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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.
3. 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
   The faculty continues the overall long-range plan to develop embedded assessment
   instruments into additional required courses, begun in spring 2009 according to the
   following plan:
   - 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.

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, ARTA 1413 Ceramics I, ART
   2013 2-D Design, art 2023 3-D Design, ART 2313 Painting I.

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. 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 as well as Art Education 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.

Current Year with five years' history:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>STUDENTS ASSESSED</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>STANDARD SCORE</th>
<th>%'ILE</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP SIZE</th>
<th>OVERALL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design General</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design General</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37 %'ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design General</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>67 %'ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design General</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 %'ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design General</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 %'ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design: General</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>51 %'ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 a 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.

Summary and Analysis of Assessment Data

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.

ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom
S10: 3 students assessed 4.0, Target Lesson Plans
1 student assessed 3.0, Acceptable

ART 4713 Methods & Media of Teaching Art
Curriculum Project Rubric (quantitative)
F09 # Assessed: 6 5 rating: 5.0 Target
1 rating: 4.0 Acceptable

Assessment Tool: Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) (quantitative) (passing 240-300)
F2009 #Assessed: 1  Score: 262
S10  # Assessed: 3  Scores: 273, 265, 292

Assessment Tool: Student Teaching Mentor Assessment Rubric (qualitative)
S09 # Assessed: 2  Rating: 4.5

Assessment Tool: SOSU Student Teaching Summative Evaluation
S10  # Assessed: 2  Average Rating 3.5-4.0 Acceptable-Target

Assessment Tool: Teacher Work Sample (qualitative)
Teacher Work Sample
S09  # Assessed: 2  Average Rating 3.0-4.0 Acceptable-Target
Analysis of Assessment / Goal One:

The above assessment data indicate that Goal 1, Outcomes 1, 2, 13 are being met at a consistently high level.

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
S10: 3 students assessed 4.0, Target Lesson Plans
  1 student assessed 3.0, Acceptable

ART 4773 Methods & Media of Teaching Art
Curriculum Project Rubric (qualitative)
F09  # Assessed: 6  5 rating: 5.0 Target
     1 rating: 4.0 Acceptable

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

ART 2103 Art and World Culture (on-line) S10
Pre-test (32 students) Post-test – (32 students)
  Range 27%-70%; Average 48%, Median 47%, Mode 43%;
  Post-test (25 students) Range 73%-97%; Average 86%, Median, 87%, Mode 87%
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) 85-90% 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) F09
Pre-test (23 students) Range 10%-80%; Average 29%, Median 20%, Mode 20%
Post-test (23 students) Range 20%-100%; Average 82%, Median, 86%, Mode 90%
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 92% 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) S10

Pre-test (students) Range 10%-50%; Average 25%, Median 17%, Mode 17%
Post-test (23 students) Range 42%-100%; Average 84%, Median, 92%, Mode 92%
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 100% 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>History of Arts</th>
<th>516</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>845</th>
<th>503</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design: General</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>51'ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

ART 2023 3-D Design
Spring 2010 Average rating 2.9, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (13 assessed)
ART 2903 Digital Imaging I (19 assessed)
Fall 2009 Average rating 3.1, Median 3.0, Mode 4.0
ART 2313 Painting I (15 assessed)
Fall 2009 Average rating Pre Rubric: 2.5, 2.5, 2.0; Post Rubric rating 3.5, 3.6, 3.5
Art 1413 Ceramics:
Fall 2009 Average Faculty Rating: average, 2.9; median, 3; mode, 3 (12 assessed)
Art 3433 Sculpture I
Fall 2009 Average Faculty Rating: average, 2.7; median,2.7; mode, 3 (15 assessed)
ART 4213 Printmaking I
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

**Assessment Tool: Embedded Pre-/Post Tests/Rubrics**

Art 1213 / Drawing 1
Fall 2009 Average Rubric Rating: 3.7 (16 assessed)
Art 2013 / 2-D Design
Fall 2009 No Data
Spring 2010 Average Pre Test 34%, Median 34%, Mode 40%
    Average Post Test 81%, Median 86%, Mode 90%
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.

Assessment Tool: Teaching and Curriculum Rubric

ART 3503 Art in the Elementary Classroom
S10: 3 students assessed 4.0, Target Lesson Plans
1 student assessed 3.0, Acceptable

ART 4773 Methods & Media of Teaching Art
Curriculum Project Rubric (qualitative)
F09 # Assessed: 6 5 rating: 5.0 Target
1 rating: 4.0 Acceptable

Assessment Tool: Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) (quantitative) (passing 240-300)
F2009 #Assessed: 1 Score: 262
S10 # Assessed: 3 Scores: 273, 265, 292

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

Art 2013 / 2-D Design
Fall 2009 No Data
Spring 2010 Average Pre Test 34%, Median 34%, Mode 40%
Average Post Test 81%, Median 86%, Mode 90%

ART 2103 Art and World Culture (on-line) S10
Pre-test (32 students) Post-test – (32 students)
Range 27%-70%; Average 48%, Median 47%, Mode 43%;
Post-test (25 students) Range 73%-97%; Average 86%, Median, 87%, Mode 87%
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) 85-90% 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) F09
Pre-test (23 students) Range 10%-80%; Average 29%, Median 20%, Mode 20%
Post-test (23 students) Range 20%-100%; Average 82%, Median, 86%, Mode 90%
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 92% 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) S10
Pre-test (students) Range 10%-50%; Average 25%, Median 17%, Mode 17%
Post-test (23 students) Range 42%-100%; Average 84%, Median, 92%, Mode 92%
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 100% art survey responses were 3-5 affirmative on a Likert scale measure indicating increased appreciation for the arts.

Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Two:

The above assessment data indicate that Goal 1, Outcomes 1, 2, 13 are being met at a consistently high level.

Modifications: None

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:
Fall 2009 Average rating 2.9, Median 3, Mode 3
Art 2023 / 3-D Design
Spring 2010 Average Faculty Rating: 2.9, Median 3, Mode 3 (14 assessed)
Art 2313 / Painting I
Fall 2008 Average Faculty Rating: 3.5 (15 assessed)
Art 3433 Sculpture
Fall 2009 Average rating 2.7, Median 3, Mode 3
ART 4213 Printmaking I
No assessment data, embedded assessment under development

Assessment Tool: Embedded Pre-/Post Tests/Rubrics

Art 1213 / Drawing 1
Fall 2009 Average Rubric Rating: 3.7 (16 assessed)
Spring 2010 no data
Art 2013 / 2-D Design
Spring 2010 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 2023 3-D Design
Spring 2010 Average pre test 47%, Median 43%, Mode 35%; Post Average 67%, Median 68%, Mode 80%

ART 3123 Color Theory
Spring 2010 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 majors: 3.2 (10 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.
Art Education Average Rating: 4.0 (4 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 2010 Average Rating: 3.6 (9 assessed)
Art Education Average Rating: 3.5 (1 assessed)

Assessment Tool: Area Concentration Test (ACAT: Art)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>History of Arts</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design: General</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Three:
Art Education majors are performing at or above Art (Studio) or Graphic Design majors in History and Aesthetic areas and at about the same level in art studios as Art majors. ACAT and OSAT scores verify
one another that our majors are average at minimum when compared to other areas of the state and U.S.

The Art Education 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.

**Modifications:**

- Senior Level assessment and rubrics were revised and implemented in a timely manner.

**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)**

- F2009 # Assessed: 1 Score: 262
- S10 # Assessed: 3 Scores: 273, 265, 292

Student-to-faculty information concerning OSAT test content: several questions ask about other fine arts areas such as dance, theater, music.

**Assessment Tool: Student Teaching Mentor Assessment Rubric (qualitative)**

- S09 # Assessed: 2 Rating: 4.5
Assessment Tool: SOSU Student Teaching Summative Evaluation
S10  # Assessed: 2  Average Rating 3.5-4.0 Acceptable-Target

Assessment Tool: Teacher Work Sample (qualitative)
Teacher Work Sample
S09  # Assessed: 2  Average Rating 3.0-4.0 Acceptable-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. 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 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. This has been identified by the last four candidates taking the OSAT. Currently, required hours are prohibitive to adding a required course in the other fine arts disciplines; however guided electives will be advised that encourage majors to gain more knowledge of other fine arts areas.

Web-based course Assessment

ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism and ART 2103 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. These two classes are taught primarily online.

Faculty Contributions

The Visual Art Division of the Department of Fine Arts is quite small, comprising two full time faculty. Assessment is of necessity an involving the entire faculty at all levels of input. The Visual Art Division offers three degree programs. Dr. Gleny Beach and Jack Ousey share the assigned responsibility of authoring the assessment report for the three programs respectively. The B.S. in Art Education Outcomes Assessment draft report was compiled by Dr. Gleny Beach, then edited by Jack Ousey. All full time and adjunct 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. Both Visual Art full-time faculty reviewed the report and made editorial contributions.

Observations/Modifications to Assessment Plan Based Upon the Assessment

- Assessment scores in all assessment instruments indicate average-above average ratings
- Full-time faculty will continue to work together with adjunct professors 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

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. Faculty agree that embedded assessment in every required course is a way to manageable assessment.

Relevant Constituents and Stakeholders

Graduates Art (Studio) 2009-2010: 1

This program provides well-prepared art educators who subsequently find employment. Two recent graduates are still seeking teaching positions. One is only searching locally, which limits the opportunities. Other graduates from this program are known to be currently teaching in the following areas:

Plainview Middle School - 1
Ardmore High School -1
Madill Elementary School -1
North Texas area – 4
Dallas area – 2
Southern Colorado -1
# Holistic Rubric for Studio Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</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 works reflects the artist's understanding of style and of contemporary art issues. The finished presentation of the work is professional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# Holistic Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning

<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>
Holistic Rubric for Senior Seminar Artwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding 4-5 points / 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>Commendable-Acceptable 3-3.9 points / 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>Less than Acceptable 2-2.9 points / 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>Unacceptable 1-1.9 points / 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>

| TOTAL |

| 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 exhibits</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>
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)

- title page (1)
- table of contents (5)
- unit rationale (include grade level) (10)
- unit goals (7)
- unit overview (a grid chart) (4)
- assessment policy (4)
- education equity statement (4)
- Unit Introduction (10)
- Lesson 1 introduction (10)
- Lesson 1 - comprehensive (100)
- Lesson 2 introduction (10)
- Lesson 2 - comprehensive (100)
- Lesson 3 introduction (10)
- Lesson 3 - comprehensive (100)
- Extra Credit lessons 1-3 (10 per lesson)
- Lesson 1 - abbreviated (30)
- Lesson 2 - abbreviated (30)
- Lesson 3 - abbreviated (30)
- Multicultural/multi-ethnic, social issue Component (25)
- glossary of vocabulary terms(15)
- 10 slides or Power Point materials (20)
- resource materials-appendix(10)
- bibliography of all sources (10)

**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)
- National Standards (5) coded with learning objectives
- extra points (5) are given for categorizing learning objectives as
  - (a) = affects
  - (c) = cognitions
  - (s) = skills
- vocabulary (5)
- teacher resources (5)
- handouts, overhead transparencies (5)
- student resources/materials (5)
- instructional strategies and motivations (10)
- learning activities - sequenced (10)
- assessment instrument/method (related to student learning outcomes) (10)
- extra points are given for assessing teacher/teaching and lesson via use of questions (5)
- Comprehensive components identified within lessons-criticism, aesthetics, production, history (8)
- special needs adaptations (5)
- integration extensions and adaptations (5)
- interdisciplinary connections (5)

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

**Possible points:** 100

### Rudimentary Lesson Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Assessed on Lesson</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title and grade level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximate class time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts/focus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning activity summary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible points:** 30
### IN CLASS LESSON PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

**KEY:** 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = average, 2 = somewhat, 1 = very little, 0 = not at all, n/o = not observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</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>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>