90%
Computer 105	21%	79%	0%	100%
Average	7%	93%	4%	96%

Outcome Links

Visual Sensitivity and Literacy [Program]

Students develop visual sensitivity and demonstrate competency in visual literacy.

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Course content knowledge expected achievement was met. The composite average was 92% with the benchmark met in 101, 102, and 105.

Benchmark was not met in ART 217 with 81% scoring 80%. ART 218 was no longer required as part of the Art Core beginning with the fall 2017 term. The average content knowledge score on ART 217 decreased by 14% during the same assessment period.

Action: Assessment committee met with ART 217 faculty and content (along with CT) reinforced within curriculum structure. Fundamental concepts to be covered by week nine in semester, with weeks 10-15 emphasizing synthesis and application.

Note: Faculty vigilance needed to reinforce content and competence in ART 217. Original plan was to reassess the change to curriculum after one five-year trial period, but committee suggests this be done after three years.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement was met. The composite average was 93% of students achieved a score of 80% or above on course content knowledge. The benchmark was met in 101, 102, 105 and 217.

Analysis/Action:

Art 102 - The only concept falling below 80% concerned additive/subtractive color. Theory introduced in first lecture one but not tested after quiz one. Concept will be reinforced and tested subsequent quizzes/exam.

Art 105 - Students scored below 80% on technical information in the course. Alter exams for technical questions to see if students are struggling with testing format (T/F) or concepts.

Art 217- Individual concept falling below 80% was value. Reinforce value in subsequent assignment content.

2019-2020:

Visual Arts Course Content Benchmark: 85% of students will score 80% or higher on embedded questions/quizzes

ART 101 Expected achievement was MET

Notes: All content knowledge areas met benchmark at 80% + The one content area meeting 80% was composition.

Analysis/ Action: Content question on composition was based on the formal definition of design. While concepts including design are reinforced throughout the term, the definition is only included in Quiz one and the final exam. This is a recurring issue in assessment, when term definitions appear early in the term and not again until the exam.

ACTION: Quizzes redesigned to include 20% of review material. [LR]

ART 102 Expected achievement was MET

Analysis/ Action: The one content area scoring at 85% concerns the application of additive color, a continuing issue is additive /subtractive color theory.

ACTION: The introduction to Color theory lecture and the concepts of additive vs subtractive color made an ART 102 course resource on the Moodle page. Assignments require students review this material as new concepts are introduced. [LR]

ART 105. Expected achievement was not met

Analysis: 80% of students met the goal both terms. The students who met the goals did so because they prepared for the final by each project that proceeds it steps up their needs at the end of this course

Action: Online resources posted on Moodle to support project content throughout term. [RJ]

ART 217 Expected achievement was not met

Analysis: 72 % of students met the goal both terms. Perspective is still falling short both in exam responses and in the portfolio.

Action: Exams will be redesigned to address both understanding and application. New teaching demos will be implemented to present perspective in a new way to assist the understanding and application.[MF]

2020-2021:

ART 101: Benchmark MET with 99% of students to score 80%+ on Content- Knowledge

Analysis: Previously course content knowledge measured as part of the final exam in which students were required to provide a description of selected art elements and art principles. This period, the course content measure was embedded in a Critical Review Writing Component, specifically, in the objective criticism unit of this assignment. The objective criticism unit of this 3-part writing component (Critical Review) required written responses to elicit a working knowledge of how the following concepts operate in a selected artwork: the formal aspects of composition, the art elements and the art principles. The unit included a controlled selection of images/artworks, and specific instruction to discuss the formal aspects of composition, 3 art elements, and 3 art principles.

Action: The objective criticism unit provided a coherent measure, designed to capture specific course content learning data and will be adopted as an assessment going forward.

ART 102: Benchmark MET with 95% of students to score 80%+ on Content- Knowledge

Analysis: Journal reflections introduced with the online course content appear to help in the retention and application of concepts. Guided reflections will become part of future course delivery regardless of course format. Concept of visible spectrum is the one area where scores did not meet benchmark. Most improved this period was the concept of pigment function. Approximately half of the students missing concept question on visible spectrum also missed color wheel. As these are symbiotic concepts, if confusion exists about one it will impact both.

Action: The relationship and differences between concepts will be emphasized in the revised lecture and journal one questions.

ART 217: Students MET and exceeded benchmark and improved remarkably from previous semesters.

Analysis: Fall and Spring had online delivery with voiced-over lectures and demo videos (as opposed to in-class lectures and demos—to be seen only once). It is possible, with the addition of videos/demos which were available for multiple views, that the change in delivery of instruction resulted in improved understanding and application. Of course, cheating is a possible side effect of online test-taking. However, the format requires short-answer responses and application of terminology to the content, so cheating is not suspected (or at least not obvious).

Action: Implement video demos and other online content to supplement face to face instruction for next terms.

ART 105:

Analysis: Why do you think your students met or did not meet the benchmark 100% of art majors met the benchmark in the Fall and only 57% met the benchmark in the Spring. Of the 7 art majors enrolled in the course for the Spring semester, 2 did not turn in a final portfolio, and 1 did not fully complete the portfolio. The 4 students who completed the portfolio did illustrate their understanding of the course content. More independence was allowed this year in their responses by providing very open-ended questions for the students to submit with their final portfolios for the class. However, in reviewing written answers, this approach was too broad. In reviewing final portfolios, it is clear that 100% of the art majors did understand the course content- the proof is in the artwork they've created.

Action: To more accurately evaluate their understanding of the course content in the future, more specific questions will be related to using the Creative Cloud software, as well as questions related to basic design.

2021-2022:

ART 101 LR:

Students scored 100% on embedded questions, and they also scored 100% on the application of the same concepts. Credit should be given to the review process, as an expanded period of time given to explore all concepts (visually and verbally) until no questions remained.

ART 101CB:

Students demonstrated a working knowledge of the course content by writing about a selected artwork. They identified the formal art aspects, art elements, and art principles used by the artist to create the artwork and discussed the application of these concepts. The students gained this working knowledge throughout the semester as they applied the concepts to tangible projects they produced. Expanding the opportunity for students to elaborate on specific concepts and to apply formal analysis more specifically is a valid consideration.

ART 102: Notes:

The one question 20% of students missed concerned subtractive color. A companion question not assessed scored at 90%. Related concept question have been added to both the exam review and quizzes 5 and 6, in an effort to keep the terminology fresh for the second half of the term

Two questions scored at 20% of students missed – 1) tertiary definition and 2) additive /subtractive color. Companion questions not assessed scored at 100 %. Concept question were added to the exam review. Recommend adding review and discussion about the relationship and differences between additive and subtractive color, as this remains an issue on which clarification is needed.

ART 217:

Quizzes were administered online, however several art majors neglected to take the quiz in the 5 day time period and scores reflect missing questions. Consider moving quizzes back to in-person format, and explore new ways to demonstrate perspective concept.

ART 105: RJ

I had 7 majors between my two sections of 105 in the fall and 1 major in my spring section. All students exceeded the benchmark. While these students were in fact all above average in their performance, in the future, I will make the embedded questions a bit more rigorous. Furthermore, I will incorporate a bit more writing throughout the semester to give students the opportunity to grow their writing skills.

	Students	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Concept	16	0%		19%	3	81%	13	100%	16
Statement	16	0%		19%	3	81%	13	100%	16

Five-year comparison - M/E Art 400 Critical Thinking

	Academic Year Ending					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Average
Concept	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	99%
Statement	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Critical Thinking	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	99.5%

	Academic Year Ending					
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Average
Concept	95%	100%				
Statement	95%	100%				
Critical Thinking	95%	100%				

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students demonstrate cognitive ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize knowledge through observation, experience, reflection, and reasoning.

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

Benchmark 1: 85% of degree candidates are expected to achieve scores to meet (14-17) or exceed (18+) expectations on senior portfolio evaluation measuring student mastery of and ability to synthesize concept and design into resolved visual solutions.

2017-2018:

Expected achievement is met. 98% of degree candidates met or exceeded goals in the area of critical thinking.

Within the composite score, the same 55% exceeded expectations in the three areas of concept, design, and the artist statement. Looking within the other 45%, including the 5% failing to meet expectations, concept and design both needed development. Both the failures and successes speak to the interconnectedness of theory, application, and communication.

Recommendation/Action: Portfolio review process amended. In an effort to guide students showing any struggle with concept development, the faculty team shall make specific recommendations/notes during the early senior portfolio review process.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement is met. 98% of degree candidates met or exceeded goals in the area of critical thinking.

Analysis/Action: While students are meeting expectations for the artist statement, it has the lowest amount of students exceeding expectations. Faculty noted a lack of discussion about concept in the statements. A renewed emphasis on concept will be integrated into the course and new assignments generated to facilitate the writing process. Discussions with Writing Center are underway, with plans to utilize its resource throughout the semester.

2019-2020:

Expected achievement is met. 100% of degree candidates met or exceeded goals in the area of critical thinking.

Analysis/Action: Statement scores decreased from the previous year. In Spring 2020, the statements were lower than Fall 2019. This drop is attributed to COVID-19 and online learning. Students did not revise drafts as rigorously as they had in previous semesters. ART 400 online course structure revised to increase support.

2020-2021:

Expected achievement is met. 95% of degree candidates met or exceeded goals in the area of critical thinking. [C/D, AS]

Analysis/Action: Benchmark was met, and performance increased in 20-21 from prior year in students scoring at the highest level. The 5% failing to meet expectations represents 1 of 21 students between the combined terms. It is significant to note these seniors spent the last three terms (likely 1/2 of their concentration working at an advanced level) largely online and without studio access. The contrast between the 200 and 400 level reviews in the same assessments is significant, and this speaks to the importance of the face-to-face at the freshman/sophomore level. Review committee recommends continued development of online supports for the written and oral skills.

2021-2022:

Expected achievement is met. 100% of degree candidates met or exceeded goals in the area of critical thinking.

Analysis/Action:

While the benchmark is met, the students who did not meet exceed struggle more with the connecting to the overall concept of their work.

Faculty overseeing concentrations are encouraged to establish assignments or activities to foster connectivity to the overall concept of work.

10.2 Data

Visual Communication/Expression ART 400 Senior Portfolio - TC/AS/VS

	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Technology	0%	31%	69%	100%	0%	35%	65%	100%
Written Communication	0%	19%	81%	100%	0%	45%	55%	100%
Oral Communication	0%	12%	88%	100%	0%	40%	60%	100%
Communication Skills	0%	21%	79%	100%	0%	40%	60%	100%

	2018-2019				2019-2020			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Technology	0%	29%	71%	100%	0%	25%	75%	100%
Written Communication	0%	46%	54%	100%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Oral Communication	0%	29%	71%	100%	0%	45%	55%	100%
Communication Skills	0%	35%	65%	100%	0%	40%	60%	100%

	2020-2021	2021-2022

	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Technology		29%	71%	100%		19%	81%	100%
Written Communication	5%	38%	57%	95%		19%	81%	100%
Oral Communication		19%	81%	100%		19%	81%	100%
Communication Skills	1%	29%	70%	98%	6%	13%	81%	94%

Outcome Links

Visual Communication and Expression [Program]

Graduates possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in one or more media.

Graduates must possess an ability to make workable connections between concept and media. (NASAD)

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

Benchmark 2: 85% of degree candidates are expected to achieve a score of 80% or above on the senior portfolio evaluation in the categories related to technological application /communication, written communication, and oral communication.

2017-2018:

Expected achievements were met in all categories with 100% meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above in categories related to technological applications/communications, written communication, and oral communication.

While goals were met, the percentage of students exceeding expectations dropped by approximately 19% in all areas except technology from the previous year.

Assessments indicate area in need of improvement largely within digital art portfolios. It should be noted that students who completed internships performed better than their counterparts. Those who followed recommended pathway through the program also performed better.

Recommendation/Action: ART 400 review implemented diagnostic assessment with the early portfolio review.

2018-2019:

Expected achievements were met in all categories with 100% meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above in categories related to technological applications/communications, written communication, and oral communication.

Analysis: The lowest percentage of students exceeding expectations is in the category of written communication, with the artist statement dropping over the past three years. Faculty noted a lack of discussion about concept in the capstone statements.

Recommendation/Action: New assignments designed and integrated into the course to facilitate the writing process, with a renewed emphasis placed on concept.

2019-2020:

Expected achievements were met in all categories with 100% meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above in categories related to technological applications/communications, written communication, and oral communication.

Analysis/Recommendation: Statements and verbal scores decreased from the previous year. In Spring 2020, the statements were lower than Fall 2019. This drop is attributed to COVID-19, as students did not revise drafts as rigorously as they had in previous semesters. The drop in verbal scores is less clear.

Action: Since presentation skills are also assessed through the University's QEP, the action will be the same: to incorporate verbal skill activities and assignments in each class meeting before the assessment, and to encourage clear understanding of what each student's exhibition intention is at the beginning (or even prior) to the ART 400 semester. Working with concentration faculty on this will facilitate the process

2020-2021:

Expected achievements were met in all categories with 98% meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above in categories related to technological applications/communications, written communication, and oral communication.

Analysis: A slight decrease in technical skills directly attributed to loss of lab use and face to face instruction, as well as displacement. Achieving the level of technical skills in those areas most severely impacted by studio losses due to hurricanes, especially printmaking, is laudable. *No working press was available to students until the last week of instruction when 1 press was returned from machinist repair.*

Verbal skills notably increased. The ART 400 class emphasized verbal skills through practice with online forums (Big Blue Button), verbal videos, and required (and well attended) online class meeting sessions to practice verbal skills in small and large groups weekly.

Action: Online verbal skill activities initiated will be adopted as part of course format. Priority will be given to the acquisition of portable printmaking presses to support both independent study by majors and seamless adaption, as online course movement necessitates.

2021-2022:

Expected achievements were met in all categories with 98% meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above in categories related to technological applications/communications, written communication, and oral communication.

Analysis:

This was an exceptional group of students who were ready and eager to be fully engaged in their work after the disruptions of 20-21, this engagement is reflected in the increase, especially in the EXCEED category which increased 11% points from previous year.

Action: Add additional small-group critiques for senior-level students within concentration classes.

10.3 Data

Senior Review/CAP

	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Application Craft /Technology	0%	31%	69%	100%	0%	35%	65%	100%
Design Development	0%	38%	62%	100%	5%	40%	55%	95%
Concept Development	0%	35%	65%	100%	5%	40%	55%	95%
Written Communication	0%	19%	81%	100%	0%	45%	55%	100%
Verbal Communication	0%	12%	88%	100%	0%	40%	60%	100%
Average	0%	27%	73%	100%	2%	40%	58%	98%

	2018-2019				2019-2020			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Application Craft /Technology	0%	29%	71%	100%	0%	25%	75%	100%
Design Development	0%	33%	67%	100%	0%	35%	65%	100%
Concept Development	0%	33%	67%	100%	0%	35%	65%	100%
Written Communication	0%	48%	54%	100%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Verbal Communication	0%	29%	71%	100%	0%	45%	55%	100%
Average	0%	34%	76%	100%	0%	38%	62%	100%

	2020-2021				2021-2022			
	F	M	E	M/E	F	M	E	M/E
Application Craft/Technology	0%	29%	71%	100%		19%	81%	100%
Design Development	5%	43%	52%	95%		31%	69%	100%
Concept Development	5%	28%	67%	95%		19%	81%	100%
Written Communication	5%	38%	57%	95%		19%	81%	100%
Verbal Communication	0%	19%	81%	100%	6%	13%	81%	94%
Average	3%	31%	66%	97%	1%	20%	79%	99%

Outcome Links

Visual Communication and Expression [Program]

Graduates possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in one or more media.

Graduates must possess an ability to make workable connections between concept and media. (NASAD)

10.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievements were met in all categories with 100% meeting or exceeding a score of 80% or above in categories related to technological applications/communications, written communication, and oral communication. Concept and design development met benchmark and yet 5% fell below expectations.

Concept and design development are the two areas within the portfolio assessment where select students fell below the standard. Portfolios in this category were from the GDES concentration with content largely taken from course projects and lacking in internship, independent study, or multi-media work.

Recommendation/Action: ART 400 review implemented diagnostic assessment with the early portfolio review. Faculty offer specific guidance as to senior portfolio content and development.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement is met. 100% of students met or exceed an expected level of achievement of >80% total score on the Senior Portfolio Review.

Analysis: Scores in the areas of Craft/Technology, Design, and Conceptual development were the highest of the last 3 year period. The diagnostic assessment was implemented with the Fall 2018 term. With the Spring 2019 term, students were asked to submit a detailed installation plan for their work. While initial results indicate both of these changes may have contributed to the higher outcomes, the student profiles/portfolios were very different at their core.

Recommendation/Action: Integrate installation plan as a required part of the diagnostic assessment, as the planning process supports self-awareness and self-editing of the portfolio.

2019-2020:

Expected achievement is met. 100% of students met or exceed an expected level of achievement of >80% total score on the Senior Portfolio Review.

Analysis/Recommendation: Statements and verbal scores decreased from the previous year. Recommendation is to incorporate verbal skill activities and assignments in each class meeting before the assessment, and to encourage clear understanding of what each student's exhibition intention is at the beginning (or even prior) to the ART 400 semester.

Action: Introduce "studio visits" in the second week of the semester. The ART 400 instructor will visit each student's studio space and view the progress of the portfolio. The student will be asked a series of questions to not only give students a chance to practice verbal skills but also guide the student toward an understanding of their body of work.

Require double-concentration students to choose one concentration/advisor for the exhibition. Emphasize the requirements for exhibiting a body of work within the context of a group show (no solo shows in a group setting).

2020-2021:

Expected achievement is met. 97 % of students met or exceeded an expected level of achievement of >80% total score on the Senior Portfolio Review.

Analysis: Verbal scores increased significantly from the previous year, with verbal skill activities incorporated in BBN and other formats in all class meetings. Pre-exhibit studio visits moved to an online format, allowing faculty to give input to the developing portfolio. Most students exhibited significant growth within the term, with some contending with lack of studio equipment due to storm losses. Installation planning appears to be showing positive results, with increasing diversity of formats especially in the graphic design area.

Action: A readiness checklist will be added to the studio visits, allowing faculty feedback and specific recommendations/guidance for both work and presentation development.

2021-2022:

Expected achievement is met. 100% of students met or exceed an expected level of achievement of >80% total score on the Senior Portfolio Review.

Analysis:

This was an exceptional group of students who were ready and eager to be fully engaged in their work after the disruptions of 20-21, this engagement is reflected in the increases, especially in the EXCEED category.

Action: Suggest to concentration faculty to increase one-on-one meeting frequency to emphasize critical thinking and meeting deadlines.

11 Assessment and Benchmark 300/400 Level Studio

Assessment:

Goal 1 - (a) Grasp of assignment/project/individual approach/interpretation to the work; and, (b) Addresses approach to media/applications and use of terminology.

Goal 2 - Thoughtful evaluation of work through multiple criteria including structure, meaning, and context/supports assertions.

Goal 3 - Examines work within a larger context.

Benchmark 1: 85% of students are expected to meet (14-15) or exceed (16+) expectations measuring ability to communicate their understanding of the project assignment and their individual approach in terms of concept and media. (KNOWLEDGE Goal 1)

Benchmark 2: 85% of students expected to achieve scores to meet (14-15) or exceed (16+) expectations measuring ability to engage in higher order thinking skills through analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of work created (EVALUATION Goal 2) and examine work within some larger context (CONTEXT Goal 3). Students should be able to demonstrate ability to think critically and contextualize their work within their concept/media through writing. Students should ultimately be able to make a connection between making, discussing, and writing about their work.

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students demonstrate cognitive ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize knowledge through observation, experience, reflection, and reasoning.

Visual Communication and Expression [Program]

Graduates possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in one or more media. Graduates must possess an ability to make workable connections between concept and media. (NASAD)

11.1 Data

Critical Thinking 300/400

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	F	M	E	F	M	E
Composite Score	13%	19%	68%	17%	34%	49%
Goal 1	13%	87%		12%	88%	
Goal 2	20%	80%		18%	82%	
Goal 3	8%	92%		26%	74%	
300/400 Writing Assessment	13%	87%		1%	99%	

	2018-2019			2019-2020		
	F	M	E	F	M	E
Composite Score	12%	24%	64%	11%	21%	68%
Goal 1	17%	83%		12%	88%	
Goal 2	11%	89%		18%	82%	
Goal 3	14%	86%		14%	86%	
300/400 Writing Assessment	12%	88%		3%	97%	

	2020-2021			2021-2022		
	F	M	E	F	M	E
Composite Score	10%	51%	39%	24%	43%	33%
Goal 1	15%	85%		12%	88%	
Goal 2	22%	78%		12%	88%	

Goal 3	26%	74%	34%	76%
300/400 Writing Assessment	21%	79%	5%	95%

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students demonstrate cognitive ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize knowledge through observation, experience, reflection, and reasoning.

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievements were not met.

Goal 1 Knowledge: met (+3)

Goal 2 Evaluation: not met (-3)

Goal 3 Context: not met (-11)

Recommendation/Action: Assessment committee met with studio faculty during spring term concerning proposed changes to the CT prompt. Revised writing prompt created for drawing studio area. Weakest area shown to be with Goal 3, placing the work within some larger context. Prompt revised for 2018-2019 to include required art historical component.

2018-2019:

Overall goal met with combined score of 88% meeting/exceeding expectations.

Analysis: While combined score met objectives, individual goal results as follows:

Goal 1 Knowledge: met (-2)

Goal 2 Evaluation: not met (+4)

Goal 3 Context: not met (+3)

Recommendation/Action: Assessment committee met with studio faculty end of spring term to review results by area. Performance on individual goals varied within each discipline; discussion shifted to assignment content.

GDES will alter critical thinking assignment to address graphic design concerns. Other areas will adjust assignments to align with course projects. Art history will expand scope of essay in effort to forge deeper connections.

2019-2020:

Overall goal met with 97% meeting/exceeding expectations. Goal 1 and 3 were met. Goal 2 fell short of 85% with 83% meeting/exceeding.

Expected achievements MET/ Not met

Goal 1 Knowledge: MET (+3)

Goal 2 Evaluation: not met (-3)

Goal 3 Context: MET (+1)

Analysis/Actions

Graphic Design Due to Covid19 and distance learning, the responses were not fully realized. Students in ART 326/ 327 used appropriate terminology. It's a matter of gaining an understanding of the intention of the product they are creating and making good visual decisions. I observe disconnects in both directions: Sometimes there is strong writing, but the final product doesn't convey their understanding, whereas other times the project is very well done, but the writing is disconnected. There is a direct correlation, though, that writing a strong creative brief greatly assists in a successful project visually.

Assignment revisions are ongoing, including having students post all documentation for projects to Moodle.

Ceramics

Most likely due to the online format, there was poor participation with assessment, the class was small to begin with, and only 7 students completed the assignment. Assignment revisions are necessitated due to online class format.

Printmaking

Assignment asks them to address issues about the work selected for critical thinking writing (the what, how and why). The “why” is usually the category that falls short. Instructor needs to show examples of writing and how to embellish the process description and less time emphasizing the technical focus.

The class needs to create a critical thinking assignment instead of selecting a work of their choice. This assignment will be part of their performance evaluation. Emphasis will be on the connection between the writing and the work and will have more relevance for the instructor and the students.

Revised assignment will be implemented in future critical thinking assignments the “CT Prompt Document”.

2020-2021:

Overall goal (85%+) not met with a combined [79%] meeting/exceeding expectations.

Expected achievements;

Goal 1 Knowledge: MET (85%)

Goal 2 Evaluation: not met (-5)

Goal 3 Context: not met (-9)

Analysis/Action: The one critical thinking goal met is KNOWLEDGE, the lowest level of Bloom's taxonomy. EVALUATION (application) was met in two disciplines but fell below in others. CONTEXT (synthesis) fell farther below, also with two disciplines meeting the goal. An assumption might be the areas exceeding would be tied to campus access, but one area returned to the studio and the other kept wholly online.

Drawing [MF ART 337-338,437-438] Goal not met with 77% of student meeting /exceeding expectations. Several students missed the goal of the assignment and omitted examples. Reviewing the assignment prompt more thoroughly and guiding students through the process of how to cite examples in the writing process is suggested.

Ceramics [KB. ART 345-346,445-46] Goal not met with 80% of student meeting /exceeding expectations. The assignment was not the issue. Student scores expected to significantly improve once we are back to face-to-face classes. Point value for the assessment portion of the assignment will be increased in an effort to help motivate the students for an appropriate investment of time.

Graphic Design [TG 326-327,426-427] Goal MET with 100% of student meeting /exceeding expectations. Overall, students have a good understanding of their projects. However, a couple of revisions should be implemented from a Graphic Design point of view:

- Have students look at their work from a global point of view. How does it work? Is there a history?
- Questions and prompts of the GD students will be revised and made applicable to the discipline

Students in 300+ classes do well because they complete Creative Briefs for projects. This gives them a good basis for answering these questions.

Painting [HK ART 311-312, 411-412]

Goal MET with 100% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

Photography [RJ ART 328-329,428-429]

Goal MET with 100% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

Over the course of this bizarre year, written assignments were not as frequent for upper-level students. For this year, the 300-400 photography assessment is supplemented with verbal critique responses. 70% of the students in ART 328, 329, 428, and 429 scored 3 or higher on all three goals. Written assignments next year (to include (but not limited to) artist statements, written responses to articles/essays, and written responses to each other's work.

2021-2022:

Overall goal (85%+) not met with a combined [75%] meeting/exceeding expectations.

Expected achievements;

Goal 1 Knowledge: MET (88%)

Goal 2 Evaluation: MET (88%)

Goal 3 Context: not met (76%)

ART 311, 312, 411 Analysis/Action

Goal MET with 100% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

Part of the success this semester is attributed to having students do two writing assignments which were both assessed. In the first writing assignment none of the students met the benchmark and feedback was provided for improvement. Therefore students performed remarkably better in the second writing assignment. In the future, students will complete formative assignments involving research into the history of art/painting to facilitate a broader context from which to interpret their own work.

ART 345, 346, 445, 446 Analysis/Action

Goal MET with 100% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

Student feedback on the project was very positive. They enjoyed researching their chosen artwork and learning about art that has a very clear social message. This project was so successful I plan on incorporating a 3-dimensional companion project to accompany the written component in the fall

Art 326, 327,426,427 Analysis/Action

Goal NOT MET with only 33% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

In general, the students have an overview and general understanding of the project(s) assigned. They exhibited a surface-level comprehension. The area for improvement is how they communicate and articulate their solutions for the project(s). Students need to exhibit detail-level writing knowledge in their breaking down specific decisions they make. This can come in the form of using proper vocabulary while also making sure they have a reasoned, research-oriented approach to decisions they are making in relation to the objective.

ART 328, 329, 428, 429 Analysis/Action

Goal MET with 100% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

Students were asked to verbally discuss their own work and write about another student's work. This did provide interesting insight, but in the future, I will have the students write about their own work as well as their peers' work. Furthermore, more writing assignments will be incorporated throughout the semester to give the students the opportunity to practice their writing and critical thinking. I intend to revise my rubric-scored assignment and next semester (and beyond), I will strive to include more examples of contemporary artists because I can see that the students' abilities to discuss their work in a greater context is lacking.

ART 317, 318, 417 Analysis/Action:

Goal NOT MET with 60% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

I would attribute the high scores of this course to the small class size and the ability to discuss topics more in a small groups and individually at a greater ease. As enrollment increases, discussions with smaller groups of the class will be conducted. If this poses quality results, it will be implemented into other courses in the future.

ART 322, 323, 324 Analysis/Action

Goal NOT MET with 59% of student meeting /exceeding expectations.

Many students scored the minimum 3 points per goal. I attribute a portion of this downtrend to students adjusting to be back in the classroom, many students expressed a somewhat difficult time getting into a normal academic headspace. The somewhat hybrid format of the class also must have played a part. The class was split due to covid concerns in a large, lab centered class. The class had to move at a faster pace as in-person instruction was cut due to the split of the class. More in-person instruction and discussion should naturally increase the scores in the future. Next academic year will be fully back to normal instruction and I look forward to viewing the results and making necessary changes afterward when needed.

11.2 Data

11.2 Benchmark: 85% of students are expected to meet (14-15) or exceed (16+) expectations measuring ability to communicate their understanding of the project assignment and their individual approach in terms of concept and media.

Goal 1 - Ability to communicate their understanding of the project assignment and their individual approach in terms of concept and media.

Academic Year	% of students met or exceeded expected level of achievement
2013-2014	42%
2014-2015	96%
2015-2016	92%
2016-2017	87%
2017-2018	88%
2018-2019	83%
2019-2020	88%
2020-2021	85%
2021-2022	88%

Outcome Links**Visual Communication and Expression [Program]**

Graduates possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in one or more media.

Graduates must possess an ability to make workable connections between concept and media. (NASAD)

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievement is met 88% of students met or exceeded Goal 1 Knowledge [Ability to communicate their understanding of the project assignment and their individual approach in terms of concept and media].

Five years of data suggest this most basic level [Knowledge] as the most consistent area of achievement in the critical thinking assignments. The ability to apply this knowledge base and subsequently use to support context indicates a continuing disconnect.

Recommendation/Action: Prompt revised for 2018-2019, changes made to the CT prompt with revised writing prompt created for drawing studio area. Student guided to draw direct connections between Goal 1 content and Goal 3 context.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement is not met, with 83% of students meeting or exceeded Goal 1 KNOWLEDGE [Ability to communicate their understanding of the project assignment and their individual approach in terms of concept and media].

Analysis: Goal 1 met in all studio areas other than GDES (50% M/E).

Recommendation/Action: GDES faculty member met with assessment committee and will revise assignment prompt to better meet content of graphic design area.

2019-2020:

Expected achievements MET with combined 88 % of students meeting or exceeded Goal 1 KNOWLEDGE [Ability to communicate their understanding of the project assignment and their individual approach in terms of concept and media].

Goal 1 Knowledge: MET (+3)

Analysis/Action:

GDES Not met with 70% score on Goal 1. Students did not fail to use appropriate terminology, rather responses were not sufficiently developed. Responses likely tied to COVID19 interruption.

Assignment revised and online support addressed.

2020-2021:

Goal 1 Knowledge: MET (85%)

Analysis/Action: The one critical thinking goal met is KNOWLEDGE, the lowest level of Bloom's taxonomy. Assessments reflect an understanding of the assignment and key course terminology used in writing. Restoration of formative assessments into courses in which these were reduced due to online formats will be implemented; revisions to writing prompt to be made.

2021-2022:

Goal 1 Knowledge: MET (85%)

Analysis/Action:

While Goal 1 continues to be met, the faculty agree that the assignment prompts require revision. Students are not sufficiently connecting their work to a broader context which is reflected in Goal 3. The introduction of formative assignments prior to the summative writing assignment will be introduced.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Art History Course Exit Exams

Assessment: Graduates will analyze the history of art from the Paleolithic period to the present day emphasizing the roles of art within the evolution of contemporary culture.

Benchmark: 85% of art majors are expected to achieve a score of 85% or above on art content questions embedded in the course exit surveys.

Outcome Links

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

12.1 Data

Art History Content:

Course	2016-2017		2017-2018	
	% M/E	Benchmark met?	% M/E	Benchmark met?
ART 261	80%	No	85%	Yes
ART 262	88%	Yes	90%	Yes
ART 363	90%	Yes	80%	No

ART 367	N/A	N/A	97%	Yes
Average	86%	MET	89%	MET

Art History Content:

Course	2018-2019			2019-2020		
	# Enrolled	% M/E	Benchmark met?	# Enrolled	% M/E	Benchmark met?
ART 261	157	88%	Yes	173	87%	Yes
ART 262	156	98%	Yes	174	93%	Yes
ART 363	171	87%	Yes	147	90%	Yes
ART 367	100	97%	Yes	77	93%	Yes
ART 461	52	90%	Yes	64	100%	Yes
Average	107	92%	MET	127	93%	MET

Course	2020-2021			2021-2022		
	# Enrolled	% M/E	Benchmark met?	# Enrolled	% M/E	Benchmark met?
ART 261	156	94%	Yes	118	91%	Yes
ART 262	154	97%	Yes	123	95%	Yes
ART 363	78	93%	Yes	77	91%	Yes
ART 367	80	92%	Yes	80	93%	Yes
ART 461	59	100%	Yes	73	95%	Yes
Average	106	95%	MET	94	93%	MET

Outcome Links

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Composite expected achievement is met 88% of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded exam questions. ART 363 is the singular course where expected achievement fell below expectations with score of 80%. Data not collected on Non-Western art courses.

Recommendation/Action: Non-Western art establish assessment for course content. Initial assessment fall 2018.

2018-2019:

Composite expected achievement is MET 92% of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded exam questions.

Analysis: Benchmark met in all courses for the first time in three years, with average score improving 4% overall and 60% of courses scoring equal to or above 90%.

Recommendation/Action: ART 261/262 - Expand content to forge deeper connections, supporting program efforts to improve critical thinking skills and Praxis content performance.

2019-2020:

Composite expected achievement is MET.

93% of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded exam questions.

Analysis: Benchmark met in all courses, with scores in "exceeding" range of 90+ in 90% of all art history courses.

Recommendation/Action: Review course content in course offerings with art education faculty to assure alignment with Praxis and increased focus on non-western content.

2020-2021:

Composite expected achievement is MET.

96% of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded exam questions.

Analysis: Benchmark met in all courses, with scores in "exceeding" range of 90+ in 90% of all art history courses,

ART 261 Action: Course revised to include short, informative, fun videos (from Khan Academy, for example) and virtual tours (inside Roman catacombs, for example) to bolster their understanding of concepts and aid in recognition of art and architecture. [BM]

ART 262 Action: Course redesigned for the Fall 2020 semester, using the iDesign course design and development process. Test prep was enhanced.[BM]

ART 363 Action: Revised study guide and essay questions given over the semester allow them to successfully discern answers. Students are required to compete half of the course by midterm, which supports learning and successful course completion. [BM]

ART 367 Analysis/ Action: Decline seen from Sp 20 to Fall 20; Through a series of essays, this course requires attention to detail. The two hurricanes pushed students to the limit and I believe they were simply less able to focus; Student scores rebounded during Sp 21. [BM]

ART 461 Analysis/ Action: Why did all students meet the benchmark? I think it's because the courses are self-paced classes with deadlines to keep them on track. The students have time to digest and understand the course content when it suits their schedule. They don't miss any classes because they are able to "attend" the course when it is convenient. [AB]

2021-2022:

ART 261 Analysis/Action: Students met benchmark because of supplemental materials provided which bolster a more comprehensive understanding of course material.Action Plan: Make course content (ancient art history) more relatable: Moodle discussion board and/or short answer assignment based on contemporary / topical events (multiple articles/videos) that relate to course content. Example topic: the ancient bust of a Roman, missing from Germany for decades, purchased at an Austin Goodwill for \$35.

ART 262 Analysis/Action: Course redesign in Fall 2020 is enhancing student understanding of what amounts to a whole lot of content covered in Art 262. The essays, discussions, and short answers are preparing students for the questions more successfully.

Action Plan: Engage students creatively: Have students create a Renaissance style altarpiece based on their favorite movie, series, podcast, or novel as subject matter. Using household items (folded paper, markers, paperclips), students design the panels to tell the story sequentially and encapsulate the narrative in a few important scenes, just as Renaissance artists did.

ART 363 Analysis/Action: Essay questions and study guides continue to help students focus on course content, making connections between stylistic periods. Lectures reorganized lectures for better flow. Action: Review lectures for efficacy.

ART 367 Analysis/Action: Assignments were revamped in accordance with the alteration of audio lectures – audio lectures were shortened so that each is now limited to one artist. This should help students to focus and learn content in small bites. Action: Review writing assignments.

ART 461 Analysis/Action: I think that my percentage dropped in my Spring 2022 class because only 75% of the students were successful on one of the embedded questions. It's odd because the question came from my lecture, which has not changed since last year so I'm not sure why more students missed this question. I do notice that my class size in the 2022 PreColumbian class has doubled this semester and overall, the students appear to be weaker. They are more prone to procrastination, which causes them to rush their answers to meet the final assignment deadline. It's possible that the recent Covid crisis is forcing more students into online classes - students who might do better in a face to face situation?

13 Assessment and Benchmark ART 450 Embedded Questions - Professional Practices/Ethics]

Assessment: These embedded questions in the capstone course address contemporary professional and ethical issues in art.

Benchmark: 85% of ART 450 students are expected to achieve a score of 80% on nine embedded quiz questions that assess student understanding of the ethical considerations of copyrights, contracts for commissioned work, and commercial gallery relations.

Outcome Links

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

13.1 Data

ART 450 Professional Practices/Ethics

Topic	2016-2017		2017-2018	
	% correct	Benchmark met?	% correct	Benchmark met?
Professional Practices - Commissioned Work	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Professional Practices - Gallery representation and direct sales	100%	Yes	92%	Yes
Legal/Professional Practices/Ethics/Contracts	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Legal/Copyright Issues	100%	Yes	97%	Yes
Legal/Public domain/Fair use	93%	Yes	92%	Yes
Composite Average	99%	MET	96%	MET

Topic	2018-2019		2019-2020	
	% correct	Benchmark met?	% correct	Benchmark met?
Professional Practices - Commissioned Work	94%	Yes	80%	No
Professional Practices - Gallery representation and direct sales	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Legal/Professional Practices/Ethics/Contracts	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Legal/Copyright Issues	100%	Yes	80%	No

Legal/Public domain/Fair use	95%	Yes	100%	Yes
Composite Average	98%	MET	92%	MET

Topic	2020-2021		2021-2022	
	% correct	Benchmark met?	% correct	Benchmark met?
Professional Practices - Commissioned Work	82%	No	100%	Yes
Professional Practices - Gallery representation and direct sales	91%	Yes	100%	Yes
Legal/Professional Practices/Ethics/Contracts	91%	Yes	88%	Yes
Legal/Copyright Issues	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Legal/Public domain/Fair use	95%	Yes	88%	Yes
Composite Average	92%	MET	95%	MET

Outcome Links

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Expected achievement is met 96% of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded quiz questions on professional practices/ethics.

Students could benefit from going deeper into content issues, especially those surrounding copyright. They are aware and engaged, but the topics are extensive and evolving.

Recommendation/Action: ART 450 content revised to include case study research relative to their own disciplines.

2018-2019:

Expected achievement is MET with an average of 98 % of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded quiz questions on professional practices/ethics.

Analysis: Students were more actively engaged in content area and discussions relative to copyright issues. Copyright case studies included those involving Richard Prince, Jeff Koons, and the USPS. Koons has been famously sued multiple times and class talked about how litigation avoided by obtaining license from the estate of Ukrainian sculptor Oksana Zhnikrup. USPS was successfully sued by artist Robert Davidson - In July 2018 the USPS paid the artist 3.5 million dollars for their mistaken use of his Las Vegas sculpture, not the real Statue of Liberty, on a stamp.

Recommendation/Action: Revise ART 450 professional practices/legal content to reflect current events and trends in business, conservation, galleries, and copyright rulings.

2019-2020:

Expected achievement is MET with a composite average of 92 % of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded quiz questions on professional practices/ethics.

Analysis: Close examination of results revealed [1] student scored at 80% on 2 questions related to [Commissions] and [Copyright -notation], with a total score of 85% and meeting requisite benchmark.

Action - A review of ethics/legal issues will be added to each related content area.

2020-2021:

Expected achievement is MET with a composite average of 92 % of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded quiz questions on professional practices/ethics.

Analysis: [2] students scored at 80% on a question related to [Commissions]

The biggest question asked while teaching this semester was: What will the art world look like post-pandemic? In the course was addressed the tenuous nature of the gallery system: speaking of how mid-size to small galleries have struggled to remain open and contrast of mega-galleries to those at the lower tier of the market.

Action: Going forward, further expansion upon discussion of open studios, social media presence, and personal websites will be important. Assessment topic on commissioned work will require students touch on two basic rules concerning price quotes and the requirement of a signed contract to begin work.

2021-2022:

Expected achievement is MET with a composite average of 95% of students met or exceeded score of 85% on embedded quiz questions on professional practices/ethics.

Analysis: Course material was implemented and then reviewed several times to foster absorption of the material.

Action: Course instructor changed due to the retirement of a faculty member, which has caused some content to be changed/tweaked. More emphasis on real world situations will be incorporated into class content, along with revised exam structure.

14 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS Art Content Knowledge Exam

Assessment: Students with a secondary concentration in art education must pass the PRAXIS Art Content exam.

Benchmark: 85% of Art Education majors will pass the Praxis Art Content Knowledge Exam on the first attempt.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

14.1 Data PRAXIS Art Content

ART Education - Praxis Content #5134:

ART		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
5134 overall	Number	2	2	2	0	0	1
	Mean	169	167	164			160
	Range	165-173	166-168	161-167			160
	% Passed on 1st Attempt	100%	100%	0%			0%

5134 breakdown	Number	1	2	2			1
Art Making	Mean	51	51	54			41
	Range	51	49-53	53-54			41
	% correct (68)	75%	75%	79%			60%
Health Historical and Theoretical Foundations of Art	Mean	28	32	23			29
	Range	28	27-37	18-27			29
	% correct (38)	74%	84%	61%			76%

ART		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
5134 overall	Number	1	3	1	1	0	1
	Mean	160	167	176	164		164
	Range	160	161-177	176	164		164
	% Passed on 1st Attempt	0%	33%	100%	100%		100%
5134 breakdown	Number	1	3	1	1		—
Art Making	Mean	46	52	53	48		
	Range	46	47-60	53	48		
	% correct (68)	69%	76%	79%	71%		
Historical and Theoretical Foundations of Art	Mean	21	25	26	25		
	Range	21	21-27	26	25		
	% correct (38)	55%	65%	68%	66%		

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

5. Application of Content

The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met. There was one candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018. The first time percentage pass rate was 0%.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be to achieve an 85% first attempt pass rate on the Praxis Art Content Knowledge Exam.

In order to achieve the goal, as the art professors redesign the art education program to meet state residency requirements, they will also revisit the topics covered on the content Praxis exam to ensure the appropriate courses are a part of the program. Professors will also evaluate and include in the course sequence when students would be most prepared to complete the Praxis exam successfully.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met. There is a new course in the curriculum (ART 335) that will address the content that 5134 covers. Continue to monitor results for the five-year average.

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to achieve an 85% first attempt pass rate on the Praxis Art Content Knowledge Exam after taking ART 335 in Junior Fall semester.

2019-2020:

The benchmark was met. In addition to continuing the new course, ART 335, I will also be purchasing multiple copies of test prep material for students to check out when they are preparing to take the exam.

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. Will continue to monitor results over the next year.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year for the Art Education Concentrations.

As part of the improvement plan and in preparation for the 2024 CAEP Accreditation visit, all K-12 and secondary programs are reviewing and realigning course content to the Praxis content exam to ensure candidate preparation.

15 Assessment and Benchmark ARED 445 Field Experience Evaluation

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) measures the following elements:

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Domain 2: Classroom Environment

Domain 2.1: Managing Student Behavior

Domain 3: Instruction

Domain 3.2: Engaging Students in Learning

Domain 3.3: Using Assessment in Instruction

Domain 4: Professionalism

Domain 5.4: Knowledge of Artists, Art History, and World Cultures

Domain 5.5: Thorough Analysis, Interpretation, and Judgment

Benchmark 1:

Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric (FEE) for Domains 1-4.

Scoring scale used:

1 - Ineffective

2 - Effective: Emerging

3 - Effective: Proficient

4 - Highly Effective

Benchmark 2: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5 (Content Specific Components) on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric.

Scoring Scale for the FEE:

- 1 - Ineffective
- 2 - Emerging
- 3 - Effective Proficient
- 4 - Highly Effective

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmarks were 2.80 or higher on each element.

Outcome Links**Art Education Competency [Program]**

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

15.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

Data table is attached.

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

2017-2018 BA_ART_Field Experience Evaluation

2018-2019 BA_ART_Field Experience Evaluation

2019-2020 BA_ART_Field Experience Evaluation (1)

2020-2021 BA_ART_Field Experience Evaluation (1)

Outcome Links**Art History and Contemporary Art [Program]**

Graduates must possess some familiarity with the works and intentions of major artists/designers and movements of the past and the present, both in the Western and non-Western worlds. Understand and evaluate contemporary thinking about art/design and professional and ethical issues related to art making and art professions. (NASAD)

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The one candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018 achieved a score of 3.13 or higher on all components in the Field Experience Evaluation for domains 1-4. A score of 3.00 (Effective: Proficient) is the benchmark for proficiency.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for candidates to score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Field Experience Rubric for domains 1-4. The benchmark will not be raised due to the low N value. Once a trend has been established, then the benchmark score may be increased.

In order to continue to understand the strengths and areas for improvement of the Art Education candidates and to ensure continued improvement, the FEE scores will be

analyzed through scripted notes of university supervisors. Areas that need improvement will be identified and addressed in curriculum content.

2018-2019:

The goal was met [4/4]. Continue to monitor results for five-year period trends. Monitor Sub Categories that are below 3.

The goal for 2019-2020 will be for candidates to score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Field Experience Rubric for domains 1-4. Will monitor Domain 2 to see if this area needs to be addressed in the curriculum in the future.

2019-2020:

The benchmark was met.

In order to continue to understand the strengths and areas for improvement of the Art Education candidates and to ensure continued improvement, the FEE scores will be analyzed through scripted notes of university supervisors. Areas that need improvement will be identified and addressed in curriculum content.

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. In order to ensure continued improvement, students will learn how to take scripted notes to ensure that they are familiar with each domain.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

All major assessments, including the field experience evaluation, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit. Therefore, a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022

15.2 Data Art Education

2017-2018:

Data not reported.

2018-2019:

Data not reported.

Domain 5: Content specific components on FEE III

ART	Fall 2019			Spring 2020			Fall 2020			Spring 2021		
	Component	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean
5.1	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00				1	3.75	3.75
5.2	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00				1	3.75	3.75
5.3	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00				1	3.75	3.75
5.4	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00				1	3.50	3.50
5.5	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00				1	3.75	3.75
5.6	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00				1	3.75	3.75
5.7												
TECH 1										1	3.75	3.75
TECH 2										1	3.50	3.50
TECH 3										1	3.25	3.25

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

15.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not assessed. The candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018 did not receive scores from the university supervisor on the components in domain 5 of the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for candidates to score a 3.00 or higher on each element of domain five (content-specific components) on the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric.

In order to obtain data for this assessment, all university supervisors will be required to score the domain five elements that are observed during the evaluations. Once data is obtained, it will be evaluated for strengths and areas for improvement.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not assessed. The goal for 2019-2020 will be for candidates to score a three or higher on each element of domain five (content-specific components) on the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric. The domain will also be reviewed to ensure it is aligned with the state standards.

2019-2020:

The benchmark was assessed and met. We will continue to evaluate this data for strengths and areas for improvement.

2020-2021:

The benchmark was assessed and met. We will watch for a five year trend now that this benchmark is being assessed regularly.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

All major assessments, including the field experience evaluation content portion are being aligned to current standards and curriculum expectations. Content experts will assist site supervisors in assessing candidate knowledge when teaching in the field. All major assessments, including the field experience evaluation, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit. Therefore, a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

16 Assessment and Benchmark ARED Senior Exit Survey

Assessment: Program completers in Art Education complete an exit survey with the following indicators:

1. Use technology to enhance learning.
2. Understand and convey knowledge of subject matter.
3. Manage student behavior for effective learning.
4. Stimulate high-order thinking.
5. Provide opportunities for student involvement in learning.
6. Use materials, resources, and activities that are developmentally appropriate.

This is a new survey that was created to align with InTASC Standards implemented in fall 2017.

Benchmark: Candidates will score all of the components on the Candidate Exit Survey at a score of 3.00 or higher.

Scoring Scale:

- 1 - Not at all prepared
- 2 - Not sufficiently prepared
- 3 - Sufficiently prepared
- 4 - Well prepared

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was a mean score of 3.50 on all indicators.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

16.1 Data ARED Senior Exit Survey

ART Education - Candidate Exit Survey:

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2017 N=0		Spring 2018 N=1	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Section 1: Curriculum Design and Implementation				4.00	4.00
1.1 Implement a variety of instructional strategies during lesson planning, which addresses students' common misunderstandings as well as typical ways students learn the content (i.e. instructional strategies).	1b			4.00	4.00
1.2 Incorporate students' diverse cultures as well as real-world interests and experiences into instructional content to make learning relevant.	4m			4.00	4.00
1.3 Implement strategies to help students understand the interconnectedness of different content areas.	5e			4.00	4.00
Section II: Classroom Environment and Management				4.00	4.00
2.1 Implement routines and rules for the classroom that enables all students to focus on learning.	3d			4.00	4.00
2.2 Demonstrate appropriate use of communication and interventions to manage behavior in the classroom taking into account student diversity.	3f			4.00	4.00
2.3 Implement efficient transitions between classroom activities.	3k			4.00	4.00
2.4 Implement and support diverse inclusiveness with structured student-led discussion, curricula, and instructional experiences.	2a			4.00	4.00
Section III: Quality of Instructional Practices				4.00	4.00
3.1 Demonstrate instructional strategies that emphasize critical thinking and deepen students' understanding by including Bloom's Taxonomy of analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation or Webb's Depth of Knowledge of strategic thinking (DOK 3) and/or extended thinking (DOK 4).	8f			4.00	4.00

3.2 Demonstrate the ability to provide academic support (e.g. scaffolding, models and approaches, instructional strategies, theories of learning) to meet particular learning differences or needs.	2f			4.00	4.00
3.3 Implement interactive and engaging technology within instructional lessons.	5l			4.00	4.00
Section IV: Student Assessment and Monitoring				4.00	4.00
4.1 Demonstrate various ways to give feedback on student work that is descriptive, specific, relevant, timely, and constructive.	6n			4.00	4.00
4.2 Analyze formal and informal assessment results against student goals and utilize the data to guide instruction.	7d			4.00	4.00
4.3 Demonstrate how to help students assess their own ability and set goals which leads to successful outcomes (formative self-assessments such as checklist and rubrics, student goal setting, etc.)	6m			4.00	4.00
4.4 Analyze formative and summative assessment data to identify students' areas of weakness and create an instructional plan for academic improvement, especially with regards to Response to Intervention (RTI).	9h			4.00	4.00
Section V: Professional Dispositions				4.00	4.00
5.1 Demonstrate thoughtful and critical reflection on his/her own effectiveness as a teacher in order to improve planning and practice.	9l			4.00	4.00
5.2 Collaborate with learners and their families, through technology and other forms of communication, to establish mutual expectations and ongoing communication to support learner development and achievement.	10d			4.00	4.00
5.3 Collaborate with educational colleagues both within Professional Learning Committees (PLCs) and individually to meet the needs of all students (e.g. special education teachers, school counselors, school librarians, curriculum, etc.)	7e			4.00	4.00
Section VI: University Information				4.00	4.00
6.1 Rate the degree of your satisfaction with the academic advising you received from your academic department. (Aligns with MSU QEP)				4.00	4.00
6.2 Rate the extent to which your field experiences contributed to your teacher education training.(Required information for Master Plan)				4.00	4.00
6.3 Rate the extent to which your student teaching/internship contributed to your teacher education training.(Required information for Master Plan)				4.00	4.00

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2018 N=1		Spring 2019 N=3	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Section 1: Curriculum Design and Implementation		3.00	3.00	3.11	1.00-4.00
1.1 Implement a variety of instructional strategies during lesson planning, which addresses students' common misunderstandings as well as typical ways students learn the content (i.e. instructional strategies).	1b	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.00-3.00
1.2 Incorporate students' diverse cultures as well as real-world interests and experiences into instructional content to make learning relevant.	4m	3.00	3.00	3.67	3.00-4.00
1.3 Implement strategies to help students understand the interconnectedness of different content areas.	5e	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
Section II: Classroom Environment and Management		3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
2.1 Implement routines and rules for the classroom that enables all students to focus on learning.	3d	3.00	3.00	2.33	1.00-4.00
2.2 Demonstrate appropriate use of communication and interventions to manage behavior in the classroom taking into account student diversity.	3f	3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
2.3 Implement efficient transitions between classroom activities.	3k	3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
2.4 Implement and support diverse inclusiveness with structured student-led discussion, curricula, and instructional experiences.	2a	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
Section III: Quality of Instructional Practices		3.00	3.00	2.56	1.00-4.00
3.1 Demonstrate instructional strategies that emphasize critical thinking and deepen students' understanding by including Bloom's Taxonomy of analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation or Webb's Depth of Knowledge of strategic thinking (DOK 3) and/or extended thinking (DOK 4).	8f	3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
3.2 Demonstrate the ability to provide academic support (e.g. scaffolding, models and approaches, instructional strategies, theories of learning) to meet particular learning differences or needs.	2f	3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
3.3 Implement interactive and engaging technology within instructional lessons.	5l	3.00	3.00	2.33	1.00-4.00
Section IV: Student Assessment and Monitoring		3.00	3.00	2.83	1.00-4.00
4.1 Demonstrate various ways to give feedback on student work that is descriptive,	6n	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00-

specific, relevant, timely, and constructive.					4.00
4.2 Analyze formal and informal assessment results against student goals and utilize the data to guide instruction.	7d	3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
4.3 Demonstrate how to help students assess their own ability and set goals which leads to successful outcomes (formative self-assessments such as checklist and rubrics, student goal setting, etc.)	6m	3.00	3.00	2.67	1.00-4.00
4.4 Analyze formative and summative assessment data to identify students' areas of weakness and create an instructional plan for academic improvement, especially with regards to Response to Intervention (RTI).	9h	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
Section V: Professional Dispositions		3.00	3.00	3.11	1.00-4.00
5.1 Demonstrate thoughtful and critical reflection on his/her own effectiveness as a teacher in order to improve planning and practice.	9l	3.00	3.00	3.33	2.00-4.00
5.2 Collaborate with learners and their families, through technology and other forms of communication, to establish mutual expectations and ongoing communication to support learner development and achievement.	10d	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
5.3 Collaborate with educational colleagues both within Professional Learning Committees (PLCs) and individually to meet the needs of all students (e.g. special education teachers, school counselors, school librarians, curriculum, etc.)	7e	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
Section VI: University Information		3.00	3.00	3.44	2.00-4.00
6.1 Rate the degree of your satisfaction with the academic advising you received from your academic department. (Aligns with MSU QEP)		3.00	3.00	2.67	2.00-3.00
6.2 Rate the extent to which your field experiences contributed to your teacher education training.(Required information for Master Plan)		3.00	3.00	3.67	3.00-4.00
6.3 Rate the extent to which your student teaching/internship contributed to your teacher education training.(Required information for Master Plan)		3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00

2019-2020:
Data not available.

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2020 N=0		Spring 2021 N=1	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Section 1: Curriculum Design and Implementation				4.00	4.00
1.1 Implement a variety of instructional					

strategies during lesson planning, which addresses students' common misunderstandings as well as typical ways students learn the content (i.e. instructional strategies).				4.00	4.00
1.2 Incorporate students' diverse cultures as well as real-world interests and experiences into instructional content to make learning relevant.				4.00	4.00
1.3 Implement strategies to help students understand the interconnectedness of different content areas.				4.00	4.00
Section II: Classroom Environment and Management				3.50	3.00-4.00
2.1 Implement routines and rules for the classroom that enables all students to focus on learning.				4.00	4.00
2.2 Demonstrate appropriate use of communication and interventions to manage behavior in the classroom taking into account student diversity.				4.00	4.00
2.3 Implement efficient transitions between classroom activities.				3.00	3.00
2.4 Implement and support diverse inclusiveness with structured student-led discussion, curricula, and instructional experiences.				3.00	3.00
Section III: Quality of Instructional Practices				4.00	4.00
3.1 Demonstrate instructional strategies that emphasize critical thinking and deepen students' understanding by including Bloom's Taxonomy of analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation or Webb's Depth of Knowledge of strategic thinking (DOK 3) and/or extended thinking (DOK 4).				4.00	4.00
3.2 Demonstrate the ability to provide academic support (e.g. scaffolding, models and approaches, instructional strategies, theories of learning) to meet particular learning differences or needs.				4.00	4.00
3.3 Implement interactive and engaging technology within instructional lessons.				4.00	4.00
Section IV: Student Assessment and Monitoring				3.25	3.00-4.00
4.1 Demonstrate various ways to give feedback on student work that is descriptive, specific, relevant, timely, and constructive.				3.00	3.00
4.2 Analyze formal and informal assessment results against student goals and utilize the data to guide instruction.				4.00	4.00
4.3 Demonstrate how to help students assess their own ability and set goals which leads to				3.00	3.00

successful outcomes (formative self-assessments such as checklist and rubrics, student goal setting, etc.)					
4.4 Analyze formative and summative assessment data to identify students' areas of weakness and create an instructional plan for academic improvement, especially with regards to Response to Intervention (RTI).				3.00	3.00
Section V: Professional Dispositions				4.00	4.00
5.1 Demonstrate thoughtful and critical reflection on his/her own effectiveness as a teacher in order to improve planning and practice.				4.00	4.00
5.2 Collaborate with learners and their families, through technology and other forms of communication, to establish mutual expectations and ongoing communication to support learner development and achievement.				4.00	4.00
5.3 Collaborate with educational colleagues both within Professional Learning Committees (PLCs) and individually to meet the needs of all students (e.g. special education teachers, school counselors, school librarians, curriculum, etc.)				4.00	4.00
Section VI: University Information				4.00	4.00
6.1 Rate the degree of your satisfaction with the academic advising you received from your academic department. (Aligns with MSU QEP)				4.00	4.00
6.2 Rate the extent to which your field experiences contributed to your teacher education training.(Required information for Master Plan)				4.00	4.00
6.3 Rate the extent to which your student teaching/internship contributed to your teacher education training.(Required information for Master Plan)				4.00	4.00

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018 indicated feeling well prepared in each section addressed in the Candidate Exit Survey.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for candidates to score all of the components on the Candidate Exit Survey at a score of three or higher.

In an effort to ensure that candidates are prepared for the teaching professions, Candidate Follow-Up Surveys will be collected during the first semester of full-time teaching, as well as

an evaluation by the employer. Triangulation of this data will provide a clearer picture of the preparedness of the completers for the first year in the profession. From this data, program improvement can be addressed.

2018-2019:

The goal was not met in the Spring of 2019. The benchmark will not change. Continue to monitor results for the five-year average.

The goal for 2019-2020 will be for candidates to score all of the components on the Candidate Exit Survey at a score of three or higher. The curriculum in ART 334 will focus on the sections that scored below three.

2019-2020:

The benchmark was not assessed. The goal for 2020-2021 will be for candidates to score all of the components on the Candidate Exit Survey at a score of three or higher. The curriculum in ART 334 will focus on the sections that scored below three.

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. We will continue to watch for trends over the next five years.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

17 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS Principles of Learning and Teaching

Assessment: Students must pass this exam to complete program.

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam on the first attempt and a minimum 65% passing score in each section assessed.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was a 100% passing rate on the PLT for candidates completing this program with 75% passing the PLT on the first try.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

17.1 Data PRAXIS PLT

ART Education - Praxis PLT 5622, 5623, or 5624*

ART		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Test Number							5622
Overall	Number	2	2	2	0	0	1
	Mean	165	171	163			173
	Range	160-169	165-176	163			173
	% Passed on 1st Attempt	50%	0%	100%			0%
5622/5623/5624 breakdown							
Students as Learners	Number	2	2	2			1
	Mean	14	16	13.5			12
	Range	11-16	14-18	13-14			12
	% correct (21)	67%	76%	64%			57%

Instructional Process	Mean	14.5	14	13.5			17
	Range	14-15	14	12-15			17
	% correct (21)	69%	67%	64%			81%
Assessment	Mean	11	11	8.5			9
	Range	9-13	11	8-9			9
	% correct (14)	79%	79%	61%			64%
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	9	11	8			11
	Range	9	10-12	7-9			11
	% correct (14)	64%	79%	57%			79%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	8.5	9	10			12
	Range	8-9	9	10			12
	% correct (16)	53%	56%	63%			75%

ART		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Test Number		5622	5622/ 5624	5622	5622		5622
Overall	Number	1	3	1	1		1
	Mean	170	174	171	166		164
	Range	170	169-179	171	166		164
	% Passed on 1st Attempt	100%	100%	100%	100%		0%
5622/5623/5624 breakdown		Number	1	3	1	1	1
Students as Learners	Mean	16	16	16	13		14
	Range	16	16	16	13		14
	% correct (21-23)	70%	76%	76%	57%		67%
Instructional Process	Mean	14	15	16	14		15
	Range	14	15	16	14		15
	% correct (20-21)	70%	71%	76%	70%		71%
Assessment	Mean	8	11.33	8	10		9
	Range	8	8-14	8	10		9
	% correct (13-14)	62%	81%	62%	77%		64%
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	9	11	12	12		10
	Range	9	10-12	12	12		10
	% correct (14)	64%	85%	86%	86%		71%
	Mean	11	9.67	10	10		8

Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Range	11	8-12	10	10		8
	% correct (16)	69%	60%	63%	63%		50%

*K-12 candidates can choose to take any of the following PLT exams: #5622, #5623, or #5624.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met. The candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018 did not pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis Exam on the first attempt. This resulted in a 0% first attempt pass rate for the year. Over the last four semesters with completers in art education, there were three out of seven candidates (43%) who passed the exam on the first attempt. In analyzing the data over the last four semesters with completers in Art Education, Students as learners = 66%; Instructional Process = 70%; Assessment = 71%; Professional Development, Leadership, and Community = 70%; and Analysis of Instructional Scenarios = 62%.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for 80% of the candidates to pass the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt and a minimum 65% passing score in each section assessed. Trends indicate increases in scores for the Analysis of Instructional Scenarios over the past four semesters with data. Components of the three PLT exams that are available for art majors to take will be analyzed to ensure that the program redesign will include course content that is addressed in the courses listed. The sequence will also set a recommended time for candidates to take the PLT exam. Advisors will also encourage candidates to take the exam at the recommended points in the sequence.

2018-2019:

Passage goal met with 100% or [4/4].

The goal for 2019-2020 will be for 85% of the candidates to pass the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt and a minimum 65% passing score in each section assessed. Trends indicate increases in scores for the Analysis of Instructional Scenarios over the past six semesters with data.

2019-2020:

The benchmark was met. The goal for 2020-2021 will be for students to take the exam in the correct semester after completing EDUC 203 and PSYC 260/261.

2020-2021:

The goal was not met. I had one student who attempted this test this cycle. I believe that it is because of everything that happened this year, COVID, hurricanes, ETC. I will monitor the results to make sure we hit our goal next year.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

EDPR faculty is continuously reviewing coursework and information pertinent to the PLT exam for K-12 majors to prepare them for the exam and to be successful in the classroom.

18 Assessment and Benchmark Louisiana Teacher Certification

Assessment: Art Education degree and certification candidates are expected to achieve Louisiana Teacher Certification.

Benchmark: 100% of Art Education candidates will receive their Louisiana Teacher Certification within six months of graduation.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 85% of Art Education candidates will receive their Louisiana Teacher Certification within six months of graduation.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 90% will receive their Louisiana Teacher Certification.

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

18.1 Data Teacher Certification

BA Art Education - Louisiana Teacher Certification:

Term	# of completers	Completers with Louisiana Teaching Certificate	% achieved certification
Fall 2016	2	2	100%
Spring 2017	—	—	—
Fall 2017	—	—	—
Spring 2018	1	1	100%
Fall 2018	1	1	100%
Spring 2019	3	3	100%
Fall 2019	1	1	100%
Spring 2020	1	1	100%
Fall 2020	—	—	—
Spring 2021	1	1	100%
Fall 2021	0	—	—
Spring 2022	0	—	—

Outcome Links

Art Education Competency [Program]

Art Education concentration degree candidates shall demonstrate competency in the teaching of art in the K-12 school setting. (NASAD)

18.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The last three candidates who completed the art education program went on to obtain their Louisiana Teacher Certification. The benchmark was set at 85% to receive their certification for 2017-2018.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for 100% of art education candidates to receive their Louisiana Teacher Certification within six months of graduation.

Candidates will attend residency seminars and meetings that will inform them of the process for filing for Louisiana Teacher Certification. The MSU certification officer will also assist candidates in obtaining and submitting the necessary documentation for approval.

2018-2019:

The goal was met, but one student waited four months to submit for her certificate due to financial matters.

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to monitor graduating students and check for Certificate completion in a timely manner.

2019-2020:

The benchmark was met. The goal for 2020-2021 will be for 100% of candidates to receive their Louisiana Teacher Certification within three months of graduation.

2020-2021:

The goal was met. The goal for 2021-2022 will be for 100% of candidates to receive their Louisiana Teacher Certification within three months of graduation. In addition to this, the visual arts department will contact the MSU certification officer to ensure success in this goal.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

19 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completers

Assessment: BA ART Secondary Concentration Art Education K-12 enrollment and completers.

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

19.1 Data

BA Art Education - Grades K-12 Assessment: Enrollment and Completers:

Academic Year	# officially enrolled in the program with an EDUC 200 packet	# of completers in the fall semester	# of completers in the spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	4	—	—	5
2014-2015	2	—	—	2
2015-2016	0	—	—	4
2016-2017	2	—	—	2
2017-2018	7	1	0	1
2018-2019	8	1	3	4
2019-2020	3	1	1	2
2020-2021	1	0	1	1
2021-2022	3	0	0	0

Outcome Links

2013 CAEP Standards [External]

3.1

The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

19.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The enrollment for candidates officially admitted into the art education program with an EDUC 200 packet nearly doubled since 2013-2014.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment. Secondary education faculty along with art education faculty, through participation in the Noel Levitz recruiting Initiative, will contact students who have inquired or applied to McNeese to enroll in education or who are undecided about a major. Seeing an increase in first-time students majoring in art education will assess the goal. The number of contacts with potential students will be tracked along with successful recruitment numbers.

2018-2019:

From Fall 2016 through Spring 2019 (three years data) there was an increase of 300%. Looking at the difference from Fall 2017 through Spring 2019 there was a 14 percent increase of students that have completed the Education 200 packet. The enrollment of the first-time freshman from Fall 2017 was three, and no first-time freshman in the fall of 2018. In 2019-2020, we will begin to use an exit survey for students who request to change major and drop the art education certification from their degree program to track students who do not complete the program.

2019-2020:

2/3 students in the program completed this year. We will continue to monitor this data for trends.

2020-2021:

We had 1/1 students complete this year. We did not have the 7% increase in recruitment, but we have a larger group of students in the program for 2021-2022.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. However, there are 3 candidates enrolled in the program with their EDUC 200 packet. This is an increase in enrollment from the previous year, but still down 50% from 2017-2018 and 2018-2019.

The Burton College of Education and particularly the Department of Education Professions has made intentional efforts to recruit candidates into teacher-education programs and has focused particular attention on those from diverse backgrounds and within high needs areas. In addition to traditional attendance at parish career fairs and expos, the following are part of the MSU Department of Education Professions (EDPR) Recruitment and Retention Plan: Unlock Education, Call Me MISTER, Educators Rising, and minors.

Although the efforts are strong and we are committed to recruiting candidates from diverse backgrounds, results of these efforts are not immediate as these students are juniors or seniors in high school and the data reported in the Performance Profile for education provider programs is on completers. We will track the data for program admission to monitor new students and make adjustments as needed to attract a diverse group of candidates interested in the field of education.

20 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment:

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Planning Rubric.

Scoring Scale:

- 1 - Ineffective
- 2 - Effective: Emerging
- 3 - Effective: Proficient
- 4 - Highly Effective

20.1 Data

Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 333, ART 334, ART 335, ART 413, and ART 414:

	InTASC		Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
--	--------	--	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------

Criteria	Standard		2015 N=2	2016 N=2	2016 N=2	2017 N=0	2017 N=0	2018 N=0*
Essential Questions		Mean	2.50	2.50	1.50			
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-2.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	0%			
Content Standards		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.00			
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%			
Student Outcomes	4n	Mean	3.00	3.00	3.00			
		Range	3.00	3.00	3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%			
Technology	5l	Mean	3.00	3.00	3.00			
		Range	3.00	3.00	3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%			
Educational Materials		Mean	3.00	3.00	3.00			
		Range	3.00	3.00	3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%			
Procedures	3k	Mean	3.00	2.50	2.50			
		Range	3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%	50%			
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Mean	2.50	2.00	2.00			
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	50%	0%	0%			
Pre-Planned (SEED) Questions	8i	Mean	2.00	2.50	1.50			
		Range	2.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-2.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	0%			
Modeled, Guided, Collaborative,		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50			
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00			

and Independent Practice	7k	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%			
Closure		Mean	3.00	3.00	1.50			
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%			
Formative /Summative Assessment	6j	Mean	2.00	2.00	2.50			
		Range	2.00	2.00	2.00-3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	50%			
Relevance and Rationale	2j	Mean	2.50	2.50	2.00			
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	50%			
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Mean	2.00	2.00	2.00			
		Range	2.00	2.00	2.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	0%			
Differentiation	7j	Mean	2.00	2.00	2.50			
		Range	2.00	2.00	2.00-3.00			
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	50%			

*Data not available for Spring 2018 candidate.

Criteria	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018 N=1*	Spring 2019 N=3*	Fall 2019 N=4	Spring 2020 N=1	Fall 2020 N=0	Spring 2021 N=1*
Essential Questions		Mean	—	—	3	3		—
		Range	—	—	3	3		—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%		—
Content Standards		Mean	—	—	3	3		—
		Range	—	—	3	3		—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%		—
Student		Mean	—	—	3	3		—
		Range	—	—	3	3		—

Outcomes	4n	% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100	100%	—
Technology	5l	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Educational Materials		Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Procedures	3k	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Mean	—	—	3	4	—
		Range	—	—	3	4	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Pre-Planned (SEED) Questions	8i	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Independent Practice	7k	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Closure		Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Formative /Summative Assessment	6j	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Relevance and Rationale	2j	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
		Mean	—	—	3	3	—

Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—
Differentiation	7j	Mean	—	—	3	3	—
		Range	—	—	3	3	—
		% Proficient or Higher	—	—	100%	100%	—

*Data not available for 2018-2019 candidates or Spring 2021 candidate.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

20.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Because the data is reported on completers and due to a change in professors for the courses in which the lesson plan should have been collected, the data for 2017-2018 was not available for the completer.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for candidates to score a three or higher on each element of the Lesson Planning Rubric. A score of three indicates a level of Effective: Proficient and is the benchmark set for all education majors. In looking at the data trends for the past three years, several areas raise concern: Essential Questions; Lesson “Hook”; Pre-Planned SEED Questions; Formative/Summative Assessment; Relevance and Rationale; Exploration, Extension, Supplemental; and Differentiation.

In 2018-2019, the instructors for EDUC 333, ART 334, ART 413, and ART 414 will meet to discuss the components of the lesson plan and define a shared agreement on the process for teaching the lesson plan components to the candidates. The candidates will write lesson plans addressing all of the components of the plan in each of the above-mentioned courses. An improvement in the ART 414 lesson plan scores should be a result of the collaboration by instructors and increased practice for the candidates.

2018-2019:

There is no data to report for the 2018-2019 academic year. Data was not reported previous to the current academic year.

The goal for 2019-2020 will be for candidates to score a three or higher on each element of the Lesson Planning Rubric.

There is a new faculty member who is currently teaching the ART Education courses and will collect data on the lesson plan in the 2019-2020 academic year. Over the past few semesters, changes have been made to the lesson plan template, so it will take several semesters of data collection to establish trends, strengths, and areas of weakness. The ART faculty member will continue to work with education faculty to norm the lesson plan rubric for use in the ART classes.

2019-2020:

This is the first time data has been tracked in two years. We will keep monitoring the data and look for trends.

2020-2021:

The completer in the spring 2021 semester did not have lesson plan data collected. Moving forward, faculty will review the major assessments needed for each course and will ensure that all assessments are collected and analyzed.

2021-2022

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

All major assessments, including the lesson plan, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

21 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample pulled from ART 334.

Prior to 2020-2021, the TCWS data were pulled from ART 414

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the criteria elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric. This data is pulled from ART 414.

Scoring Scale:

- 1 - Ineffective
- 2 - Effective: Emerging
- 3 - Effective: Proficient
- 4 - Highly Effective

21.1 Data

Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from ART 414):

Criteria		Fall 2015 N=2	Spring 2016 N=2	Fall 2016 N=2	Spring 2017 N=0	Fall 2017 N=0	Spring 2018 N=1*
Choice of Assessment	Mean	3.00	2.50	3.50			
	Range	2.00- 4.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00- 4.00			
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	100%			
Pre-Assessment	Mean	1.50	2.50	2.50			
	Range	1.00- 2.00	2.00- 3.00	2.00- 3.00			
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	50%			
Post-Assessment	Mean	2.00	2.00	2.50			
	Range	1.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00			
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	0%	50%			
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean	2.00	2.50	3.00			
	Range	2.00	2.00- 3.00	2.00- 4.00			
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	50%			
Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors	Mean	2.00	2.50	3.50			
	Range	1.00- 3.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00- 4.00			
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	100%			
Data to Determine	Mean	1.50	2.50	2.50			
	Range	1.00- 2.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00- 4.00			

Patterns and Gaps	% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	100%			
Response to Interventions	Mean	1.00	1.00	4.00			
	Range	1.00	1.00	4.00			
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	100%			

*Data not available from ART 414.

Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from ART 334 effective 2020-2021):

Criteria		Fall 2018 N=0*	Spring 2019 N=0*	Fall 2019 N=0	Spring 2020 N=0	Fall 2020 N=0	Spring 2021 N=1
Choice of Assessment	Mean	—	—				2.00
	Range	—	—				2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				0%
Pre-Assessment	Mean	—	—				2.00
	Range	—	—				2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				0%
Post-Assessment	Mean	—	—				2.00
	Range	—	—				2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				0%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean	—	—				3.00
	Range	—	—				3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				100%
Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors	Mean	—	—				3.00
	Range	—	—				3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				100%
Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps	Mean	—	—				3.00
	Range	—	—				3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				100%
Response to Interventions	Mean	—	—				3.00
	Range	—	—				3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	—	—				100%

*Data not available for 2018-2019 completers.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in 2021-2022 and, therefore, no new data to report.

21.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Because the data is reported on completers and due to a change in professors for the course in which the Teacher Candidate Work Sample is collected, the data for the 2017-2018 completer was not available. In looking at the trends in data from the past three years, all

seven categories raise concern. The art education completers did not score 100% meeting benchmark or higher more than once out of three semesters in any category.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for candidates to score a three or above on each of the criteria elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric assessed in ART 414.

An education professor will meet with the ART 414 professor to discuss the Teacher Candidate Work Sample components and assist them in ways to instruct candidates on how to complete the assessment. An increase in performance on the assessment should be the result of the increased and supplemented instruction. Scaffolding of the instruction throughout the coursework will also be addressed, which should also result in improved understanding by and improved performance.

2018-2019:

Data was not available to report for the 2018-2019 AY completers.

The goal for the 2019-2020 AY will be for candidates to score a three or above on each of the criteria elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric assessed in ART 414.

There is a new faculty member who is currently teaching the ART Education courses and will collect data for the Teaching Cycle in the 2019-2020 academic year. Over the past few semesters, changes have been made from the TCWS to the TC, so it will take several semesters of data collection to establish trends, strengths, and areas of weakness. The ART faculty member will continue to work with education faculty to norm the rubric for use in the ART classes.

2019-2020:

The TCWS will be assessed in ART 334 in the future because ART 414 is not being taught anymore.

2020-2021:

This is the first time this has been assessed in ART 334. The goal will be for students to score no lower than 3.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year with a concentration in Art Education therefore no new data was reported.

All major assessments, including the teaching cycle, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

End of report