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The Program Mission: The mission of the BS in Art Education 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: The outcomes under these goals have been selected because they are the art learning outcomes for teacher art education candidates identified by the Oklahoma State Education Department for Teacher Preparation.

I. Develop a philosophical and historical understanding of visual art education and an understanding of contemporary art education practice.
   Outcomes:
   1. Has a sound philosophical understanding of visual art education and is able to support, justify, and implement the visual art curriculum.
   2. Has an understanding of past, current, and future trends and issues in art education as well as art education research.
   13. Understands that contests and competitions have a valuable place in art education; however, they should not drive the development of the local curriculum.

II. Understand the content disciplines of art and their universal experience in world culture.
   Outcomes:
   3. Has knowledge of developmentally appropriate visual art content including aesthetics, art criticism, and art history, around a core of art production.
   6. Understands art history including various styles, periods, ethnic groups, and cultures from around the world.
   7. Has knowledge of aesthetics (the field of study that relates to beauty in the arts) and art criticism (art review and commentary), along with teaching strategies appropriate for both areas that involve a variety of media and awareness of developmental levels.
   10. Develops a portfolio of his/her own artwork.

III. Understand and use various studio art media and basic principles of compositional design
   Outcomes:
   5. Understands and has experience in the application of the elements and principles of art and design.
   8. Understands and has experience in various methods of art production and creative development including drawing, figure drawing, color and design, painting, printmaking, sculpture, clay, applied design, and technology. Additional experience should involve metal, stone, fiber, papermaking, wood, and mixed media.
   10. Develops a portfolio of his/her own artwork.

IV. Understand how to plan and implement an interdisciplinary art curriculum
   Outcomes:
   4. Has a working knowledge of and has had experience in integration of the arts with other fine arts areas as well as other academic disciplines.
   9. Has proficiency in teaching strategies that are developmentally appropriate and inclusive of various student learning styles and is sensitive to the needs of diverse ethnic and cultural groups and those with disabilities.
   12. Has knowledge of a wide variety of arts resources including community resources, materials, equipment, and information about exhibitions and/or major collections.

Types of Assessment

Internal 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 and/or student learning 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 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. Specific Course Rubrics

Art 3503 and Art 4773 utilize specific rubrics such as the Curriculum Rubric, Teaching Segment Rubric (see appendix for example)

6. 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.

7. **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.

8. **Teacher Work Sample** (qualitative)

External Assessment:

9. **OSAT (Oklahoma Subject Area Test)**
10. **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.

11. **Student Teaching Mentor Assessment Rubric** (qualitative)

**Quantitative and Qualitative**

Assessments #1, #5, #6, #7, #10 and #11 are basically qualitative. 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.

Assessments #4, #8, and #9 are quantitative. However, assessment of course grades averaged as final grades include qualitative elements. Even #9, the OSAT, has an essay question that is graded by a rubric that relies somewhat upon subjective judgment.

Assessment #2 is mix of quantitative or qualitative depending on the embedded instrument used by the course instructor in the class. This allows for effective assessment of the mastery of academic curriculum for each assessed course.

---

**GOAL ONE:** Students will develop a philosophical and historical understanding of visual art education and an understanding of contemporary art education practice.

**Outcomes:**

1. Has a sound philosophical understanding of visual art education and is able to support, justify, and implement the visual art curriculum.
2. Has an understanding of past, current, and future trends and issues in art education as well as art education research.
13. Understands that contests and competitions have a valuable place in art education; however, they should not drive the development of the local curriculum.

**Assessment Tools:** Faculty Observation/ Curriculum Rubric for ART 4773

**ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom**
S09, 2 students: 4.00 Target range

**ART 4773 Methods and Media of Teaching Art**
Curriculum Project Rubric (qualitative) Student collaborates to design curricula in which with awareness of these outcomes
F08  # Assessed: 1  Rating: 4.25 Target range

Assessment Tool: Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) (quantitative) (passing 240-300)
S09  # Assessed: 1  Score: 276

Assessment Tool: Student Teaching Mentor Assessment Rubric (qualitative)
S09  # Assessed: 1  Rating: 4.91

Assessment Tool: SOSU Student Teaching Summative Evaluation
S09  # Assessed: 1  Average Rating 4.0 Target

Assessment Tool: Teacher Work Sample (qualitative)
Teacher Work Sample
S09  # Assessed: 1  Average Rating 4.0 Target

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 in the assessment instruments used indicated that significant learning was taking place. In developing lesson plans and curricula in both ART 3503 and ART 4773, students must apply awareness of these outcomes. Some items in the OSAT also cover this area; therefore passing of this test also indicates achievement of outcomes.

Modifications: None

GOAL TWO: Students will demonstrate understanding of the content disciplines of art and their universal experience in world culture
Outcomes:

3. Has knowledge of developmentally appropriate visual art content including aesthetics, art criticism, and art history, around a core of art production.
6. Understands art history including various styles, periods, ethnic groups, and cultures from around the world.

Assessment Tool: Curriculum Rubric
ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom
S09, 2 students: 4.00 Target range

ART 4773 Methods and Media of Teaching Art
Curriculum Project Rubric (qualitative) Student collaborates to design curricula in which with awareness of these outcomes
F08  # Assessed: 1  Rating: 4.25 Target range

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.

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.

ART 2113 Art History Survey I; ART 3133 Art History Survey II
No Assessment; Embedded assessment instruments to be identified/created

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.

10. Develops a portfolio of his/her own artwork.

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric

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 1
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%

7. Has knowledge of aesthetics (the field of study that relates to beauty in the arts) and art criticism (art review and commentary), along with teaching strategies appropriate for both areas that involve a variety of media and awareness of developmental levels.

ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom
S09: 2 students assessed 4.0, Target Lesson Plans

ART 4773 Methods & Media of Teaching Art
Curriculum Project Rubric (qualitative)
F09 # Assessed: 1 Rating: 5.0 Target

Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) (quantitative)
Passing: 240-300
S09 # Assessed: 1 Score: 276

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.

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.

Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Two:
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 and Art and World Culture class indicated that significant learning was taking place. The assessment in this class is embedded within the course outcomes and content. Following this type of assessment, the notion of “embedded assessment” was adopted in fall 2008 by the faculty. With this adoption, each required class within a program has or will either identify an existing assessment or create an assessment that can provide quantitative or qualitative pre- and post-assessment data demonstrating learning of program outcomes on a regular basis as part of the teaching of the course.

The faculty 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. Standardized test scores also indicate a major deficiency in student understanding of basic art terminology. Initiating pre-post assessments that embedded and part of each required course will provide consistent assessment of particular course content and progress through the program. This assessment strategy will continue to add classes until consistent data is gathered every time the course is taught. Ultimately data will build until a baseline can be ascertained with which to compare subsequent data from semester to semester.

**Modifications:**

- Faculty agreed to analyze syllabi for each required class, identify or create pre/post instruments from measurable course outcomes that meet program outcomes, and implement that assessment consistently each time the course is taught.
- 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.
- 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.
- ART 3123 Color Theory was created and approved May 2008 as a required course in the program and taught for the first time in spring 2009 by Dr. Donna Adams, Adjunct. Dr. Adams created and implemented a pre-/post- test from course outcomes and content.
- Faculty agreed to develop and use a consistent rubric and procedure in the Senior Show Critiques

---

**GOAL THREE:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of various studio art media and basic principles of compositional design

**Outcomes:**

5. Understands and has experience in the application of the elements and principles of art and design.

8. Understands and has experience in various methods of art production and creative development including drawing, figure drawing, color and design, painting, printmaking,
sculpture, clay, applied design, and technology. Additional experience should involve metal, stone, fiber, papermaking, wood, and mixed media.

10. Develops a portfolio of his/her own artwork.

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric

Art 1413 Ceramics:
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

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: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric

Art 1413 Ceramics:
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

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 1
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: Mid-level Assessment
Core Final Grades Average all majors: 3.68 (15 assessed)
Core Final Grades Average Art Education: 3.8 (4 assessed)

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review
Each senior presents an art education research paper and a presentation of his/her mature work.
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
Art Education Average Rating: 4.0 (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 Education Average Rating: 3.5 (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. Since the Art Education program is accountable to the state for Outcome Outcomes for art teacher candidates, the outcomes of the Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Preparation were adopted even though a couple of the outcomes have a very narrow focus. By using those outcomes, our goals and outcomes are consistent for reporting to NCATE, Higher Learning Commission Program Review, and SE’s Outcome Assessment Report.

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.
• 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.

GOAL FOUR: Students will demonstrate understanding planning and implementation of an interdisciplinary art curriculum

Outcomes:

4. Has a working knowledge of and has had experience in integration of the arts with other fine arts areas as well as other academic disciplines.
9. Has proficiency in teaching strategies that are developmentally appropriate and inclusive of various student learning styles and is sensitive to the needs of diverse ethnic and cultural groups and those with disabilities.
12. Has knowledge of a wide variety of arts resources including community resources, materials, equipment, and information about exhibitions and/or major collections.
14. Understands the art-related competencies in Oklahoma’s core curriculum and knows how to incorporate them into various art classes.

Assessment Tool: Teaching and Curriculum Rubric

ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom
S09, 2 students: 4.00 Target range

ART 4773 Methods and Media of Teaching Art
Curriculum Project Rubric (qualitative) Student collaborates to design curricula in which with awareness of these outcomes)
F08  # Assessed: 1  Rating: 4.25 Target range

Assessment Tool: Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) (quantitative) (passing 240-300)
S09  # Assessed: 1  Score: 276

Assessment Tool: Student Teaching Mentor Assessment Rubric (qualitative)
S09  # Assessed: 1  Rating: 4.91

Assessment Tool: SOSU Student Teaching Summative Evaluation
S09  # Assessed: 1  Average Rating 4.0 Target

Assessment Tool: Teacher Work Sample (qualitative)
Teacher Work Sample
S09  # Assessed: 1  Average Rating 4.0 Target

Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Four:
Art 3503 and 4773 currently base all of the course content around teaching art from a curriculum based on awareness that art content is comprised of comprehensive content that includes art history, aesthetics (appreciation and value), critical analysis, production of artworks, social and cultural context. All curricula is developed with awareness of individual learning styles, cultural and ethnic background, integration with the other arts and subject disciplines, and special needs. In creation of curricula, students become more aware of arts resources and appropriate ways to implement and showcase student art works. This content, in addition to the other assessment tools indicate that these outcomes/outcomes are met at a consistent and satisfactory to above satisfactory level.

Modifications:

The Art Education Program needs to be strengthened in the content area of the other fine arts: theater, music, and dance. Currently, required hours are prohibitive to adding a required course in the other fine arts disciplines; however guided electives could be incorporated that encourage majors to gain more knowledge of other fine arts areas.

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.S. in Art Education assessment report was authored by Dr. Gleny Beach. 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.

Faculty know the students personally and often adjust instructional tactics to fit the particular learning style of the student. This is particularly important in the fine arts where process is as important as content. While a good rubric helps quantify learning, it is no replacement for the intuitive subjective observation of an engaged mentor. Most importantly, faculty share this information with each other both informally and formally. Mentorship in one class can carry over into another because of the flexibility and inevitable sociability of a small faculty.

The greatest weakness this report reveals is that this program, with a small faculty, has limited human resources. This report reveals, as our latest program review indicates, that our faculty is spread extremely thin and lacks clerical support. This puts the responsibility of collection and correlation of assessment data squarely on the shoulders of faculty who are already over-engaged in the studio and classroom. This requires faculty to make an extra effort to focus on the consistent administration of our solid assessment plan. The faculty agree that embedded assessment in every required course is a way to manageable assessment. The entire faculty have pledged to do just that.
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 2313 Painting I (*Art 1213, 2013)</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 2903 Digital Imaging I</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 3123 Color Theory</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 3433 Sculpture I (*Art 2023)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4213 Printmaking I (*Core)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also required: Completion of Senior Exhibition and Presentation in the spring semester of graduation or the spring before fall graduation

Total: 45 hours

Also required: PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION BLOCK OF 33 HOURS THAT INCLUDES ART 4773 Methods and Media of Teaching Art

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 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 3323 Painting II
ART 4333 Painting III
ART 4343 Painting IV
ART 4223 Printmaking II
ART 4443 Sculpture II

---
### Holistic Rubric for Studio Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-5 Rating</strong> / 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 work 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><strong>3-3.9 Rating</strong> / 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><strong>2-2.9 Rating</strong> / 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 naïve manner if appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-1.9 Rating</strong> / 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

**NAME** ________________________  **SEMESTER** _____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ 4-5.0 Rating / 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>▶ 3-3.9 Rating / 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>▶ 2-2.9 Rating / 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>▶ 1-1.9 Rating / 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>

**TOTAL**

**AVERAGE**
### 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></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commendable-Acceptable 3-3.9 points</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than Acceptable 2-2.9 points</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unacceptable 1-1.9 points</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| AVERAGE |
### 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></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artwork/Design: Exhibits use of good composition/design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
ART 4773 Methods and Media of Teaching Art
CURRICULUM PROJECT EVALUATION SHEET

Points will be assessed upon criteria of content, developmental appropriateness, and neatness. 50 points are included for form which includes word processed, sequential, use of good grammar and sentence structure, required format. **One lesson must have multicultural emphasis or multicultural components may be included in all lessons.** Number the pages of your curriculum. (Points possible are in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>table of contents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit rationale (include grade level)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit goals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit overview (a grid chart)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education equity statement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit introduction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1 introduction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2 introduction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3 introduction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Credit lessons 1-3 (10 per lesson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1 - abbreviated</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2 - abbreviated</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3 - abbreviated</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/multi-ethnic, social issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glossary of vocabulary terms</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 slides or Power Point materials (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource materials-appendix</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibliography of all sources</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TOTAL each student/ 265**  
**FORM /50**

**LARGE TEACHING TOOL (25)**

**LESSON PRESENTATION (100)**

**COLLABORATIVE GROUP (100)**

**PARTICIPATION**

**TOTAL GRADE/ 540**

**Comprehensive lessons contain:**

- title and grade level (1)
- approximate class time needed (1)
- concepts/focus (5)
- learning objectives (10)
- OK Priority Academic Skills Standards PASS) (5) *coded w/ learning objectives
- National Standards (5) coded with learning objectives
- extra points (5) are given for categorizing learning objectives as
  - (a) = affects
  - (c) = cognitions
  - (s) = skills

**Abbreviated lessons contain:**

- title and grade level (1)
- approximate class time needed (1)
- description of concepts/focus (8)
- objectives (10)
- learning activity summary(10)
ART 4773 Methods and Media of Teaching Art

WORKSHEET FOR COMPREHENSIVE LESSONS

Comprehensive Lesson Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Assessed on Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title and grade level (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximate class time needed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts/focus (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning objectives (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS) (5) &amp; National Standards (5) coded with learning objectives—extra points are given for categorizing learning objectives as (5) (a) = affects (c) = cognitions (s) = skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulary (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher resources (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handouts, overheads (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student resources/materials (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional strategies and motivations (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning activities - sequenced (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment instrument/method (related to student learning outcomes) (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*extra points(5) are given for assessing teacher/teaching and lesson via use of questions |
| DBAE integration identified within lesson (8) |
| special needs adaptations (5) |
| extensions and adaptations (5) |
| interdisciplinary connections (5) |
| possible points: 100 |

Rudimentary Lesson Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Assessed on Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title and grade level (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximate class time needed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts/focus (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning activity summary (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible points: 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Art 3503 and Art 4773**

**In Class Lesson Presentation Assessment Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was there evidence of good preparation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were learning objectives stated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the instructional material interesting and clearly presented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the lesson developmentally appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were visuals appropriate and used effectively?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were students actively involved in the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was closure applied to the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the diction and volume of the student teacher's voice effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was correct oral grammar used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the student teacher appropriately dressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the time effectively used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was clean-up adequately done in an orderly manner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>