

Field Group: Natural Art

Major: Natural Art

List the names of those involved in the completion of this report:

John Doe, Tommy Gun

1. Reflection on any changes from last year's assessment.

Last year we assessed SLO#1 (Students will be able to identify the physical art mediums available in nature and describe the pros and cons of using each), which was the first time we ever conducted an assessment of any kind. In terms of the assessment procedures, it was challenging to decide on what to assess as a group, who would be responsible for what portions of the assessment, and our timeline. This was more of a logistics problem which we ironed out and were able to come up with a plan that was actionable.

The assessment itself had its positives and negatives. We decided to assess one of our core upper-division courses, **NA 300 Nature and Art**, where students had to complete a natural art project and present it to the class. This was a perfect fit as the course objectives aligned very well to SLO#1. The challenging part was creating a set of criteria for the assessment that was more explicit than what we had used in the past. However, after having a lunch meeting with the Director of Academic Assessment, we were able to identify key criteria that we were looking for in the projects and presentations. The Director of Academic Assessment then took that criteria and created a checklist that we used in our assessment.

The assessment itself was the easy part. Thanks to the checklist that we had, all we did was examine student projects and observe their presentations on the final day of class. They were scored on a scale of 1=initial, 2=emerging, 3=developed, and 4=highly developed. As this was something that we had always done in the course, it was not more work and was manageable since we only had a total of ten students in the class.

The findings themselves were useful. We realized that our students were mostly "highly developed" in their knowledge of the benefits and drawbacks of using a specific natural medium for their projects and using that medium to express a main point. However, most students were only "emerging" at being able to identify the multiple natural mediums available to them. We realized that this was because students really did not have the opportunity to share their knowledge of what was available in nature in just the one project as most students only used one or two of the mediums that are available to them. So, we decided to do two things. First, we plan on having students complete two projects and presentations in the course, with one focusing on the different mediums available to them and what medium would best fit their final project and why (this would be their midterm project), and the second project being their final project where they go more in-depth with one or two mediums and express a key point of their own interest. Second, we will be revising SLO#1 at our next program review to reflect this emphasis on knowledge and expression.

2. Please list student learning outcomes for the major and which SLO(s) you will assess this year.

This year, we will be assessing SLO#3 (Students will be able to effectively use Natural Art terminology and theory when presenting their own projects and critiquing those of others). We will be assessing this SLO through their senior project displays and accompanying short paper. Since we have so few majors, we assessed the final projects for all seven majors this year. We have attached one picture of a senior project and the accompanying short paper as an example.

We will not be assessing SLO#2, #4 through #7 this year for the simple reason that we are choosing to assess what we can meaningfully assess within the time frame of an academic year, which is one SLO. We plan on continuing the process of assessing one SLO each year until we have assessed each one. All SLOs can be found on our program website at <http://www.cooluniversity.edu/naturalart>. They are also attached as an appendix to this report.

All department faculty members were involved in the reading, scoring, analysis, and completion of the report.

3. Description of analysis of student learning outcome assessment.

SLO#3 was assessed using the attached checklist. Prior to this year, the criteria for this course assignment was completed using “the faculty as the expert” methodology with continuous formative feedback being provided to students on their senior projects and papers. Keeping with this method, we used two department meetings to put to paper the criteria we as faculty already use when evaluating their projects and accompanying papers. Then, we asked the Director of Academic Assessment to help us revise our criteria and form it into a “checklist” of things that we see for student work that is “highly developed, developed, emerging, or initial.” Once we had the criteria in the format of a “checklist” we began the actual assessment.

The assessment consisted of the review of all seven senior projects and their accompanying papers. Each faculty member read and scored the students they were advisors for, which were four by one faculty member and three by the other. Since we were already reading and reviewing these papers, it only took a few additional minutes per paper to score each senior project and accompanying paper using the checklist. The scores were collected and organized by the Director of Academic Assessment for us.

4. Description and discussion of results

We found that all seven students used Natural Art terminology at a “highly developed” level in their accompanying papers. Most, five out of the seven students were also able to apply Natural Art theory at a “highly developed” level in their projects, but only three out of the seven were able to discuss Natural Art theory as it applied to their project, and how their project fit into previous work of others at a “developed” level or higher in their accompanying paper. We also found no evidence of critiquing others’ work in either their project or accompanying paper.

5. Field Group recommendations for academic year 2014-15.

Our recommendations for addressing the issues we found are as follows:

- SLO#3 needs to be revised to remove critiquing from the SLO and redefine it in a separate SLO. It was not evident in the student work assessed and we, as a department, need time to determine where it can be assessed, but we do feel that it is important to keep this as it is an important aspect of what we as art professionals do in the professional world. However, we will revise it as part of our next program review and assess it as part of the next assessment cycle.
- We need to consider assessing student presentations of their senior projects. The Director of Academic Assessment has informed us that it may be too early to conclude that students are having difficulty with discussing Natural Art theory and linking their work to the work of others. Since much of what we do is visual and verbal we plan to assess this again but through the observation of senior project presentations using the same checklist.

6. Proposed assessment plan for academic year 2014-15.

Next year, we plan on assessing SLO#2 (Students will be able to research and utilize research pertinent to a specific topic in Natural Art). This specific SLO is tied to the senior project accompanying paper. As such, both department faculty will participate in this assessment.