

# 2019 Visual Arts Assessment Report

---

- I. Annual Assessment Meetings — p. 1
  - II. Closing the Loop — p. 2
  - III. Examination of Assessment Data — p. 7
  - IV. Program Changes — p. 19
  - V. Action Plan — p. 20
- Appendices: Relevant Rubrics
- a. Standard studio artwork rubric
    - 1. Grading Guidelines for VART401
    - 2. Grading Guidelines for VART402
    - 3. ART119 Project 1 Grading Guidelines
    - 4. ART223 Final Project Grading Guidelines
    - 5. ART261 Final Project Grading Guidelines
  - b. Artist Research Rubric
  - c. Standard Writing Rubric
    - 1. Artist statement/thesis statement rubric
    - 2. standard ART100-200 reading response rubric
  - d. Book Arts Rubrics:
    - 1. BKRT115
    - 2. BKRT320
- 

## I. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT MEETINGS

1. Meeting, September 12, 2018 - 45 min. In attendance: Yookyong Choi, Richard Kegler, Ted Lossowski, Leah Mackin, & Katie Waugh

*Topics:*

  - Reviewed 2018 Assessment Action Plan priorities
  - Discussed course offerings, staffing proposals, and course proposals
2. Meeting: February 6, 2019 — 60 minutes. In attendance: Yookyong Choi, Richard Kegler, Ted Lossowski, Leah Mackin, & Katie Waugh

*Topics:*

  - Reviewed progress on 2018 Action Plan priorities
  - Discussed course offerings and staffing for Fall 2019
3. Meeting: May 15, 2019 — 35 minutes. In attendance: Ted Lossowski, Katie Waugh

*Topics:*

  - Reviewed use of new data collection form
  - Reviewed available data on student outcomes related to Action Plan priorities and program changes, concentrating on ART and VART courses, concentrating on upper-level (junior and senior) outcomes.

4. Meeting: June 5, 2019 — 20 minutes. In attendance: Ted Lossowski, Katie Waugh  
     **Topics:**
  - Reviewed data collection expectations/procedures
  
5. Online Collaboration (May 12 —June 7): (Due to the continued fluctuation of staffing in key areas, much of our assessment data and reflection had to be conducted virtually — some of our primary teaching staff were unavailable to meet after the end of the semester. Dept. Chair produced a new data collection form to help facilitate virtual collaboration. Participating faculty include Leah Mackin, Rob Lomoscolo, Yookyoungh Choi, Ted Lossowski, and Katie Waugh).
  - Data & reflection from relevant courses tracked & reported.
  - Katie Waugh synthesized data and wrote report; Drafts of Report and Plan were shared digitally with participating faculty.

## II. CLOSING THE LOOP

The 2018 report notes the success of the Fall 2018 iteration of VART300 as appearing to have built lasting foundations in critical thinking and implementation of critical theory in upper-level classes. Anecdotally, the remaining students who participated in that course (given its 2-year sequence) do appear to have further benefited from that curriculum (data provided below in “Evaluation of Assessment Findings”) The 2018 report further notes the need for continuity in this content, so that reinforcement may be ensured throughout the curriculum. This will need to be more specifically established in 2019-2020, as more permanent staffing will finally be in place.

The department was fortunate to welcome new colleagues this year, however with this comes some difficulty in determining year-to-year general or anecdotal conversations about student performance. However, the 2018 Assessment Program Changes largely indicated changes to be made in the permanent faculty’s course rotations for this reason. Data and reflections are listed below:

- **ART100-200 Courses:**  
Attempts to address growing concern over lack of student accountability for attendance and work completion:
  - Prof. Lossowski plans to eliminate his attendance policy, while also ceasing to help students who’ve missed classes for unexcused absences. This places the onus for course materials solely on students, and underscores the need for constant attendance.
    - ***Reflection: This change in policy resulted in far more absences than seen before. However, Prof. Lossowski plans to continue this policy.***
  - Pedagogical Approaches:
    - More structured periodic check-ins and graded benchmarks to ensure consistent work, particularly in courses enrolled with a broad range of students (non-art majors). (*Goal 3, Obj. 2; Goal 5, Obj. 2*)
      - ***ART118, 119, 121, 261 (Data listed below in course-by-course analysis)***
    - More overtly tying written coursework to studio assignments, to generate more intrinsic motivation for writing in studio classes, including writing for idea generation, contextual development, in addition to self-reflections and project statements. (*Goal 4, Goal 6*)

- **ART119 & 261**
- *Reflection & Data: In addition to the data listed below, in ART119, 261, and 223, the number/scope of large “projects” was reduced slightly, and complemented by more studies, exploratory exercises, etc. (The issues above are tracked and reviewed in the data below)*
- ART119: Visual Organization: (Prof. Waugh)  
*PLAN FROM LAST YEAR: “More consistent, thorough, and overt emphasis on iteration, self-reflection, divergent thinking, and research (text-based and material) in the development of project ideas. This approach can be extended beyond one project, to reinforce these habits of production. (Goal 3, Obj. 2; Goal 6, Obj. 2).”*

<b>ART119: FALL 2018</b>	<u>Graded as Competent/Not Competent</u>			
Project 1, Works Cited/ Bibliography	100% “Competent”			
Project 1, Response/5 Crucial Positions Analysis	75% “Competent”			
	<u>AVG</u>	<u>% Above D</u>	<u>% Above B</u>	<u>% above A</u>
Project 1 Grade: “Effort & Integrity” rubric category	87%	100%	75%	50%

***Reflection:** This method of project preparation, paired with the self-motivated orientation of this project, is successful in helping students perform well in this area. This was the second year in which this project and method was used, and anecdotally, students were energized by hearing about the previous cohorts’ work as well. This continues the strong work presented last year (AVG project score in “Effort & Integrity Category: 90% — with small class sizes, a variance of -3% is unremarkable). In both years, the research, ideation, and iteration stages of project development were exceedingly directed, with clear benchmarks and instructions. Anecdotally, one student remarked during this process “Oh, this is teaching us how to make actual artwork.” (This, of course, was the intent.) Further work can be done, then, in implementing beyond the highly-directed structures, and help students adopt these practices more intrinsically, perhaps at the upper-level within the major.*

- ART121: Beginning Drawing: (Prof. Waugh)  
 In response to visiting artist Amos Kennedy, students conducted a self-reflective and research exercise in advance of creating an artwork inspired by our in-class workshop discussing his work. (Goal 5, Obj. 2 and Goal 4, Obj. 1)

<b>ART121: SPRING 2019</b>	<u>Graded as Competent/Not Competent</u>			
PRE-PROJECT REFLECTION	45% Competent			
	<u>AVG</u>	<u>% Above D</u>	<u>% Above B</u>	<u>% above A</u>

TEXT DRAWING Grade: "Effort & Integrity" rubric category	72%	86%	43%	0%
--	-----	-----	-----	----

*Reflection: This class takes as its main goal observational drawing, which was the primary focus for the first half of the semester. Given that this project was introduced in April, students hadn't had practice with thinking through the conceptual motivations in their work, and may have struggled to understand its relevance (there was a significant percentage of students who simply did not complete this exercise; this is the primary reason for such a low "Competence" average above). This cohort also struggled significantly with other coursework dealing with self motivation & conceptual grounding for their work (largely the reading assignments). This could be due to several factors: a significant portion of course enrollment due to students merely taking it for new Gen Ed credit, and consequently were not as inherently motivated to think deeply about the critical concerns/motivations undergirding artistic production; high percentage of students with histories of poor engagement/performance in other classes; and changes to course structure/content that may have inadvertently deemphasized this kind of thinking (in an effort to bridge remedial skill gaps in other areas).*

- ART118: Three Dimensional Design (Prof. Lossowski)

*Goal 3, Obj. 2; Goal 6, Obj. 2*

<b>ART118: Spring 2019</b>	<u>% Above D</u>	<u>% Above B</u>	<u>% above A</u>
Wire Drawing: Eye, mind, hand coordination skill development interpreting objects into a 3-D drawing	100%	89%	44%

*Most students reproduced mediocre objects; to fix this, students could bring in five or more objects to choose from.*

- ART261: Photographic Digital Imaging (Prof. Waugh)

This semester, more formal, thorough written project proposals were required for each major project, paired with more frequent one-on-one in-progress meetings. (*Goal 5, Obj. 2 and Goal 4*)

<b>ART261: FALL 2018</b>	<u>Graded as Competent/Not Competent</u>			
Project Proposals, Projects 1-3	AVERAGE of all projects: 70%			
	<u>AVG</u>	<u>% Above D</u>	<u>% Above B</u>	<u>% above A</u>
Final Project, "Intention & Informed Decision Making" rubric category	85%	100%	70%	40%

*\*\* Data above reflect student outcomes for those students who participated in the course; one student functionally withdrew from the course, submitting virtually no coursework throughout the semester and attending very infrequently.*

*These outcomes are not reflected above.*

- ***Reflection:*** *In reviewing these proposals, a direct correlation may be made between those students who most successfully submitted "Competent" proposals (those with credible, thoughtful plans) throughout the semester and those who earned the strongest grades in the Final Project "Development & Integrity" rubric category. Out of protection of individual student information, this data is withheld. However, success criteria listed above indicate that this semester-long effort towards building students' well-grounded, intentional process is successful.*
- **ART350:**  
Continued emphasis on iteration, process, thinking-through-making, and creatively generative artistic research, through replication of methods instated in FA17. (Further data is necessary). (*Goal 3, Obj. 2; Goal 4; Goal 6, Obj. 2*)
  - ***Data Reported Below: "Examination of Assessment Data"***
- **VART401, 402:**
  - Continued emphasis on developing quality of writing, largely through more timely and specific feedback on written work. (*Goal 4, Obj.2*)
  - Cultivating divergent thinking in VART401, through solicitation of feedback from outside faculty. (*Goal 6, Obj. 2*)
  - Addition of written self-reflections in VART402 to follow-up on timelines included in VART401 proposals. This will emphasize metacognitive skills, and emphasize adaptability and accountability in project planning (*Goal 3, Obj. 2*)
    - ***Data Reported Below: "Examination of Assessment Data"***
- **Course Sequences & Prerequisites:**  
Visual Arts Faculty will conduct a more thorough Strategic Plan in the Summer of 2018, in effort to determine whether alternate course prerequisite structures (particularly among 100-200 level courses such as ART119 and BKRT/ART127), would lead to more consistent student outcomes. Tied to this, of course, will be an evaluation of how this would relate to staffing needs.
  - ***This process is significantly underway, but temporarily paused due to hiring in the department. This should be a collaborative process, and staffing throughout the program was quite contingent this year. This will likely be taken up in 2019-2020.***

### **ART350: Creative Art Projects**

Changes implemented in 2017-2018, centering on significantly increasing emphasis on writing, idea iteration, and self-reflection continued, as suggested in last year's plan. They will certainly be repeated in subsequent versions of the course.

In reviewing the data below, it is important to recognize the impact of small class sizes; for instance, success criteria were not met for either assignment in FA18 (when looking at individual scores, not provided here), although this is more a reflection of individual student performance rather than a broad concern from a cohort. When taken together over 2 years, we can see more conclusively that the majority of students are meeting success criteria for

the “Artist’s Research Statement” (*Goal 3, Obj. 1, Outcome 2*), and we have nearly met it for Composite Grades for Readings & Annotated Bibliographies (*Goal 5, Obj. 1, Outcome 2*). Both of these could be improved in the future with more formal attention to expectations; the largely individual instruction that this course features can complicate instruction in some areas. We do conduct shared discussions & critiques, so clearer demonstrations & guidelines for this work should be shared during these times.

GOAL 3: PROFESSIONALISM				
Instill a(n) aesthetic and/or conceptual awareness within majors that will facilitate advance to graduate study and serve as a foundation for professional work.				
	Objective	Outcome	How Measured	Measurement Tool
#1 Connect the history of art and study of visual culture with contemporary practice by relating students’ individual practices (methods, media, techniques and subject matter) to those of the past.	#2 Students in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will explain their work, verbally and in writing, emphasizing professional and public speaking skills.	Junior (Creative Art Projects) Group Critiques and Research Statements, Senior Seminar Critiques, Thesis and Artist statements; Senior Oral review	Locally Developed Rubric; Senior validations are Confirmation by extra-institutional critique committee members	All Studio majors must present an acceptable statement regarding their work, at or above a grade of C.
LIFE-LONG LEARNING				
Promote the creative visual, verbal and written expressions that develop into a sustainable, enriching practice in the visual arts, distinguished by intellectual/ conceptual accountability.				
#1 Achieve self-awareness of individual proclivities, talents and attractions to visual solutions.	#2 Students in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will foster the continued development of their own idiomatic sensibilities and conceptual trajectories while incorporating authoritative writings by others.	Culminating term project; written assignments; Reading Assignments and response papers; exhibition critiques	Locally Developed Rubric; Confirmation in class critiques	90% of students to score at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level

Out of sensitivity for very small class sizes and an effort to maintain student anonymity, simple averages for coursework in ART350 will be provided:

	<u>Artist’s Research Statement</u>	<u>Composite Grade: Readings &amp; Annotated Bibliography</u>
	Avg	Avg
ART350, FA17	82%	78%
ART350, SP18	85%	82%
ART350, FA18	85%	78%
ART350, SP19	63%	85%

<b>ART350: FA17, SP18, FA18, SP19</b>					
	<u>AVG</u>	<u>% ≥ D</u>	<u>% ≥ C</u>	<u>% ≥ B</u>	<u>% ≥ A</u>
Artist's Research Statement	77%	90%	80%	70%	30%
Composite Grade: Readings & Annotated Bibliography	81%	90%	90%	50%	30%

**VART401: Senior Seminar; 402: Senior Project; & 403: Senior Exhibition**

In Fall 2017, faculty introduced several new methods and assignments intended to strengthen students' abilities in writing, research, and theoretical contextualization of their work. Initial findings in 2018 Assessment Report identify evidence of the success of these methods, while identifying the need to continue review due to small class sizes and new methods.

Given the very small class size, feedback methods were largely executed in individual meetings (work sessions with faculty), and students were instructed to seek feedback from outside faculty where disciplinary interests were appropriate. Students did not universally take this instruction, and in one case this did impact student performance. This suggests the need for more formalized collaboration among Vis Arts faculty — a task made much easier by the hiring of new permanent colleagues taking place in Spring/Summer 2019. The students in this cohort ultimately were not assigned to provide written self-reflections on their thesis timelines, although this topic was regularly addressed verbally and worked through in their Weekly Journals.

Data that further supports this content are provided below in "Examination of Assessment Data."

**Course Sequences & Prerequisites:**

Prof. Waugh wrote an initial draft Strategic Plan for the program, but out of recognition of the extraordinarily contingent nature of all other members of the program (taking in to account upcoming departures of long-term colleagues), this process has been tabled, as has the review of course sequences and prerequisites. Simply put, this process requires collaboration. The Strategic Plan draft does outline a timeline for work on building our staffing, and several of these tasks have been accomplished or are underway.

**III. EXAMINATION OF ASSESSMENT DATA**

The Priorities established in last year's Action Plan are as follows:

- Goal 3: PROFESSIONALISM  
Objective 2: Establish responsible work habits through development of project and time management skills.

- Goal 4: COMMUNICATION  
Objective 1, Outcome 2: Students in the Studio & Book Arts Concentrations will demonstrate more advanced technical and critical thinking skills that lead to a synthesis of form and concept.  
Objective 2: Develop strong, accurate, and convincing writing styles
- Goal 6: Research  
Objective 2: Develop the ability to define and follow through on research questions, whether related to art historical analysis or studio projects.

Data collected in support of these priorities follow below:

<b>Goal 3: PROFESSIONALISM</b> <b>Instill a(n) aesthetic and/or conceptual awareness within majors that will facilitate advance to graduate study and serve as a foundation for professional work.</b>				
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>How Measured</b>	<b>Measure ment Tool</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>
#2: Establish responsible work habits through development of project and time management skills.	#1 Students will create and follow work schedules, meeting in-progress benchmarks.	Project proposals, in-progress preparatory work (sketches, outlines, studies, mock-ups, etc), working critiques, participation in required work sessions and studio time. self-evaluation exercises, journals	Locally Developed Rubric	90% of students to perform at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level
	#2 Students will respond to and reflect on in-progress feedback and self-evaluation.	final critiques, participation in required work sessions and studio time, self-evaluation exercises	Locally Developed Rubric	90% of students to perform at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level

**GOAL 3: Objective 2, Outcome 1:**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
VART401	Timeline in "Thesis Proposal"	"Preparation and Plan for Execution"	0	0	100%

COURSE	Assignment/ Activity	Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool	% above A	% Above B	% above D
	<p><u>Success Criteria NOT MET</u>— This was a very small cohort, and strangely students omitted photographic documentation of their work, as assigned. This was folded in to their grade for their Plans and Preparation, and subsequently has pulled their grades down quite low in this category. If their Timelines were evaluated more specifically, they would have likely met success criteria. Their abilities to manage their time and projects can also be measured in outcomes below related to “Weekly Journals.”</p> <p>It is unclear why students omitted the required content happened, although this task was not given as much specific course attention due to student absences that interfered with planned activities, paired with the fact that students actually had more formal instruction in photography than previous cohorts, and therefore less time was set aside for this in class. This may have inadvertently de-emphasized that activity. The students did, however, successfully photographically document their work in the following semester. In future, this content</p>				
BKRT115	Independent Publishing: One-page Book/Zine Exchange	Locally Developed Rubric	25%	50%	100%
<p><u>Success Criteria: NOT MET</u> in specific regard to the development of project management skills. Project outlined with benchmark goals to complete draft(s) in advance of project due date with in-progress critique to guide in revisions and alterations prior to production. Only one student adequately succeeded in this regard throughout the project scope; other three students had varying degrees of success. (Sample size very small.)</p> <p>As first project, perhaps expectations were not clearly outlined or reiterated thoroughly enough for beginning students. This could be modified in future.</p>					
BKRT115	Artists’ Book / A structural approach	Locally Developed Rubric	25%	75%	75%
<p><u>Success Criteria: NOT MET</u> in specific regard to the development of project management skills through narrative project proposals. Only one student adequately succeeded in this regard throughout the project scope; two students submitted these proposal documents late; one not at all. (Sample size very small.)</p>					

**GOAL 3: Objective 2, Outcome 2:**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
BKRT115	Artists' Book / A structural approach	Locally Developed Rubric	75%	75%	75%
	<u>Success Criteria NOT MET*</u> In this regard, would argue that sample size too small to adequately translate in this criteria* Three of four students successfully and generously contributed to a critical dialogue in regards to their Final Projects for the semester. The participating students reflected on previously submitted/ shared in-progress works to address growth, progression of ideas, gained skills, etc.				
BKRT320	Project Proposal	Locally Developed Rubric	100%	100%	100%
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> As an advanced-level course, the students had a strong foundational understanding of the project scope (as basis for the course, to create an editioned bookwork). Project proposals were narrative documents; shared with peers at multiple stages to allow for critical dialogue, reflection, editing, etc.				
ART350: Fall 2018- Spring 2019 Combined	Weekly Journals	Locally Developed Rubric	17%	17%	17%
	<u>Success Criteria NOT MET:</u> This cohort of students suffered from chronic non-compliance with this task, suggesting perhaps they either don't find it to be useful in structuring their work habits, or struggled to plan their work habits (it should be noted: the majority of students in Fall 2018 repeated the course for credit in Sp19, which likely exaggerates the non-compliance issue). This should be tracked yet again next year, with perhaps more direct conversation and follow-up, and more overt, stated, accountability for this. Given the sequential nature of the curriculum, this tracking can take place in the VART400-sequence, as this unique cohort which seemed to struggle with this activity will be asked to complete similar self-management exercises in those courses, and with far more stringent expectations for project completion.				
VART 402	Weekly Journals	Locally Developed Rubric	50%	100%	100%

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> Students performed well; they used this as a method to track progress and outline short reflections on on-going work.				
ART223 & 261	Peer Working Critiques w/ Professor Follow-up	[ungraded exercise]			
	<p>After several work sessions on each project, students were asked to perform small group critiques on their peers' projects, with specific emphasis on aiding students' motivations (rather than declarative analyses of works as-they-stand at that moment). The function of these critiques was made explicit (again, in opposition to final project critiques), and students were frequently asked to either take notes or sketches on practical, actionable steps to be taken according to their peers' feedback. Students then met with the instructor for additional feedback and to evaluate and review their thoughts on the feedback they received. This is, by design, a non-graded exercise, as assigning grades at this stage in project development introduces far too much grade anxiety while severely limiting divergent thought. However, in evaluating average grades on projects in rubric categories related to responsiveness to critique (Often described within the "integrity" category of a rubric), it is clear that this method helps produce successful projects. Anecdotally yet significantly, nearly every student who seriously undertook this process had notable improvements in project execution.</p> <p>*Data listed below:</p>				
ART223	Composite of all Main Projects	"Integrity" category of rubric	40%	80%	100%
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> (See reflection above)				
ART261	Composite of all Main Projects	"Integrity" category of rubric	30%	80%	90%
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> However, it should be noted: The data above is based on the participatory members of the class (one student functionally withdrew from the class, submitting no work and attending very few classes. This student's outcomes have been removed from the averages above).				
VART401	Studio Work:	Grading Criteria: "Adherence to Deadlines"	33%	66%	66%

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
Success Criteria NOT MET: However, there are personal student concerns dealing little with academic program that caused this success criteria to not be met.					
VART402	Studio Work:	Grading Criteria: "Tenacious, Consistent Work Habits and Rigorous Adherence to Deadlines"	50%	50%	100%
Success Criteria NOT MET: However, this cohort is too small to be statistically relevant, and pedagogical discussions of this prove challenging when attempting to maintain student anonymity. Longer-term results will be tracked and reported in next year's report.					

**Goal 4: COMMUNICATION:**  
**Develop a broad range of technical, critical-thinking, and problem-solving skills in order to attain effective and intellectually compelling communication of ideas through visual artworks, written statements and research projects.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>How Measured</b>	<b>Measurement Tool</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>
#1: Explore, use and master a variety of techniques and media in response to projects that pose conceptual and/or technical questions/ problems.	#2: Students in the Studio & Book Arts Concentrations will demonstrate more advanced technical and critical thinking skills that lead to a synthesis of form and concept.	Culminating term project; Senior Thesis Exhibition; final portfolio	Locally Developed Rubric; Confirmation in class critiques	90% of students to score at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level
#2 Develop strong, accurate and convincing writing styles.	#1 Students will demonstrate preliminary visual and conceptual analysis skills and translate the visual to the verbal by analyzing and describing artworks and exhibitions seen at first-hand.	Research paper; written assignments; response papers; exhibition critiques; class journals; response papers; book reviews; essay portion of exams	Locally Developed Rubric	90% of students to perform at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level
	#2 Students will demonstrate more complete analytical skills intranslating between the visual to the verbal, by conducting effective, appropriate, and creatively generative research.	Research paper, Evidence of Artistic Research, weekly journals	Locally Developed Rubric	90% of students to perform at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level

**Goal 4: Objective 1, Outcome 2:**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
ART350: Fall 2018- Spring 2019 Combined	Final Portfolio/ Studio Work Grade	Studio Work Grading Criteria	33%	83%	100%
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> While doing so in vastly different ways, the majority of students made significant strides in navigating and building the connections between their material/technical methods and their conceptual motivations. There is still room for improvement, but to a large degree these students demonstrated a thorough awareness of this dynamic in the way they were developing their work.				
VART402	Thesis Body of Work: Studio Work Grade	Studio Work Grading Criteria	50%	100%	100%
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> Although this cohort was small, they almost universally demonstrated a strong ability to “synthesize form and content,” as demonstrated by an evaluation of the artworks themselves (as seen elsewhere, written analyses were not as convincing, but it is notable that the work itself possesses strong abilities in this area). This can also be understood as further validation of the strength of the VART300 curriculum, mentioned above.				
ART320	Editioned bookwork	Locally Developed Rubric; Confirmation in class critiques	80%	100%	100%
	<u>Success Criteria MET /</u> Each student approached project very differently with individualized challenges and goals to successfully finish the Project.				

**Goal 4: Objective 2, Outcome 1:**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
BKRT320	Written Response Papers	Locally Developed Rubric (pass/ fail, essentially)	100%	100%	100%

COURSE	Assignment/ Activity	Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool	% above A	% Above B	% above D
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET*</u> Assignment outlined that students respond to one reading and one field trip (RIT Cary Collection and Visual Studies Workshop) and then utilize responses for an in-class discussion. Students successfully submitted and contributed to appropriate conversations.</p> <p>Utilizing structure of QCQ (Quotation, Comment, Question) for reading provided framework for conversation in class. Also, giving students time in class to read one another's responses ensured that they actually did - providing a much generous basis for conversation than if I had insisted that they read one another's responses prior to class meeting.</p>				
BKRT115	Written Response Paper: Amos Paul Kennedy Exhibit	Locally Developed Rubric	100%	100%	100%
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET /</u> Students appropriately submitted responses to a Amos Paul Kennedy's visit using a method called QCQ (Quotation, Comment, Question).</p> <p>QCQ (Quotation, Comment, Question) for reading provided framework for conversation in class. In future, I would give students in class time to read one another's responses before starting conversation, so they have understanding of what one-another was responding to.</p>				
ART261	Reading Responses	Locally Developed Rubric	50%	60%	60%
	<p><u>Success Criteria NOT MET:</u> This semester saw an experiment in adventurous reading; this content in this course can be misunderstood as profoundly production-oriented (given its immediate commercial implications), and in an effort to find the limits of how forcefully this could be counteracted, the quantity and rigor of reading assignments was greatly increased. Students were asked to respond, reflect, and analyze both in writing and images to a greater degree than previously, thereby forging more overt abilities to "translate the visual to the verbal" in the way they communicated responses to texts. Clearly, those who participated rose to the occasion, and the class was marked by some uniquely thorough, enriching conversations due to this; the unsuccessful students were largely due to their non-compliance with the assignments (not turning things in; this may have been due to the number of readings assigned).</p>				

**Goal 4: Objective 2, Outcome 2:**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
BKRT 115	Presentation on a Book Artist/Book Arts Subject	Locally Developed Rubric	25%	75%	75%
<p><u>Success Criteria NOT MET</u> / Small sample size skews success rate, since one student failed to fulfill basic requirements of the presentation. In regards to this Outcome though, all students did achieve success in regards to articulation of personal response. As part of the presentation, I wanted the students to give their opinion of the artists/artwork/art movement based upon their research.</p>					
ART119	Project 1, Works Cited/Bibliography	Pass/Fail "Competence" Grade	100% "Competent"		
	Project 1, Response/5 Crucial Positions Analysis	Pass/Fail "Competence" Grade	75% "Competent"		
<p><u>Success Criteria MET:</u> (See analysis above in Section II)</p>					
ART223	Artist Presentation	Locally Developed Rubric	40%	60%	100%
<p><u>Success Criteria MET:</u> (60% above B counted as success due to small sample size) Students all performed at or above minimally acceptable standards; however, there is definite room for improvement in helping better establish clear strategies and expectations for the quality of analysis expected. However, distinct approaches and ideas found in these presentations then formed a through-line conversation in future critiques, etc — students were able to refer back to artists' methods or aesthetics with a short-hand, almost inside-joke nomenclature that derived directly from their classmates' presentations, demonstrably helped shape their understanding of subsequent project ideas.</p>					
ART350: Fall 2018- Spring 2019	Evidence of Artistic Research	Locally Developed Rubric	0%	50%	50%

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
Combined	<p><u>Success Criteria NOT MET:</u> Students in this cohort struggled with completion of graded coursework aside from their main artworks (data proves this phenomenon took place to a a higher degree than in previous cohorts). However, given that some students repeated the course for credit, we can see clearly that there are significant improvements during the second iteration of the course; this suggests that with reiteration, students better understand the value of this coursework both to their grades and to their development of ideas.</p>				
ART350: Fall 2018- Spring 2019 Combined	Composite "Readings" Score	Locally Developed Rubric	50%	50%	83%
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET*:</u> While numerically it is not met, the grade deviation for the lowest-scoring student was under the "D" level by just 1% — this is too small a miss to be statistically relevant, and would have meant our success criteria was met. Qualitatively, there was a rich, thorough, ongoing individual reading list accomplished with many of these students, all of which by definition was directly supportive of their practices.</p>				
VART 401	Midterm Artist List	Locally Developed Rubric	33%	66%	100%
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET:</u> Students are assigned to identify and describe the work of 10 artists they find to be informative to the work they are working towards for their thesis. While it was successful as a distinct assignment, the suggestion that this list then be used to help support later written work in the thesis process was not as universally adopted (which directly relates to outcomes listed below in "Thesis Statement"). These links could be made more overt by asking for an updated Artist List at the beginning of the Spring Semester/VART402, to ensure the relevance of the exercise after students' ideas have become more resolved.</p>				
VART 402	Thesis Statement	Locally Developed Rubric	50%	50%	100%

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET:</u> While success criteria were met for this exercise, it should be viewed as unacceptable for a student to earn anything lower than a C on this exercise, as doing so suggests a concerning deficit in a student's competence in the field. This severity is reflected elsewhere in the Success Criteria definitions elsewhere in the Assessment Plan (GOAL 3, Obj. 1, Outcome 2). The unsuccessful work referred to here is not indicative of concerns with pedagogy, necessarily — it stems from some unique student conditions. However, when students do struggle to be successful, (even) more periodic check-ins, individual work sessions, and mentorship can be <i>required</i>. Additionally, a more formalized peer-review process could be enacted in the future.</p>				

**GOAL 6: RESEARCH**  
**Enable students to engage in experimentation, research, and discovery through both traditional and new media, encouraging the practice of outcome or concept-driven media choices.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>How Measured</b>	<b>Measurement Tool</b>	<b>Success Criteria</b>
#2 Develop the ability to define and follow through on research questions, whether related to art historical analysis or studio projects.	#1 Students will demonstrate ability to define research goals, identify lines of enquiry, and synthesize findings into a cohesive argument or creative response.	Written Assignments, Research Papers, Studio Project Proposals, Evidence of Artistic Research	Locally Developed Rubric; Confirmation in class critiques	90% of students to perform at or above D level; 65% at or above B level; 20% at or above A level

**Goal 6: Objective 2, Outcome 1:**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
BKRT115	Presentation on a Book Artist/Book Arts Subject	Locally Developed Rubric	25%	75%	75%

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
	<p><u>Success Criteria NOT MET</u>/ Small sample size skews success rate, since one student failed to fulfill basic requirements of the presentation. Other students adequately researched and delivered presentations to one another.</p> <p>This is the second time the instructor has assigned this kind of research presentation with a goal to encourage students to utilize the campus library's resources and promote responsible independently-led research using online sources and contemporary journals and publications. Large goal is to address copyright, crediting other artists/photographers/researchers, and finding and citing appropriate sources when accessing information about living artists.</p>				
ART119	Drawing the Line Research & Proposal	Rubric Category: Creativity & Thought	50%	88%	100%
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET</u>: The detailed, thorough, and relatively involved process by which this component of the project is executed, now found successful for two years, suggests a useful model for other classes (further reflection below in ART223).</p>				
ART223	Final Project proposal	Rubric Category: Creativity, Thought, & Integrity	40%	100%	100%
	<p><u>Success Criteria MET</u>: All students met goals for this rubric category, however, this exercise was folded in to a rubric category that also accommodates other factors. Had this exercise been graded alone, success criteria would not have been fully met, due in general to issues of students' lack of information literacy (drawing their required research component from unreliable sources, or not adopting a generative relationship with research in the development of their ideas). This lack of success may have been due to an assumption that they would draw on previous course content from a pre-requisite course (ART119) without enough explicit instruction/reminders to do so. In future, this component could be rolled out similarly to the more successful (if also rather prescriptive) methods used in ART119.</p>				
ART261	Final Project proposal	Rubric Category: "Intention & Informed Decision Making"	36%	64%	90%

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>Assignment/ Activity</b>	<b>Relevant Rubric Category/ Grading Tool</b>	<b>% above A</b>	<b>% Above B</b>	<b>% above D</b>
	<u>Success Criteria MET:</u> As mentioned above (Section II), the semester-long effort in strongly emphasizing reading, creatively generative research, and conceptually-motivated practice appears to have been successful in helping students ultimately develop & articulate well-founded creative decisions.				
ART350: Fall 2018- Spring 2019 Combined	Evidence of Artistic Research	Locally Developed Rubric	0%	50%	50%
	<u>Success Criteria NOT MET:</u> (See above, Goal 4, Obj. 2, Outcome 2)				
VART401	Evidence of Artistic Research	Locally Developed Rubric	0%	0%	50%
	<u>Success Criteria NOT MET (at all):</u> Again, this class was statistically too small to be relevant. Further data will be collected in upcoming years. It should be understood however, that the very poor scores here are not about the quality of the work but merely due to the incompleteness.				

*Relevant rubrics and assessment tools are included at the end of this document.*

#### IV. PROGRAM CHANGES

##### **Changes to Coursework and Instructional Methods:**

- 200-300 level Studio Art Classes (Prof. Waugh):
  - Prof. Waugh will consciously reenforce research-based art production methods introduced in ART119, both to ensure wide familiarity for those who have not taken ART119, but also as an opportunity to strengthen of these skills. (Ideally to then suggest intrinsic value of such research in future more self-driven work).
- 100-300 level Book Arts Classes (VHF Leah Mackin)
  - Provide in-class peer review time for QCQ exercises, to ensure more thorough engagement with peers' ideas, and strengthen effectiveness of this model.
- ART350:
  - More direct, explicit instruction in construct of artists' writings and annotated bibliographies, to both provide more direct assistance in executing these tasks, and to emphasize their role in the course (and necessity for students to complete them). This will include discussions of selecting appropriate resources.
- VART401 & 402:

- Assign some topical weekly reflections, or ask students to share “highs/lows” with the group, to emphasize the integral nature of this kind of work. In VART402, this can include a direct assignment to reflect on progress established in Thesis Proposal Timelines.
- Assign an updated “Artist List” at the beginning of VART402, in recognition of students’ changing priorities.
- Establish a more formalized peer-review process for Thesis Proposals, Thesis Statements, and Artist Statements, both in recognition of students’ deep knowledge of their peers’ artist development and also as a way to strengthen outcomes for all.
- On-going Curriculum Development and Strategic Planning Work:
  - With the anticipated hiring of new long-term colleagues in Art History and Book Arts, collaboration on curriculum development, course sequencing, major requirements, and broader strategic planning can begin. This will likely take place in Spring 2020, with Prof. Waugh’s return from Sabbatical.

## V. ACTION PLAN

### **Areas of focus for 2018-2019:**

In reviewing the data above, and reflecting on interest in tracking student outcomes related to more anecdotal evaluation of student performance in 2018-2019, faculty determined the following areas need continued evaluation in the future:

1. Information Literacy: Emphasizing appropriate, relevant, and useful sources of information in support of both artworks and written work.
2. Developing Intrinsic appreciation for multi-stage ideation/critique/reflection process.
3. Students’ personal accountability (to work, education, and ideas) and persistence in process, paired with more rigorous, divergent thinking.

Given these priorities, the faculty have chosen to focus on the following Program Learning Objectives for the upcoming year:

- 3-Year Evaluation of VART401, 402, & 403: The Studio Art Senior Seminar experience will be assessed thoroughly, using data from past three years’ cohorts. This will provide a more stable sample size, while also neatly corresponding with the implementation of new research and production expectations set in place in 2017-2018. Areas to be assessed will include those listed below, in addition to Goal 2, Obj. 1; Goal 3, Obj. 1; and Goal 4.
- Goal 3: PROFESSIONALISM  
Objective 2: Establish responsible work habits through development of project and time management skills.
- Goal 5: LIFE-LONG LEARNING  
Objective 1, Outcome 2: Students in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will foster the continued development of their own idiomatic sensibilities and conceptual trajectories while incorporating authoritative writings by others.
- Goal 6: Research

Objective 1: Acquire strong research skills that draw from a variety of research methodologies, including: scholarly research (i.e. books, periodicals, internet resources); studying works of art at first-hand from the Wells College art collection, Wells rare book collection, the String Room Gallery to art collections off-campus; conducting personal interviews with artists, curators and scholars

Objective 2: Develop the ability to define and follow through on research questions, whether related to art historical analysis or studio projects.

### **Data Collection:**

The faculty have determined that the content of our rubric scores and written and verbal feedback constitute the most accurate form of data for evaluating student performance. Faculty teaching courses that include the above Objectives, particularly in those courses open solely to Visual Arts majors (where objectives dictate performance for Majors), will tabulate the rate of student success in these areas, according to student success criteria listed in the Assessment Plan. Such feedback is guided by rubrics, and is additionally expanded on in verbal and written form. Such feedback data may take the following forms:

- Rates at which which students earn successful scores on key coursework and/or in relevant aspects of local rubrics.
- Qualitative descriptions of cohorts across multi-course sequences
- Summaries of formal verbal assessments (critiques, senior oral defense, working critiques, department meetings).

### **Timeline:**

Large portions of the Visual Arts Curriculum (ARTH, BKRT) will be taught by new colleagues in beginning in Fall 2019. Prof. Waugh will reach out to these new faculty to familiarize them with the goals outlined above, and assessment procedures more generally. .

Faculty will discuss and share progress on Assessment priorities during Program Meetings, although due to Professor Waugh's upcoming sabbatica in Fall 2019, data and evaluation will largely be solicited during the end of Spring 2019. Data will be shared and collected digitally. Prof. Waugh will guide the data collection process, and will formulate the final report.

## **Grading Rubrics**

The following rubrics serve as a general outline for student assessment; locally-developed rubrics and considerations further refine feedback.

### **A: Studio Arts Courses General Rubric:**

Grade	
A	<p>Class Work: Student demonstrates outstanding skill, discernment and understanding of visual principles in accomplishing her or his work. The quality of work is excellent, and it is integrated with exceptional creativity.</p> <p>Class Participation: Student demonstrates through discussion, critique, and studio interaction outstanding ability to discuss and assess work, communicating how visual elements and strategies are used. The student demonstrates extensive use and understanding of concepts and terminology used in the discipline.</p> <p>Homework Projects: In the case of studio assigned homework (activity) the student completes the assignment in all aspects and creatively exploits possibilities within open-ended assignments. The work demonstrates skill, good judgment, and application of principles. In the case of written assignments, oral presentations, and research, the work/presentations/document, presents sound research and is well written and well presented.</p>
B	<p>Class Work: Student demonstrates moderate skill, discernment and understanding of visual principles in accomplishing her or his work. The quality of work is good, and it is integrated with some creativity.</p> <p>Class Participation: Student demonstrates through discussion, critique, and studio interaction a solid ability to discuss and assess work; communicating how visual elements and strategies are used. The student demonstrates competent use and understanding of concepts and terminology used in the discipline.</p> <p>Homework Projects: In the case of studio assigned homework (activity) the student completes the assignment and fulfills more than minimal requirements. The work demonstrates some skill, judgment, and application of principles. In the case of written assignments, oral presentations, and research, the work/presentation/document, presents research and is reasonably well written and suitably presented.</p>
C	<p>Class Work: Student demonstrates average skill, discernment, and understanding of visual principles in accomplishing her or his work. The quality of work is modest, and is moderately integrated.</p> <p>Class Participation: Student demonstrates through discussion, critique, and studio interaction and average ability to discuss and assess work, communicating how visual elements and strategies are used. Though the discussion and assessment of work is substantially complete, the communication of some visual elements and strategies is incomplete or missing. The student demonstrates a superficial rather than thorough understanding of concepts and terminology used in the discipline.</p> <p>Homework Projects: In the case of studio assigned homework (activity) the student completes most of the assignment and fulfills the minimum requirements. The work demonstrates modest skill, some judgment, and in parts, application of principles. In the case of written assignments, oral presentations, and research, the student makes a modest effort as evidenced by a satisfactory presentation/document. Research may be incomplete, or lacking in organization.</p>
D	<p>Class Work: Student demonstrates lack of skill, discernment and understanding of visual principles in accomplishing her or his work. The quality of work submitted is less than acceptable, and is poorly integrated.</p> <p>Class Participation: Student demonstrates through discussion, critique, and studio interaction a limited ability to discuss and assess work, while communicating at a minimal or perfunctory level how the visual elements and strategies are used. Poor effort is made to relate an understanding of the art concepts and terminology used in the discipline.</p> <p>Homework Projects: In the case of studio assigned homework (activity) the student does not complete the assignment and fulfills only minimal requirements or submits work late. The work demonstrates lack of skill, weak judgment, and little application of principles. In the case of written assignments, oral presentations, and research, the work/presentation/document, presents faulty or negligible research and is not well written and presented.</p>

F	<p>Class Work: Student fails to demonstrate skill or understanding of the issues involved. Quality of work submitted is insufficient, and poorly integrated.</p> <p>Class Participation: In discussion, critique, and studio interaction, the student states an opinion vaguely or does not assess the work and shows little or no evidence of an understanding of how visual elements and strategies are used in the discipline.</p> <p>Homework Projects: In the case of studio assigned homework (activity) the student does not complete the assignments and does not fulfill requirements. In the case of written assignments, oral presentations, and research, the work/presentation document, presents faulty or negligible research and is not well written or presented.</p>
---	--

**A-1: Grading Categories for Art Work in VART401:**

- Ability to develop sophisticated ideas that ultimately produce a body of work
- Adherence to deadlines
- Regular work habits, with consistent production & development
- Critical and creative thinking within the studio
- Reflection and self-evaluation in response to feedback

**A-2: Grading Categories for Art Work in VART402:**

- Ability to develop a sophisticated idea ultimately producing a body of work, reflecting commitment to your work as a serious artist.
- Intellectual and artistic self-direction and self-awareness.
- Material sophistication (Craftsmanship/Process/execution of tactile skills is intentional, knowledgable, & supports your thesis idea.).
- Tenacious, Consistent Work Habits & Rigorous Adherence to Deadlines (Work diligently/work through problems/ demonstrate a rigorous relationship to work/constant ).

**A-3: ART119: Project 1 — Grading Criteria**

- Craftsmanship & Form (10 pts): Careful attention to details, with neat cutting and gluing (no unintentional sloppiness, torn edges, or sloppy application of glue).
- Form/Organization of Space (10pts) Thoughtful use of space: composition demonstrates knowledgable use of previously-covered formal principles, such as negative space, balance, interrelationship of forms, and/or gestalt theory.
- Content/Creativity (10 pts): Thoughtful interpretation of idea/topic, with defensible decisions connecting artwork and topic. Composition elements all have purpose, symbolism, and/or ideas— Thorough ability to complete and respond to the prompt, through formal arrangements, symbolism, and/ or metaphor. Project effectively draws on ideas from outside sources.

Organization of space is representative of abstract ideas.

- Effort/Integrity (8 pts): Staying focused on the work; work is clearly the result of sustained effort, research and reflection (as demonstrated by preparatory research assignments). Maintained in-progress deadlines, and executed preparatory studies and sketches in a timely way. Responded to

#### **A-4: ART223: Final Project Grading Criteria**

Brushwork and Paint Handling: shows control, with specific & intentional placement & manipulation of paint, with thoughtful & creative decisions about style. Demonstrates ability to purposely select & vary brush stroke qualities (size, texture, weight). Paint handling and brushwork show purpose and intent. (8pts)

Color & Value: thoughtful, intentional use of color, demonstrating awareness of color theory principles & color interactions (in mixed paint and in analysis of subject), ability to control and replicate desired and specific colors & values. Ability to demonstrate paint mixing on palette, wet-into-wet, and/or via glazing/scumbling (as assigned/required). (8pts)

Creativity & Thought: There should be evidence of thought, passion, and personal intentionality, which should coexist with the presence of assigned goals/techniques/objectives. Evidence of finding an unexpected solution, or extraordinary discovery during work process. The final painting should reflect deep engagement with the intent and purpose of the project proposal, providing a well-formulated, serious attention to research, ideas, and concerns that exist outside “just” your own emotional expression. (10 pts)

Integrity: Dedication, effort, follow-through. Consistent work habits, commitment to fixing mistakes and responding to critique. Have it done, and done well. Finish it, and do what you say you’ll do. (8 pts)

Composition & Form: Thoughtful Composition, clearly demonstrating forethought and/or familiarity with compositional principles. Contains some sense of focal point (if appropriate), and accurate/engaging/thoughtful proportions/scale. When appropriate, painting relies on physical materials & installation/space as key components of its meaning and construction. (8 pts)

Total: 42 points. Grade Reported as an average.

#### **A-5: ART261 Final Project: Grading Criteria**

- Composition/Lens Use and Presentation: Demonstrates planning and purpose, with awareness of compositional principles, all in support of your creative intentions. Appropriate, inquisitive, creative and/or self-aware attention to composition both in-camera and in editing. Where appropriate, installation/construction contributes significant influence on viewer’s experience/artist’s intent.

(6 pts)

• Lighting, Exposure, Color: Accurate color management in the print. Demonstrates ability to create well-exposed images with rigorous attention to maintaining proper exposure, color, and focus. Any errors made in camera are corrected using appropriate Photoshop and/or Lightroom tools (white balance, exposure, digital noise, depth of field). Accurately/carefully adjusted white balance and color casts. Accurate, evocative, and/or creative use of light sources (including accuracy on any composite elements). (6 pts)

• Image Detail & Editing: Clarity & sharp focus (where desired). Proper resizing and print resolution. Accurate corrections made in Lightroom/Photoshop (noise reduction, chromatic aberration corrections, appropriate levels of sharpening). If applicable: purposeful, well-executed compositing skills when needed (accurate, refined selections; appropriate adjustments to blending modes & transformations and/or targeted corrections). (6 pts)

• Development & Integrity (How hard you work): Fully completed, with consistent work habits; demonstrates development of technical skills, with evidence of creative problem-solving and rigorous self-editing. Clear demonstration of effort (not always accepting the easiest, most available solution). (6 pts)

• Intention & Informed Decision Making (your concept): Artist displays a sense of purpose or personal motivation, and an evocative or creative exploration of the assignment's conceptual prompts. Photos relate to each other, such that they all support some kind of idea, approach, or intent. For Option 1: Demonstrates purposeful decisions about visual qualities (using skills and techniques to support creative intentions). For Option 2: Intentions clearly articulated and supported in accompanying statement, and photos convey a focused and inquisitive/rigorous/adventurous engagement with subject. (6 pts)

TOTAL of 36 points // Grades reported as a percentage.

**B: Artist's Research Rubric:**

Quality	
<b>A</b>	<p>Student's research demonstrates a rigorous, wide-ranging, and thorough awareness and exploration of self-determined lines of inquiry, with demonstrable evidence of material, aesthetic, and contextual self-awareness. Student clearly implements and understands new (to them) ideas, processes, and context for research work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Writings</b> show critical thought, self-awareness, and ability to draw connections within and beyond knowledge in the discipline;</li><li>• <b>Sketches, maquettes, and studies</b> demonstrate development, thinking-through-making, and sincere engagement with visual or material investigation; <b>Sample artists</b> are discussed insightfully, identifying relevance to student's own ideas;</li><li>• <b>Research</b> sources have integrity and show breadth in pursuit (legitimate academic sources from a range of locations/experiences)</li></ul>

Quality	
<b>B</b>	<p>Student's research indicates awareness and pursuit of identifiable theme or topic, and exhibits proficiency in some key areas (material, aesthetic, and contextual). Student demonstrates awareness of ideas, processes, and context for work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Writings</b> show critical thought, self-awareness</li> <li>• <b>Sketches, maquettes, and studies</b> demonstrate thinking-through-making, and development or identification of general skills;</li> <li>• <b>Sample artists</b> are discussed (even if only briefly) for their relevance to student's own ideas;</li> <li>• <b>Research</b> consists of legitimate academic sources</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	<p>Student's research follows an identifiable theme or topic, and exhibits proficiency in some key areas (material, aesthetic, and contextual). Student shows little new development in understanding, largely staying within a pre-determined, "safe," realm of understanding and context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Writings</b> show some degree of self-awareness, but demonstrate only cursory critical thought or engagement with knowledge in the discipline</li> <li>• <b>Sketches, maquettes, and studies</b> serve as an inventory of techniques, but with little cohesion or sense of intention;</li> <li>• <b>Sample artists</b> are identified as relevant to student's interests, but not explained;</li> <li>• <b>Research</b> sources are identified, but may be occasionally unreliable.</li> </ul>
<b>D</b>	<p>Little evidence of new thought, skill or ideas. Student possesses merely cursory knowledge of disciplinary context for their intentions or ideas (such knowledge as would be derived solely from other required courses – very little new understanding)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Writings</b> show little self-awareness or critical thought, and occasionally may be characterized by unquestioned generalizations, inaccurate information, or unfounded assertions.</li> <li>• <b>Sketches, maquettes, and studies</b> serve as an inventory of techniques, but with no cohesion, or evidence of development;</li> <li>• <b>Sample artists</b> are identified, not explained, and have illegible relationship to student's stated interests;</li> <li>• <b>Research</b> sources are only occasionally identified and may be occasionally unreliable.</li> </ul>
<b>F</b>	<p>Almost no evidence of new thought, skill or ideas. Student does not possess even cursory knowledge of disciplinary context for their intentions or ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Writings</b> show little self-awareness or critical thought, and are entirely characterized by unquestioned generalizations, inaccurate information, or unfounded assertions.</li> <li>• <b>Sketches, maquettes, and studies</b> do not show introductory skill with techniques, and demonstrate no cohesion, evidence of development, or purpose whatsoever.</li> <li>• <b>Sample artists</b> are misidentified, not explained, and have illegible relationship to student's stated interests;</li> <li>• <b>Research</b> sources are not identified and/or are unreliable &amp; inaccurate.</li> </ul>

### C: General Rubric for Papers, Theses and Statements

Grade	(adapted from rubric written at PA State U. by Dr. Sophia McClennen)
-------	--

A	<p>Thesis: Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear. Connects well with paper title.</p> <p>Structure: Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.</p> <p>Use of evidence: Primary source information used to buttress every point with at least one example. Examples support mini-thesis and fit within paragraph. Excellent integration of quoted material into sentences. Demonstrates an in depth understanding of the ideas in the assigned reading and critically evaluates/responds to those ideas in an analytical, persuasive manner.</p> <p>Analysis: Author clearly relates evidence to "mini-thesis" (topic sentence); analysis is fresh and exciting, posing new ways to think of the material. Work displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.</p> <p>Logic and argumentation: All ideas in the paper flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. Author anticipates and successfully defuses counter-arguments; makes novel connections to outside material (from other parts of the class, or other classes), which illuminate thesis. Creates appropriate college level, academic tone.</p> <p>Mechanics: Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or comma splices. Conforms in every way to format requirements.</p>
B	<p>Thesis: Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality. Paper title does not connect as well with thesis or is not as interesting.</p> <p>Structure: Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.</p> <p>Use of evidence: Examples used to support most points. Some evidence does not support point, or may appear where inappropriate. Quotes well integrated into sentences. Demonstrates a solid understanding of the ideas in the assigned reading and critically evaluates/responds to those ideas in an analytical, persuasive manner.</p> <p>Analysis: Evidence often related to mini-thesis, though links perhaps not very clear. Some description, but more critical thinking.</p> <p>Logic and argumentation: Argument of paper is clear, usually flows logically and makes sense. Some evidence that counter-arguments acknowledged, though perhaps not addressed. Occasional insightful connections to outside material made. Mostly creates appropriate college level, academic tone.</p> <p>Mechanics: Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have one run-on sentence or comma splice. Conforms in every way to format requirements.</p>

C	<p>Thesis: May be unclear (contain many vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure the paper. Paper title and thesis do not connect well or title is unimaginative.</p> <p>Structure: Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.</p> <p>Use of evidence: Examples used to support some points. Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate (often because there may be no clear point). Quotes may be poorly integrated into sentences. Demonstrates a general understanding of the ideas in the assigned reading and only occasionally critically evaluates/responds to those ideas in an analytical, persuasive manner.</p> <p>Analysis: Quotes appear often without analysis relating them to mini-thesis (or there is a weak mini-thesis to support), or analysis offers nothing beyond the quote. Even balance between critical thinking and description.</p> <p>Logic and argumentation: Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear. May not address counter-arguments or make any outside connections. Occasionally creates appropriate college level, academic tone, but has some informal language or inappropriate slang.</p> <p>Mechanics: Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Some errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have some run-on sentences or comma splices. Conforms in almost every way to format requirements.</p>
D	<p>Thesis: Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.</p> <p>Structure: Unclear, often because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.</p> <p>Use of evidence: Very few or very weak examples. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Quotes not integrated into sentences; "plopped in" in improper manner. Demonstrates a little understanding of (or occasionally misreads) the ideas in the assigned reading and does not critically evaluates/responds to those ideas in an analytical, persuasive manner.</p> <p>Analysis: Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to argument; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to. More description than critical thinking.</p> <p>Logic and argumentation: Ideas do not flow at all, usually because there is no argument to support. Simplistic view of topic; no effort to grasp possible alternative views. Does not create appropriate college level, academic tone, and has informal language or inappropriate slang.</p> <p>Mechanics: Big problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors in citation style, punctuation, and spelling. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices. Does not conform to format requirements.</p>
F	<p>Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the assignment. Very difficult to understand owing to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis, or utterly incompetent thesis. Does not follow paper guidelines for length and format. Plagiarized work is submitted.</p>

**C-1: Rubric for Artist's Writing: Artist's Statements, Artist's Research Statements, and Thesis Statements**

	<b>Critical Self-Awareness/Insight</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Analysis &amp; Argumentation</b>	<b>Mechanics</b>
<b>A</b>	Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear. Demonstrates significant & insightful ability to understand one's own motivations, and can place themselves appropriately in contexts beyond internal expression.	Evident, understandable, appropriate for main ideas. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.	analysis is fresh and exciting. Work displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description. All ideas flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. makes novel connections to outside material (from other parts of the class, or other classes), which illuminate thesis. Creates appropriate college level, academic tone.	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or comma splices. Conforms in every way to format requirements.
<b>B</b>	Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality. Demonstrates ability to understand one's own motivations, but may not demonstrate deep awareness of context.	Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.	Evidence often relates to main creative motivations, though links perhaps not very clear. Some description, but more critical thinking is needed. Occasional insightful connections to outside material made. Mostly creates appropriate college level, academic tone.	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have one run-on sentence or comma splice. Conforms in every way to format requirements.
<b>C</b>	May be unclear (contain many vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure further analysis. Vague awareness of motivations <u>or</u> context. May rely solely on unexplored claims of self-expression.	Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.	Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate. Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear. Occasionally creates appropriate college level, academic tone, but has some informal language or inappropriate slang	Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Some errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have some run-on sentences or comma splices. Conforms in almost every way to format requirements.
<b>D</b>	Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point. Little awareness of motivations and context.	Unclear, often because main idea(s) is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences	General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to argument; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to. More description than critical thinking.	Big problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors in citation style, punctuation, and spelling. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices. Does not conform to format requirements,
<b>F</b>	Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the assignment. Very difficult to understand owing to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis, or utterly incompetent thesis. Does not follow paper guidelines for length and format. Plagiarized work is submitted.			

**C-2: Rubric for Artist's Writing: Thesis Project Proposal**

	<b>Critical Self-Awareness/Insight</b>	<b>Structure &amp; Format</b>	<b>Preparation &amp; Plan for Execution</b>	<b>Mechanics</b>
	<b>40%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>A</b>	Demonstrates significant & insightful ability to understand one’s own motivations, and can place themselves appropriately in contexts beyond internal expression. All ideas flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. makes novel connections to outside material (from other parts of the class, or other classes), which illuminate thesis.	Evident, understandable, appropriate for main ideas. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences. Section headings present, and convey all content with excellent attention to design & layout.	Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear. Timeline is fully complete and presents rigorous, attainable goals. Photographic documentation supports main ideas or direction of work and is technically well-execute. Communicates plans clearly and with an appropriate college level, academic tone.	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or comma splices. Conforms in every way to format requirements.
<b>B</b>	Demonstrates ability to understand one’s own motivations, but may not demonstrate deep awareness of context. Evidence often relates to main creative motivations, though links perhaps not very clear. Some description, but more critical thinking is needed. Occasional insightful connections to outside material made.	Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences. Section headings present, with clear attention to design.	Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality. Timeline is fully complete and presents reasonable, although perhaps not rigorous, plans. Photographic documentation supports direction of work, but may suffer from minor technical errors. Communicates plan clearly, and generally creates appropriate college level, academic tone.	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have one run-on sentence or comma splice. Conforms in every way to format requirements.
<b>C</b>	Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate. Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear provides little around which to structure further analysis. Vague awareness of motivations <u>or</u> context. May rely solely on unexplored claims of self-expression.	Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences. Section headings are present, but design is unconsidered or jumbled.	May be unclear (contain many vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new. Timeline is vague or unrigorous. Photographic documentation has vague connection to proposal, or suffers from persistent technical issues. Occasionally creates appropriate college level, academic tone, but has some informal language or inappropriate slang	Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Some errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have some run-on sentences or comma splices. Conforms in almost every way to format requirements.

	<b>Critical Self-Awareness/Insight</b>	<b>Structure &amp; Format</b>	<b>Preparation &amp; Plan for Execution</b>	<b>Mechanics</b>
	<b>40%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>D</b>	More description than critical thinking. Little awareness of motivations and context. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to argument; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to. Indicates little ability to identify any reasons or decision making for work.	Unclear, often because main idea(s) are weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences. Section headings absent, and/or design renders content illegible/confusing.	Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point. Timeline is incomplete or highly unspecific, while photographic documentation is illegible or wholly unconnected to plans. Persistently presents informal, unconsidered language.	Big problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors in citation style, punctuation, and spelling. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices. Does not conform to format requirements,
<b>F</b>	Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the assignment. Very difficult to understand owing to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis, or utterly incompetent thesis. Does not follow paper guidelines for length and format. Plagiarized work is submitted.			

**C-3: Standard Reading Response Rubric: 100-200 level Studio Art Courses**

<b>Standard Reading Response Rubric: 100-200 level Studio Art Courses</b>	
<b>5 points</b>	Fully Read & Responded to entire reading assignment; reflection demonstrates engagement with main ideas and any assigned questions/topics
<b>3 points</b>	Partially read assignment; full engagement is notably missing (does not consider all main topics in reading, and/or does not respond to all assigned questions/topics), but some response is present/ demonstrates interaction with text.
<b>0 points</b>	Little to no evidence of having read the assignment.

**Note:**

This rubric is used to encourage participation and develop intrinsic interest toward materials. Accuracy and interpretation of information are tracked via specific questions and instructions, but good-faith effort towards engaging with sometimes challenging material is rewarded, even when students may struggle with comprehension. In-Class discussions and written feedback accompany these responses. Rubrics may change slightly to accommodate specific objectives or course content.

(Moodle translates these point scores into percentages)

## Assignments + Grading Rubrics

### **BKRT115 Hand Bookbinding I**

#### **Book Arts Presentation**

Book Arts Presentation is 5% of overall class grade, broken down into a 10pt scale:

- 4pts - Presentation file uploaded to Moodle by 9/25
- 4pts - Images and Information is accurate / appropriately sourced and cited in a consistent and recognized format (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.)
- 2pts - Personal reactions/thoughts/engagement with information

**Independent Publishing:** One-page Book/Zine Exchange is 15% of overall class grade, broken down into a 15pt scale:

- 5 pts - Completing the edition by 3/4: 35 books, ready to exchange
- 3 pts - Mock-up #1 on 2/18
  - Physical thing! Put your ideas on paper. Folded/cut how you plan to produce the edition.
- 4pts - Content & Form
  - Project shows intentionality to connect content to assignment
  - Challenges the structure *or* content; Effort to make an interesting book!
- 3pts - Craft
  - Evenly folded, cleanly cut for *all* copies of the edition

**Artists' Book / A structural approach** is 15% of overall class grade, broken down into a 15pt scale:

- 2.5 pts - Research and planning, mock-ups/sketches shown
- 5 pts - Final project completed by Final Exam date 5/8
- 5 pts - Content & Form
  - Project shows intentionality, creativity, original thought
  - Challenges the structure *or* content; Effort to make an interesting book!
  - Includes colophon
- 2.5 pts - Craft / Presentation
  - Considers how best to present your bookwork: How is it "read"?
  - Formal qualities of binding/construction in line with conceptual approach of bookwork
  - Experimentation with unconventional materials in advance of creating the final work (if relevant)

#### **Response to Amos Paul Kennedy, Jr's Visit**

"Amos is a talker and we've heard a lot of what he has to say - and read a lot of words he's put on paper. BEFORE Monday 4/22 at 1:00pm, please upload a written response to Amos' visit. Select text from one of Amos' prints in the exhibition and relate it to a conversation or exchange that you had or experienced with Amos. This could be in response to a portion of the documentary, a quote from his talk, or even just overheard in the interactions in the print shop, tea time, etc. There's no word limit or minimum for this assignment - it's just an opportunity for you to process the visit. We will discuss this response on Monday 4/22." - *Moodle assignment*

- Pass/Fail rubric (Uploaded vs. Not uploaded, essentially)

Assignments + Grading Rubrics

**BKRT320 The Printed Book**

***The Printed Book Project***

Create an editioned bookwork utilizing techniques and resources available in the Wells Book Arts Center. Project scope is entirely decided upon by student from conceptualization, research, sketches and mock-ups, through production and completion.

Minimum requirements:

- Edition size of *at least* 10 books:
  - 1 completed for the Wells Book Arts Center archives
  - Group Exchange
- Project contains printed component(s) utilizing letterpress printing

**Grading Rubric**

This project is 50% of overall class grade, broken down on the following point scale:

10 pts - Project Proposal

- Submitted by 2/26
- Share with classmates for feedback; give classmates feedback
- Conceptually strong, includes research/context

20 pts - Mock-ups/Drafts

- First mock-up submitted by 3/19
- Physically created to scale, starting to test out materials
- Multiple mock-ups and tests will be necessary - number is irrelevant, what is important is that there is thought and intent to work through the book as an object

20 pts - Final completed edition

- Completed by 5/7
- Exchange with classmates, at least one for the WBAC archive

**Reading Response // QCQ: [Publishing in the Realm of Plant Fibers and Electrons](#),**

Published 2014 by Temporary Services

- Respond to the reading utilizing the format of Quotation / Comment / Question
- Upload to Moodle by a specific date
- Use QCQs as grounding for a discussion of the reading in class

Pass/Fail rubric (Uploaded vs. Not uploaded, essentially)