

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025

<i>PCAL</i>	<i>Art & Design</i>
<i>509: Visual Studies BA</i>	
<i>Program Coordinator: Mike Nichols and Miwon Choe; Assessment Coordinator: Kristina Arnold</i>	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1

Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate proficiency with the use of the elements and principles of art and design through creating visual art works.
Evaluation	This SLO represents a fundamental learning outcome for students in our program.
Measurement Instruments	Over the next assessment cycle we will work with program coordinators to refine the evaluation rubric to reflect appropriate expected levels of proficiency.
Criteria & Targets	In AY 24, we shifted our measure of evaluation from a 7-point numerical scale to a three-category scale describing level achieved (novice, intermediate, proficient) – a method of evaluation more logically aligned to student achievement – and we redefined criteria for student success as 75% of students achieve level of proficient. We will retain this new criteria and target moving forward.
Results & Conclusion	Over the past three years, we have continued to iterate and refine the process of assessing SLO 1 in the following substantive ways: • (introduced AY 22) Improving internal reliability of responses from assessors by shifting from all faculty as assessors, to a subset of assessors most familiar with the programs and the SLOs (newly appointed program coordinators) • (introduced AY 22) refining the artifact collected (shift from a physical to a digital artifact, a more appropriate assessment method for all concentrations) • (introduced AY 24) developing a rubric for SLO assessment, • (introduced AY 24) developed curricular maps to identify courses in which this SLO is addressed

	(introduced AY 24) shifting measure of evaluation from a 7-point numerical scale to a four-category scale describing level achieved (novice, intermediate, proficient, expert) – a method of evaluation more logically aligned to student achievement – and redefining criteria for student success to match this new measurement Over the past three years, we have spent significant time discussing ways to include Art Education students in our evaluation for both their Art Education concentration (through a separate instrument) and their Studio concentration (through this instrument). Currently, Art Education majors who also have the Studio concentration are waived from taking the Capstone course because their capstone is through the 432 Portfolio course. Ways to have these students benefit from the studio-oriented Capstone course, through which they would exhibit and become part of this assessment, continue to be explored.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Over the past three years, we have made significant progress in our assessment strategy for SLO 1. We continue only to be able to assess the BA Studio concentration, as we have never been able to collect necessary data from the Art Ed concentration in time for assessment. In AY 24, we detailed the information and artifacts needed to assess our Art Education concentration within the 509 BA. We now need to build time into our art ed methods classes and faculty schedules at the end of the semester to capture these artifacts and information. Our plan for the next three-year assessment cycle is as follows: 1. Commit to evaluating and refining the substantive changes made to our assessment strategy for SLO 1 outlined above. The department will also continue to address holistic curriculum development, oversight, and revision where needed, and take lessons learned from our yearly ASL reports back into the classroom for continued improvement. 2. Develop a process for effectively assessing the Art Education concentration.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	SLO 2 Demonstrate proficiency in the use of multiple art materials and techniques.
Evaluation	This SLO represents a fundamental learning outcome for students in our BA program.
Measurement Instruments	We believe there may be a misalignment between the artifact requested and the outcome we desire to assess and continue to work to more effectively align what we ask students to provide for their artifact more directly with the SLO. We will also work with program coordinators to refine the evaluation rubric to reflect appropriate expected levels of proficiency.
Criteria & Targets	In AY 24, we shifted our measure of evaluation from a 7-point numerical scale to a three-category scale describing level achieved (novice, intermediate, proficient) – a method of evaluation more logically aligned to student achievement – and we

	redefined criteria for student success as 75% of students achieve level of proficient. We will retain this new criteria and target moving forward.
Results & Conclusion	Though this learning outcome is critical for our graduates, we have not consistently met our target for success. To help ensure this goal is successfully met, we have continued to refine the process of assessing SLO 2 following the methods listed in SLO 1, above. Additionally, we believe there may be a misalignment between the artifact requested and the outcome we desire to assess. Stated one of the assessors: “I think the question... may be at odds with advice we give students when putting together [the artifact]. Meaning, students often showcase a single medium of focus such as GD or painting. Maybe we need to align the assessment to what we ask of them.” Based on this observation, we continue to work to more effectively align what we ask students to provide for their artifact more directly with the SLO. As with SLO 1, we need to develop a method to assess students in the Art Education concentration for SLO 2.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Over the past three years, we have made significant progress in our assessment strategy for SLO 1. Our plan for the next three-year assessment cycle is as follows: 1. Commit to evaluating and refining the substantive changes made to our assessment strategy for SLO 1 outlined above. The department will also continue to address holistic curriculum development, oversight, and revision where needed, and take lessons learned from our yearly ASL reports back into the classroom for continued improvement. 2. Continue to work to develop an effective artifact to assess SLO 2. 3. Develop a process for effectively assessing the Art Education concentration.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3

Program Student Learning Outcome	SLO 3 Demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate about their work and the work of other artists, both historic and contemporary.
Evaluation	Over the next assessment cycle we will examine SLO 3, to ensure A) it is not multi-barreled and is measurable, and B) the role that we expect historic and contemporary influences to play in a student’s work (for example, a potential revision could read: Demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate about their work and the work of <i>within the context of</i> other artists, both historic and contemporary).
Measurement Instruments	See below discussion under “results.”
Criteria & Targets	In AY 24, we shifted our measure of evaluation from a 7-point numerical scale to a three-category scale describing level achieved (novice, intermediate, proficient) – a method of evaluation more logically aligned to student achievement – and we

	redefined criteria for student success as 75% of students achieve level of proficient. We will retain this new criteria and target moving forward.
Results & Conclusion	Over the past three years, we have continued to iterate and refine the process of assessing SLO 3 in the substantive ways listed in SLO 1, and we have: Developed and included an additional measurement to assess this competency. Assessment now includes both a written creative statement and an oral presentation. While we have not met this SLO in all of the past 5 years, continued focus within the program and in the Portfolio and Capstone courses on career readiness, with specific attention on helping students develop effective verbal communication skills, ensure that our students continue to improve in this important area. With the advent of AI, it is likely that the value of written statements will decrease as a valid measure for assessing real student learning. On the other hand, developing and delivering an oral creative talk, whether through assistance with AI tools or not, gives students practice in effectively communicating about their work and process – critical skills as they develop career readiness in their fields. As with SLO 1, we need to develop a method to assess students in the Art Education concentration for SLO 3.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Over the next assessment cycle we will: 1) examine SLO 3 to A) ensure it is not multi-barreled and is measurable, and B) clarify the role that we expect historic and contemporary influences to play in a student's work (for example, a potential revision could read: Demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate about their work and the work of <i>within the context of</i> other artists, both historic and contemporary.); 2) Continue to observe, and where necessary examine ways to mitigate, any negative effects AI has on student learning and assessment in our program. 3) Develop a process for effectively assessing the Art Education concentration.

Potential new SLO 4 (Art Education Concentration Only): Demonstrate proficiency in methods of art education

Instrument 1: Praxis II Scores / Pass Rate

Instrument 2: Teaching Philosophy

Instrument 3: Teaching Portfolio

Over the next assessment cycle, we also need to explore whether or not adding an additional SLO 4 to assess Art Education is necessary, or whether we will be able to assess the program through our existing SLOs through collection of additional art-education-specific artifacts.