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Mission

The Program Mission: The mission of the BA in Studio Art program is to support the Art Division’s mission to become the cultural artistic training and information center for the Texoma region by providing:

- Guidance and instruction leading to entrance in the professional fields of art education and studio art.
- Programs of study which develop skills and that promote professional values for career preparation.
- Cultural opportunities for life-long learning and aesthetic experience.
- Focused support of and innovation in general education and aesthetic awareness classes.

Those aspects of the mission most appropriate for the purview of this report concern bullets one and two. Goals and learning outcomes for the program directly relate to the mission of professional and career preparation.
Goals and Learning Outcomes

I. Develop a philosophical and historical understanding of visual art and contemporary art practice.
   1. Students will understand the flow of art history, including style, period, and ethnicity and will appreciate cultural diversity in global society.
   2. Students will have a basic knowledge of aesthetics and art criticism and understand their relevance to contemporary art practice.

II. Develop mastery of studio art media and understand the effective use of the principles of composition and design.
   1. Students will be able to effectively apply the elements and principles of design to art works.
   2. Students will be able to critique and discuss works of art using the vocabulary of design.
   3. Students will master the techniques, technology and process of their chosen discipline.

III. Develop a professional outlook and career plan.
    1. Students will develop a professional portfolio of their artwork and a career plan appropriate for a visual artist.
    2. Students will develop the habits of disciplined artistic production.

Types of Assessment

1. Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric
   The holistic course rubric enables faculty to isolate and describe the primary traits of high level art productions and to use the numeric scale based upon that rubric to evaluate student work against an objective model. It is superior to class grades as an assessment tool in that it assesses student work against an objective external standard rather than a relative standard based upon the requirements of the class project or learning level of the student (class grades). This rubric is used consistently as a classroom tool for evaluation of individual projects, as a benchmark for the evaluation of growth within a particular class, and as an assessment tool at the mid-level and senior portfolio review.

2. Embedded Course pre-and-post assessment instruments
   In November 2008, Dr. Gleny Beach attended a workshop entitled “Using Embedded Assessment to Improve Student Learning and Teaching Effectiveness” at Oklahoma City University with assessment professional Dr. Larry H. Kelly. Following the sharing of this information with the art faculty, all of the faculty agreed to begin the process of creating embedded assessments classes required by a major program. The following plan was then created:
   • Review syllabi for measurable, results-oriented course outcomes (Fall 2008)
   • Identify core competencies/skills covered by the target courses (Fall 2008)
   • Identify existing measures (tests, case projects, practical applications, etc.) in which assessment activities could be conducted. (Fall 2008)
• Select 1-2 classes to implement existing or newly created assessments in which data would be tracked for each semester. using either pre-post or portfolio rubric and begin collecting data regularly (Spring 2009)
• Target the Core Classes (listed in #2 above) as the first classes (Spring 2009)
• Add embedded assessment for 1-2 classes each semester following

To date, the following courses have implemented this process and the first data has been collected: ART 1213 Drawing I, ART 2013 2-D Design, ART 2013 Art and World Cultures, ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism, and ART 3123 Color Theory. These results are included in this report.

3. Mid-level Assessment
This assessment will be an average of all embedded assessment evaluations for the core of art classes required of all program majors: ART 1213 Drawing I, ART 1413 Ceramics I, ART 2013 2-D Design, art 2023 3-D Design, ART 2313 Painting I. Because the embedded assessment approach was first adopted half-way through the fall 2008 semester and embedded assessment data was not yet available, an averaging of final grades will be used for this report. As future embedded assessment data is gathered, the Mid-Level Assessment will rely on averaging of final grades in core classes.

4. Final Grades
5. Senior Portfolio Review
During the Senior Portfolio Review, faculty review students’ visual portfolios, as in the description of the Mid Level Portfolio Review. In addition, students make a public presentation of their work which is evaluated by the combined faculty using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning. A formal written artist’s statement and an appropriate Personal Career Plan are also evaluated by the faculty.

6. Senior Exhibition Critique
The realization of a senior show is an important real world application of the goals of the Studio Art program. The senior show of each student is evaluated by the combined faculty and by visiting guest curators. The addition of critical voices outside the University is doubly providential, not only for the students being assessed, but also for the program. It provides an opportunity for assessment of the quality of the program from external “art world” consultants.

7. ACAT (Area Concentration Achievement Test)
Given during the Senior Portfolio Review, students complete the Art History, Design and Studio Art categories. This national assessment tool provides an external context for assessing the effectiveness of the Studio Program in achieving its academic goals.

Quantitative and Qualitative

Assessments #4 and #7 are basically quantitative. The nature of the creative process is such that assessments of goals, outcomes and quality is ultimately subjective (although effective rubrics can mitigate against this somewhat). The aesthetic element in the Arts can only be assessed in this manner.
All other assessments are basically qualitative (some embedded assessments are quantitative with a qualitative element within a pre-post assessment tool. These assessments allow for effective assessment of the mastery of academic curriculum.

Summary and Analysis of Assessment Data

GOAL ONE: Develop a philosophical and historical understanding of visual art and contemporary art practice.

1. Learning outcome: Students will understand the flow of art history, including style, period, and ethnicity and will appreciate cultural diversity in global society.

**Assessment Tool: Pre-Test and Post-Test Results**
Class assessment administered at beginning and end of the semester.

*Art 2133 Art History Survey I / Fall 08*

No data is available. Embedded assessment tools are being developed by faculty teaching these courses.

**Assessment Tool: Embedded Pre-Post Tests (quantitative), Final Grades (quantitative and qualitative); Art Survey (qualitative)**

*Art 2103 Art and World Culture (on-line) S09*

Pre-test (25 students) Post-test – (31 students)
S09 Range 33%-63%; Average 48%, Median 47%, Mode 43%;
Post-test (25 students) S09 Range 63%-93%; Average 78%, Median, 80%, Mode 77%
BENCHMARKS MET (Pre-test benchmark 20% passing at 60% level; Post-test benchmark: 70% passing at 60% level)

**Final Grades** BENCHMARK MET (Benchmark 70% Passing )

*Art Course Survey (25 students)* 90-100% art survey responses were 3-5 affirmative on a Likert scale measure indicating increased appreciation for the arts.

**Assessment Tool: ACAT (Area Concentration Achievement Test)**

*History of Art Arts category*

No students were assessed during the senior review process. No ACAT exams were administered during 2008-2009.

2. Learning outcome: Students will have a basic knowledge of aesthetics and art criticism and understand their relevance to contemporary art practice.

**Assessment Tool: Embedded Course pre-and-post assessment instruments**

Class assessment administered at beginning and end of the semester.

*ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism (on-line) F08*
Pre-test (26 students) F08 Range 5%-80%; Average 24%, Median 20%, Mode 10%
Post-test (26 students) F08 Range 60%-100%; Average 83%, Median, 80%, Mode 80%
BENCHMARK MET (Pre-test benchmark: 20% passing at 60% level; Post-test
benchmark: 70% passing at 60% level)
Final Grades – BENCHMARK MET (Benchmark: 70% passing)
Art Survey - An average of 93% art survey responses were 3-5 affirmative on a Likert
scale measure indicating increased appreciation for the arts.

Assessment Tool: ACAT (Area Concentration Achievement Test)
History of Arts category
No students were assessed during the senior review process. No ACAT exams were
administered during 2008-2009.

Analysis of Assessment / Goal One:
At the end of the each semester the full faculty meet together to discuss and review assessment
data and to make plans for the next semester. The faculty agreed that the data collected from
the Aesthetics and Art Criticism class indicated that significant learning was taking place.
Ultimately, previous assessment tools were deemed inadequate to give meaningful data
concerning Goal One. It is anticipated that the embedded assessment plan for all required
courses will add more meaningful data to Goal One.

Modifications:
- Faculty agreed to create embedded assessment tools for Art History courses.
- Faculty agreed to consistently administer and correlate data for program assessment.

GOAL TWO: Develop mastery of studio art media and understand the effective use of the
principles of composition and design.

1. Learning Outcome: Students will be able to effectively apply the elements and principles of design
to art works.

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric
The aggregate rating was based upon a composite of the scores obtained during the final
critique of all studio projects in all core classes in which the Studio Course Rubric was used.

ART 1213 Drawing I
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

Art 1413 Ceramics:
Fall 2008 Average rating 3.2, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (16 assessed)
Summer 2009 Average rating 3.7, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (3 assessed)

Art 2013 / 2-D Design
Fall 2008 Average Faculty Rating: 3.1 (16 assessed)
Art 2023 / 3-D Design
Fall 2008 Average Faculty Rating: 3.1 (14 assessed)

Art 2313 / Painting I
Fall 2008 Average Faculty Rating: 3.5 (15 assessed)

Art 3433 Sculpture
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

ART 4213 Printmaking I
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

Assessment Tool: Embedded Pre-/Post Tests/Rubrics
Art 1213 / Drawing I
Spring 2009 Average Rubric Rating: 3.7 (16 assessed)

Art 2013 / 2-D Design
Spring 2009 (pre/post test course content, 50 points, 14 assessed)
Pre-Test: Average 34%; Median 34%; Mode 40%
Post-Test: Average 81%; Median 86%; Mode 90%
Post-Test Score Increase: 47%; Median 47%; Mode 48%

ART 3123 Color Theory
Pre-test of course content (28 assessed)
Average score 34%, Median 30%, Mode 28%
Post-test of course content as a Final (28 assessed)
Average score 79%, Median 79%

Assessment Tool: ACAT (Area Concentration Achievement Test)
Studio Arts category
No students were assessed during the senior review process. No ACAT exams were administered during 2008-2009.

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review
Each art program senior presents an artist's statement/influences and a presentation of his/her mature work.
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
Art (Studio) Average Rating: 3.5 (1 assessed)

Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique
The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.9 (10 assessed)
Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 4.0 (1 assessed)

2. Learning Outcome: Students will be able to critique and discuss works of art using the vocabulary of design.

Assessment tool: Faculty Observation using Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning
The Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning is a new assessment tool and was not used in most studio classes.

Art 2313 Painting I
Fall 2008 Average Faculty Rating: 3.5 (15 assessed)

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)
These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.

Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 3.5 (1 assessed)

3. Learning Outcome: Students will master the techniques, technology and process of their chosen discipline.

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)
These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.

Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 3.5 (1 assessed)

Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique
The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.

Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.8 (10 assessed)
Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 4.0 (1 assessed)

Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Two:

The faculty noted that the Studio and Self Critique rubrics were not yet being used consistently in all classes. In particular the Self Critique Rubric was being used infrequently. They agreed that the data from the Senior Reviews and from the studio rubrics indicated problems with student understanding of color theory and of basic design concepts. Embedded assessments in each required course will provide additional data.
Modifications:

- Faculty agreed to add additional critique opportunities and art critical discussions to class curriculums.
- Faculty agreed that course content in introductory classes should add study modules concerning basic art vocabulary and design concepts.
- Faculty agreed that special emphasis should be placed on color theory in introductory design, drawing and painting classes.
- Dr Donna Adams, Adjunct, who specializes in color theory and teaches 2-D design classes at Southeastern, was asked to teach Painting I and to emphasize basic color theory concepts in her course curriculum.
- Faculty agreed to use the Studio and Self Critique Rubrics consistently in all classes.
- Faculty agreed to develop and use a consistent rubric and procedure in the Senior Show Critiques.

GOAL THREE: Develop a professional outlook and career plan.

1. Learning Outcome: Students will develop a professional portfolio of their artwork and a career plan appropriate for a visual artist.

   **Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)**
   These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.
   - Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
   - Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 3.5 (1 assessed)

2. Learning Outcome: Students will develop the habits of disciplined artistic production.

   **Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)**
   These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.
   - Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
   - Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 3.8 (1 assessed)

   **Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique**
   The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.
   - Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.8 (10 assessed)
   - Art (Studio) Major Average Rating: 4.0 (1 assessed)
Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Three:

At the end of the semester faculty and students have the opportunity to review the results of the Senior Portfolio Review and of the Senior Exhibition Critique. Students are encouraged to continue work strengthening areas of weakness and pursuing areas of strength.

The program goals were radically altered during our last self-study for Higher Learning Commission Program Review and Assessment Plans for each program altered to reflect those changes. Previously, for the Mid-Level Assessment, a pre-test of basic information was given to entering majors and a post-test given at the completion of core classes, accompanied by a faculty interview/review of each major's portfolio. Upon several years of low post-test scores, faculty agreed that knowledge of terminology and basic design was minimal as assessed by the pre/post test. Content and teaching of this information in all core classes needed to be addressed concerning emphasis on basic understanding of formalistic terminology connected to good design. This was one impetus for adoption of program assessment by utilization of embedded assessment in all required courses. By adopting course embedded assessments in each required course, faculty think that each program will benefit from a more comprehensive and valid assessment process not only at Mid Level but throughout the entire program. Embedded assessment in each course will identify weakness and strength more readily than a pre/post test of basic terminology of design and will give more validity to overall assessment of programs.

The Mid-Level Portfolio Review of each major was manageable when the art department had only the art education and the art (studio) programs. With the addition of the BS in Graphic Design program, the art major number doubled from 30-35 to 60-70 majors. This portfolio review method proved unmanageable with a faculty of only three and assessment was not completed consistently. When faculty agreed in fall 2008 to adopt an embedded assessment approach to evaluation and assessment of all programs, the individual portfolio review process was ended. The process of using embedded assessment began with examination of each course syllabus by its instructor, alignment of course outcomes with program goals, and development of an embedded assessment instrument in each course that would reflect course outcomes and outcomes. This process requires time to implement. When Embedded Assessment was adopted in November 2008, some courses were already nearly over for the semester. To begin the Embedded Assessment process, in spring 2009, ART 1213 an embedded pre/post survey was developed and implemented; ART 2013 2-D used an embedded pre/post comprehensive test; ART 3123 used an embedded pre/post comprehensive test; ART 2103 Art and World Culture and ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism used the pre/post tests and art survey already in use as General Education Assessment instruments. Until embedded assessments of the core art courses are in place, compilation of an average of final grades for each student who has completed all core
courses was used in this report. As embedded assessments are added each semester, program assessment will be able to use averaging of course embedded assessments in future assessment reports rather than final grade averaging.

Over the last nine years, the visual art department has undergone three different approaches to assessment. The first was during a time when an outside faculty advised and guided the assessment process. The second was when Visual Art was united with Music in the Fine Arts Department. The Chair of the Fine Arts Department asked that faculty develop a plan similar to music. This third time, the art faculty took the initiative and ownership of development of embedded assessment in a way that makes sense to each faculty and is attainable without extensive involvement of faculty time to conduct and record data for all assessment purposes. In the interim, as valid assessments for each required course are developed and implemented, our evaluation and assessment of art programs will improve with each semester and constitute valid and useful assessment to program improvement and growth.

**Modifications:**

- Senior Level assessment and rubrics will be examined, revised and implemented in a timely manner.
- Studio faculty will place more emphasis on student self-critique and collect assessment data of that process.
- Regular data collection and ease of access will become a higher priority by identification/creation and use of embedded assessments in all courses.
- Embedded assessment of all core courses will be in place by the spring semester of 2010. Average of core course embedded assessments will constitute the Mid-Level Assessment of the program.
- Embedded assessment instruments that assess course outcomes will continue to be developed in each required course, with a goal of having embedded assessments of course outcomes in every required course of a program.

**IETV and /or Web-based course Assessment**

Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism and the Art in World Cultures classes are the only courses taught in a web-based format that are required in this degree program. They are both assessed by pre/post testing and by a final survey. Pre/post test scores indicate that significant learning is taking place and surveys indicate a student validation of the techniques and aims of the course and increase in appreciation of the arts. Both courses have already been listed under their appropriate learning outcomes. They are both required classes in the Art and Art Education programs.

**Faculty Contributions**
The Visual Art Division of the Department of Fine Arts is quite small, comprising three full time faculty. Assessment is of necessity a team effort involving the entire faculty at all levels of input. The Visual Art Division offers three degree programs. Dr. Gleny Beach, Jack Ousey and Dave Barnes are each assigned the responsibility of authoring the assessment report for the three programs respectively. This B.A. in Art (Studio) Assessment Report was authored by Dave Barnes. All faculty are responsible for collecting assessment data from their classes and recording it in a timely manner. At this time, Dr. Gleny Beach keeps and organizes assessment data.

At the end of each semester, in conjunction with the Senior Portfolio Review the entire faculty meets to discuss assessment and the problems or issues that arise from the data collected. Discussion of assessment is a regular component of ongoing Division conversation. The entire Visual Art Division faculty was asked to review the report and make editorial contributions.

Observations/Modifications to Assessment Plan Based Upon the Assessment

- Goals and Outcomes for all programs have been combined and edited where possible to create clearer and more manageable assessment plans.
- Future assessments will be more effective if assessment tools are embedded into required courses, consistently administered and recorded.
- The Entry Basic Art Achievement Test will no longer be an assessment tool.
- The Mid-Level Portfolio review will move toward using data from embedded assessment in all core program requirements, averaged for Mid-Level assessment data
- The Holistic Studio Course Rubric will be an option for studio classes but will include a pre and post assessment to provide data for Mid-level averaging and a background against which the Senior Portfolio reviews can be analyzed.
- Faculty will work together to develop simplified and standardized forms for keeping and recording data to facilitate yearly comparisons.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program as related to assessment

Paradoxically, the strengths and weaknesses of the program are both directly related to its small number of majors and small number of faculty. For example, the small number of faculty enabled the program to spin on a dime and to immediately and effectively make modifications that addressed deficiencies in the core program. Those issues were primarily revealed by assessment tools because a great strength of the program is that studio instruction is inherently personal.
At least 50% must be upper level courses.

**Guided Elective**: ART 1103 Art Appreciation

**Core**

* Prerequisite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 1213 Drawing I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2013 2-D Design</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2023 3-D Design</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 1413 Ceramics I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3123 Color Theory</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2103 Art &amp; World Culture</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2113 Art History Survey I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2313 Painting I (*Art 1213, 2013)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics &amp; Criticism</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3103 Survey of Native North Amer. Art</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3133 Art History Survey II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3213 Drawing II (*Art 1213)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3323 Painting II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3433 Sculpture I (*Art 2023)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4213 Printmaking I (*Core)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43-45 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electives**: 6 hours of the 9-11 required hours of the following electives can be counted in General Education Electives.

- ART 2333 Computer Graphics I
- ART 3033 Computer Graphics II
- ART 2903 Digital Imaging I
- ART 3903 Digital Imaging II
- ART 2633 Web Page Design I
- ART 3633 Web Page Design II
- ART 3313 Hist. & Theory of Design
- ART 3423 Ceramics II
- ART 3523 Ceramics III
- ART 3623 Ceramics IV
- ART 4203 Drawing III
- ART 3103 Survey of Native N. Amer. Art
- ART 4333 Painting III
- ART 4343 Painting IV
- ART 4223 Printmaking II
- ART 4443 Sculpture II
- ART 4513 Applied Graphic Design
- ART 4960 Directed Reading

**Total**---------------------------54 Hours
### Holistic Rubric for Studio Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-5 Rating / The artist has produced a work that is visually interesting. The artist has taken some chances by pushing the assignment into a personal visual statement. The works reflects the artist's understanding of style and of contemporary art issues. The finished presentation of the work is professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.9 Rating / The composition exhibits unity with appropriate concern for variety. The artist is aware of the quality of the painterly surface. The techniques of the medium are used in a way appropriate to the assignment. Plastic issues are handled well, if appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.9 Rating / The artist attempted to use the techniques of the medium and the elements of value, color, and texture in a way appropriate to the assignment. Composition may be disorganized or overly simplistic. Plastic issues are handled in a naive manner if appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.9 Rating / The artist followed the basic instruction for the assignment. Exhibited little understanding of visual principles with clumsy execution of the techniques of the medium appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | |
| AVERAGE | |
# Holistic Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-5.0 Rating</strong> / The student uses a wide array of technical and theoretical nomenclature to clearly describe visual choices. She is able to discuss formal influences and to place the work within the context of contemporary art issues. She is able to give insight into the affective dimension of her choice making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-3.9 Rating</strong> / The student is able to describe visual choices clearly using appropriate art making nomenclature. Student is able to explain how the work fulfills the requirements of the assignment and can discuss what art techniques or understandings were gained from the exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-2.9 Rating</strong> / The student attempts to use appropriate nomenclature to describe visual choices. Student attempts, but may not be able to coherently describe the choice making process. Student is able to explain how the work fulfills the requirements of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-1.9 Rating</strong> / The student attempts to describe visual choices but uses art nomenclature awkwardly or incorrectly. Student may be unaware of the relationship between the project and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME ________________________  SEMESTER ________________________
### Holistic Rubric for Senior Seminar Artwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding 4-5 points</strong> / The artist has produced a body work that is visually interesting and engaging to the viewer. The artwork demonstrates the artist's mature understanding and attention to the surface, finish, composition and/or content, and presentation of all artworks. The artist has taken some chances by pushing the assignment into a personal visual statement. The works reflect the artist's development of style and of contemporary art issues. The finished presentation of the work is professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commendable-Acceptable 3-3.9 points</strong> / The body of artwork exhibits understanding of media. The artwork demonstrates the artist's attention to the surface, composition and/or content. The techniques of the medium are used in an effective way. Plastic issues are handled well, if appropriate to the particular artwork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than Acceptable 2-2.9 points</strong> / The artist attempted to use the techniques of the medium and the elements of value, color, and texture. Composition may be disorganized or overly simplistic. Plastic issues are handled in a naïve manner and may lack technical finish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unacceptable 1-1.9 points</strong> / The artist followed the basic instruction for artwork presentation. Exhibited little understanding of visual principles with clumsy execution of the techniques of the medium appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Senior Portfolio Review/Presentation Faculty Rating Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable=1</th>
<th>Less than Acceptable=2</th>
<th>Acceptable=3</th>
<th>More than Acceptable=4</th>
<th>Target=5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student does not exhibit</td>
<td>The student exhibits</td>
<td>The student adequately exhibits</td>
<td>The student admirably exhibits</td>
<td>The student powerfully exhibits.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME__________________________ MAJOR_________ SEMESTER________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork/Design: Exhibits use of good composition/design</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technique/technical knowledge: Exhibits understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge: Exhibits subject area knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills: Quality of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation image quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: Resume, artist's statement, paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation/Professionalism (attendance, participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of exhibition artworks/graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>