2018 Visual Arts Assessment Report

I. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT MEETINGS

1. <u>Meeting, September 20, 2017 - 1 hour. In attendance: H.R. Buechler, Nancy Demerdash-Fatemi, Richard Kegler, Katie Waugh</u>
   Topics:
   - Reviewed 2017 Action Plan priorities
   - Discussed specific on-going examples/classroom situations dealing with these priorities, and worked to define some immediate solutions for some shared issues

2. <u>Meeting: February 14, 45 minutes. In attendance: H. R. Buechler, Nancy Demerdash-Fatemi, Ted Lossowski Richard Kegler, Katie Waugh</u>
   Topics:
   - Reviewed progress on 2017 Action Plan priorities
   - Discussed course sequencing and ideal course rotations for Fall 2018

3. <u>Meeting: May 24, 1.75 hours. In attendance: Ted Lossowski, Katie Waugh</u>
   Topics:
   - Reviewed available data on student outcomes related to Action Plan priorities from ART and VART courses, concentrating on upper-level (junior and senior) outcomes.
   - Discussed progress on new (in 2017) student learning objective category: "Goal 3, Obj. 2"
   - Discussed outcomes of program changes implemented in 2017-2018
   - Discussed possible changes to coursework and pedagogy for 2018-2019

4. <u>Meeting: May 28, 45 minutes. In attendance: H.R. Buechler and Katie Waugh</u>
    Topics:
    - Reviewed data on student outcomes in key Book Arts courses, related to Action Plan priorities from 2017.

5. <u>Online Collaboration (May 20-31):</u> *(Due to the 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. Participating faculty include H.R. Buechler, Lorrie Frear, Ted Lossowski, Eric Mercer, and Katie Waugh).*

    - Sharing data and analysis related to Action Plan goals from 2017 via shared online document and follow-up conversations.

    - Katie Waugh synthesized data and wrote report; Drafts of Report and Plan were shared digitally with participating faculty.

II. CLOSING THE LOOP

The 2017 Assessment Report "Program Changes" proposed the changes listed below. Given our small class sizes, in several cases we will continue to pursue and track these learning outcomes in the upcoming 2018-2019 academic year, as more data is needed to fully evaluate these outcomes. Additionally, some strategies proposed in the 2017 Report were modified in response to student needs, staffing, or other contingencies as described.

The 2017 Assessment Report "Program Changes" focused largely on two areas: 1) Encouraging more emphasis on iteration, process, and acceptance of "failure" in students' studio practices, and 2) Improving both the quality and function of writing in both art history and studio courses.

Faculty noted some improvements in these areas (further discussed below), and anecdotally suggest this may in part have to do with greater continuity in the methods and approaches throughout the program during this year. Additionally, the Fall 2018 iteration of VART300 established a rigorous and wide-ranging theoretical basis on which upper-level Majors built further connections in other classes. These two factors appear to play a role in what faculty have identified as an increase in students' abilities to think critically and apply theoretical analysis in the context of artistic production and research. Data shared below support this claim. Ultimately, this suggests continued need for this kind of pedagogical continuity, which may have to be specifically cultivated given that two primary teaching positions will be filled by new colleagues in Fall 2018.

- **Greater Focus on Writing (Research Assignments, and particularly when tied to Creative Production):**

    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.

#1 Explore, use and master a variety of techniques and media in response to projects that pose conceptual and/or technical questions/ problems.	#1 Students in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will develop and demonstrate technical and problem-solving skills in order to carry out their ideas and concepts in a sophisticated manner.	Preparatory sketches and studies, topical projects; portfolio	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
	#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	
#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	
	#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	

While use of the Writing Center was not as prevalent as initially planned, other methods seem to have produced positive outcomes in students' writing. These methods are outlined below:

ART119: Visual Organization
Prof. Waugh introduced -a new project that paired research with a foundational design project. Students responded to a shared prompt, through a thorough project ideation process that included text-based research, material investigation, written synthesis, and ultimately a visual/aesthetic response. This asked students in this foundational course to understand creative production as tied to research and scholarship, and consequently linked to a writing practice. This project, then, modeled key components of research necessary for well-founded writing (information literacy, bibliography development), while also demonstrating to students the necessity of this kind of work. Tellingly, this produced the strongest scores related to "Creativity" (as defined by project rubrics) of any project in the course (average score on this rubric category: 89%, versus lowest average score in this category: 76%). Ultimately, it would be best to encourage this kind of depth throughout a course to improve these scores across the semester, and more work can be done to impress upon students the need for this kind of work and rigor to take place regardless of whether it's mandated.

ART241: Introduction to Oxidation Fired Ceramics
Students were provided in-class writing exercises, particularly as guided supplementary activities in critiques. Because of this direct tie-in, all students participated, and consequently did so more frequently and meaningfully in verbal critiques than when such exercises were not mandated in advance.

ART260: Introduction to Darkroom Photography

Research and writing were specifically structured in to the last two projects in the semester, in the form of written analyses about the conceptual context for students' work. These exercises asked students to practice articulating specific methods of analysis or research goals within writing first, and to then create work out of this well-founded position. Students' scores relating to the rigor of these writing exercises demonstrate that while minimum success criteria were met (Grades at or above the "D" level), students struggled more with Project 4 writing. It is likely that this could be due to the fact that the conceptual prompt for the assignment was less restrictive, demonstrating that students performed better within more firmly established conceptual guidelines. Also, data for this course becomes complicated by the fact that two students functionally withdrew from the course, but never formalized the procedure. As such, they did not turn in these graded items.

	AVG	% Above D	% Above B	% above A
Project 3	71%	79%	64%	21%
Project 3 (of those turned in: 11/14)	84%	100%	82%	27%
Project 4	71%	86%	47%	20%
Project 4 (of those turned in: 12/14)	79.8%	92%	58%	25%

ART262: Alternative Video in Art & Society
In Spring 2018, the last "CML" iteration of ART262 was offered, and as such, ths was the last instance of this course with a declared focus on writing that serves the outgoing general education (SC) curriculum. Students in this course are always tasked with completing a hybrid final project encompassing a final research paper that then serves as inspiration for creative work in video art. This can be challenging, as students often opt for a rather direct, literal translation of their research into a straight-forward moving image format. In future iterations of the course, smaller, more sequentially developmental writing exercises will be used (as described in ART260 above), to better establish the connection between research and creative production.

	AVG	% Above D	% Above B	% above A
Spring 2016	82%	92%	64%	29%
Spring 2018	63%	75%	42%	8%
Spring 2018, of those submitted (10/12)	75%	90%	50%	10%

The decrease in performance for this coursework is concerning, and may further be understood through examination of students' performance on in-progress deadlines. In Spring 2016, 78% of students earned a "competent" score for their in-progress work

(annotated bibliography and research proposal), where in Spring 2018, only 58% of students earned such a score. The end-result performance is clear: rushed, last-minute work is less likely to meet expectations, and in the case of two students no essay was ever produced, despite repeated warnings and the students' acknowledgement of their inability to participate in in-class peer review and research workshops. This non-compliance is concerning, and perhaps could be attributed to some students' resistance to the idea of writing truly playing a part in artistic practice (and consequently ignoring provided information about the weight of this essay in the course grade, for instance), paired with these particular students' documented academic struggles in other courses.

Methods for writing instruction in this course were largely unchanged between these two years, however, accountability for seeking out supplemental assistance was shifted slightly more to students, and due to contingencies causing time pressures there were fewer in-depth conversations about strategies, expectations, and conventions of writing within the field of art (less time for follow-up after initial introduction). Course deadlines were rearranged to accommodate for student progress, but this then disassembled some of the carefully-designed developmental sequencing of culminating coursework. These outcomes suggest that this sequencing is certainly necessary, and were the course offered in this format again, other solutions would need to be made. However, this alludes to one of the key pressures in this course; there is simply too much content attempted. As mentioned before, the course will be restructured in the future to allow for a more acceptable pace.

BKRT 115: Bookbinding I, 120: Letterpress, 285: SpTp: Collaborative Book
New instructional methods related to writing were implemented throughout. All written work, including reading responses, were provided with far more thorough feedback and workshopping, which demonstrated the necessity for well-formulated writing in a variety of contexts. Students enrolled in BKRT120, while at times struggling with inconsistent formatting, unclear thesis development, and/or unsubstantiated claims, ultimately met established success criteria, and demonstrated improvement throughout the semester:

BKRT120	% Above D	% Above B	% above A
Paper 1	100%	71%	28%
Paper 2	100%	71%	43%

ART350: Creative Art Projects
Addition of far more self-reflective writing exercises (sourced from Anne West's "Mapping the Intelligence of Artistic Work",) with the intent of drawing a more overt tie between writing, self-reflection, and process (these exercises also specifically contribute to "Process" focus described below). These self-reflection writing exercises were graded on thorough completion only, and therefore a more qualitative description for these student outcomes is more appropriate. These exercises generated classroom conversation, and asked students to begin thinking through their own artistic motivations through writing, without the pressure of explaining and defending completed works. They will certainly be repeated in subsequent versions of the course. While comparisons of writing quality among this cohort to those previously do not necessarily suggest drastic improvement, what is clear is that with a more consistent writing practice, students simply comply more consistently with larger writing

deadlines (the 2016-2017 cohort struggled to adhere to deadlines). Students are permitted to repeat this course for credit, and although only one student chose to do so in SP18, there are demonstrable improvement in both this student's abilities to describe artistic process and motivations, and writing skills (simple grammar and mechanics, etc).

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

Artist's Research Statement	
	Average
ART350, SP17	85%
ART350, FA18	82%
ART350, SP18	85%

VART401: Senior Seminar; 402: Senior Project; & 403: Senior Exhibition
Faculty introduced a new reading assignment to establish dialog regarding student-artists' roles as artists within academia, and the relationship between sophisticated artistic practice and a well-formed research and writing practice. Then, faculty introduced a fairly dramatic overhaul of the written component of the thesis work for the Studio Art concentration in Fall 2017, which then continued in VART402 during Spring 2018. Contextual research received far greater emphasis, and included a class consultation with a research librarian, and a more scaffolded deadline structure that allowed for greater depth and focus in the writing process. Additionally, students were given clearer guidelines, while being assigned to write nearly double what was expected previously. This increase in duration and was in specific response to faculty concerns that the quality and rigor desired for this kind of writing could not be completed in what had been a fairly brief document. As such, all students produced writing that generally surpassed the sophistication and quality of most previous iterations of this coursework. To summarize, the weakest of this year's cohort far outpaced the weakest of previous years, and in some cases the strongest work so far outpaced previous cohorts that they were nearly the ideal iteration of this assignment. They were asked to assume higher standards, and largely rose to the occasion. However, some students certainly did underperform according to these new standards, and therefore several more years' worth of focus on this will be necessary to fully understand the impact of this change. Data for this content are provided below in "Examination of Assessment Data."

- **Emphasis on Process: Iteration, preparation, planning, and "failure": Goal 3, Objective 2**

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.

#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	

Faculty identified in 2017 a need for formalizing and targeting students' development of skills related to process, planning, and self-evaluation. This arose out of a concern for students' tendencies to eschew true development and risk-taking in favor of quick, immediate solutions, rather than well-implemented time management skills that allow for trials, re-direction, critical feedback, and production time. As this is a new objective, and some of the following changes are intended to redirect an academic culture from the beginning of the program course sequence, we wish to continue reviewing this in our 2018-2019 Assessment work.

ART119:
The new project described above also emphasized rather intense iterative process, underscoring idea generation and divergent thinking as crucial steps in creative process. Students at times found this to be challenging, as they are so used to mobilizing the first (and only?) idea they may have into completed artworks. It's clear that this needs more thorough contextualization throughout the course, and should be established as a consistent, overt, graded component of each project. However, when reviewing the data listed above, it is reasonable to conclude that this work did contribute to more flexible and divergent thinking on this project.

ART119, ART260, ART262:
In an effort to demonstrate and encourage the need for honest self-reflection and generative response to "failures," many project deadlines in these courses were essentially converted to working-deadlines, meaning students were permitted and encouraged to adjust and re-work components after presenting in final project critiques. Critique methodologies were varied, emphasizing a trajectory from "cold read" objectivity towards close, contextualized, practical feedback. More emphasis in these discussions was placed on students' intentions (when viewing the critique as an analytical exercise for classmates, it's essential that they enact their own analysis without reliance on the artist's stated claims), so that classmates could help guide the work from the perspective of the artist.

This may have produced mixed results; while some students took full advantage of this opportunity for refining their work, for others it may have also established an unintended sense of flexibility on deadlines. This may explain an increase in student non-compliance with deadlines, or in some severe cases, students simply not turning in work at all. However, this issue has been shared more broadly beyond these courses and even the Visual Arts program, and its reasons are unclear.

BKRT/ART127: Introduction to Graphic and Print Design:
Students enrolled in this course had a broad range of motivations, as is customary for intro-level studio courses. However, due to this breadth, the course was modified in response to their outside interests and skill levels. In an early studio project, students were assigned to re-do a project entirely after initial submission. This was done in large part to both rectify some of the skill disparities and also to model truly effective iterative process that leads to

divergent thinking and outcomes. As discussed below in "Action Plan," course sequences and prerequisites will be evaluated for this course to address some of this as well.

ART241:
In an effort to demonstrate to students the role experimentation and failure can play in the creative process, students were assigned to execute a series of glaze test tiles with their own self-determined sequence of glaze combinations. This was a mandated precursor to later glazing requirements. All students executed the assignment, and therefore all met minimum expectations for this kind of fruitful experimentation.

BKRT285:
This course modeled collaborative project management, and as such focused quite specifically on building reasonable and rigorous timelines and project plans. Students began by assessing individual strengths and weaknesses, and worked together to establish project parameters. Due to this specific focus, students collectively met this objective, executing their project with extensive self-reflection, preparation, and timeliness. Given the degree of success for this method, further modeling of this practice may be beneficial in other courses with group work.

BKRT115& 120 :
Readings on the role of "Failure" as part of creative practice were assigned prior to the first project critique. This essentially deescalated the emotional tenor of the first project critique, and demonstrated more clearly that critique is a crucial part of the learning process, as it assists the student-artist in building incremental development. Anecdotally, but significantly, this resulted in a more vocal, comfortable classroom atmosphere in these critiques.

ART350:
New reading materials were added to the course in FA2017 that specifically asked students to consider the way failure, iteration, and process feature in their own newly-developing artistic practices. Anecdotally, this then formed a shared dialog throughout the semester, in which students could more aptly recognize the function of various stages of creative production in themselves and their classmates, and consequently could more effectively respond to what they learned in those stages. One of these readings specifically inspired an entire new direction in one student's work, and has become the basis of a radically reconfigured practice for this student. This approach has emerged as the student's primary line of inquiry, and has then generated further research and artwork.

VART401:
As described above, written work in this course was reconfigured to allow for more mindful project planning and research. At the end of FA17, students were tasked with establishing their own Spring-Semester artwork production timeline. This clearly delineated how far in advance they'd need to complete their own self-defined projects in order to meet their goals. This was met with varying success; students' artwork in this cohort was unique in its technical and logistical complexity, and this may likely be attributed in part to their advanced-planning. While they did not all adhere to their timelines, it did require far more detailed planning earlier in their process. Greater faculty oversight could improve compliance with the timelines, and/or more self-evaluation exercises could be instituted. However, if used largely as an exercise rather than a useable timetable, this has value in demonstrating to students the complex planning and logistics needed for executing a new body of work

and an exhibition. Self-reflection exercises could be added to help students evaluate why and how they've deviated from their plans.

III. EXAMINATION OF ASSESSMENT DATA

Data collected according to priorities established in last year's Action Plan are as follows:

GOAL 2: CRITIQUE AND INFORMED DECISION MAKING Analyze, verbally and in writing, past and contemporary works of art and purposefully adapt/appropriate techniques, forms, methodologies, or concepts through artistic production and critically engaged writing assignments.				
#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.	#1 Students in the Art History concentration will be able to identify critical methodologies.	Participation in Senior Seminar Discussions; in-class discussions; formal oral report; research papers; response papers	Locally Developed Rubric, Confirmation of Seminar Participants	All AH majors articulate differences among critical- approaches
	#2 Students in the Art History concentration will begin to use critical approaches.	Senior Thesis; research papers in 300-level classes; formal oral report; response papers	Locally Developed Rubric, Confirmation of Seminar Participants	All AH majors write and acceptable thesis demonstrating understanding and application of at least one critical approach
	#3 Students in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will apply appropriate historical and contemporary techniques, styles and media towards their own expressions.	Senior critiques; special projects; exhibitions; Senior Thesis Exhibition	Locally Developed Rubric; Confirmation by extra-institutional critique committee members	All Studio majors can effectively apply artistic techniques, media expressions or conceptual underpinnings in their senior work.
	#4 Students in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will apply informed conceptual frameworks in their own expressions.	Senior critiques; special projects; exhibitions; Senior Thesis Exhibition	Locally Developed Rubric; Confirmation by extra-institutional critique committee members	All Studio majors can effectively apply artistic techniques, media expressions or conceptual underpinnings in their senior work.

Data (Outcome #3):

	Validation	Grade AVG	Successful (≥70%)	Unsuccessful (≤69%)
ART350	Studio Work: Grading Category: "Technical Sophistication/ Development"	83%	100%	0%
VART402	Thesis Statement	88%	100%	0%

			Successful (≥70%)	Successful (≥70%)
VART402	Oral Defense	n/a	100%	0%
VART402	Studio Work: Grading Category: "Intellectual & Artistic Self-Direction and Self-Awareness"	88%	100%	0%

Data (Outcome #4):

	Validation	AVG	Successful (≥70%)	Successful (≥70%)
ART350	Studio Work: Grading Category: "Divergent Thinking/Conceptual Rigor"	82%	100%	0%
VART402	Thesis Statement: Rubric Category: "Analysis & Argumentation"	88%	100%	0%
VART402	Oral Defense	n/a	100%	0%
VART403	Artist's Statement: Rubric Category "Critical Self-Awareness/Insight"	87%	100%	0%

Interpretation (Outcomes #3 & 4):
Students in both the ART350 and VART402/403 cohort varied widely in their competence in these areas. Success criteria were met if defined as suggested above, although the wide variance in student outcomes in these areas suggests a need for clarifying these success criteria (this will be reflected in the updated *2018 Assessment Plan).* However, ideally majors at this level should be operating at a higher level of accomplishment than C- (as was the case in some of the above instances). However, grades for VART402 Studio Work listed above demonstrate a 9.4% increase from the previous year, and a 12% increase for the VART402 Thesis Statement overall. (Success criteria in these areas were not universally met by all students last year, while they were in Sp18). This increase may be attributed to changes made to instructional methods described above, although with small class sizes it may be necessary to return to these methods over several years for more accurate data.

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.

					% Above D	% Above B	% above A
	Validation	n=	AVG				
ART262	Project 1 Working Critique	12	58%		*58%*	*58%*	42%
ART385	In-Progress Development in Project Working Critiques	9	65%		*67%*	*33%*	0%
ART350-FA17	Weekly Journals	3	87%		100%	100%	33%
ART350 - FA17	Studio Work: Grading Criteria "Consistency & Time Management"	3	77%		100%	*33%*	33%
VART401	Thesis Proposal: Rubric Category: "Preparation & Plan for Execution"	4	84%		100%	*50%*	25%
VART401	Studio Work: Grading Criteria "Adherence to Deadlines"	4	81%		*75%*	75%	50%
VART402	Studio Work: "Tenacious, Consistent Work Habits and Rigorous Adherence to Deadlines"	4	91%		100%	100%	75%

#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

Data (Outcome #1):

Interpretation:
This goal establishes performance criteria specifically for Visual Arts Majors, and therefore the inclusion here of ART262 and ART385 is perhaps misleading. However, it demonstrates performance in non-requirement courses, and includes students who may have large variance in their intentions for studying the field and therefore can provide a notable comparison of a variety of student motivations. (ART262 fulfills Sustainable Community credit). It's clear by reviewing this data that students in more project-based courses (rather than those in which they determine the majority of their artwork motivations) are more likely to misallocate their worktime, and instead

prioritize simply pushing towards a final deadlines. Due to the time-intensive content in ART385, all projects are due at the end of the semester, but the implementation of this procedure should be reevaluated, as students did not universally meet success criteria for in-progress work.

However, performance in major-requirement courses (ART350 & VART401-402) show a more positive outcome. It's possible that art majors are more likely to value in-progress feedback, and to recognize the sheer time and labor needed to fulfill this kind of work. The performance for students in the VART401-402 sequence shows notable improvements in this area, however this is in part due to differences in grading criteria; VART402 conflates "Tenacious Work Habits" and "Adherence to Deadlines," which ultimately ended up providing cover for students who perhaps struggled with deadlines but worked (and produced) constantly.

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.

#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

Data (Outcome #1):

	Validation	n=	AVG	% Above D	% Above B	% above A
ART262	Final Essay	12	63%	*75%*	*42%*	*8%*
ART262	[Final Essay of those submitted (10/12)]	10	75%	90%	*50%*	*10%*

				% Above D		
ART385	Museum Response Essay	9	58%	100%	*33%*	22%
ART386	[Museum Response Essay: of those submitted]	7	75%	100%	*42%*	29%

Data (Outcome #2):

	Validation	n=	AVG	% Above D	% Above B	% above A
ART119	*See above: reflection in Section II, p. 3*					
BKRT120	Research Paper	7		100%	71%	43%
ART260	Final Project: Research & Proposal	15	63.8%	*80%*	*47%*	20%
ART260	[Final Project: Research & Proposal, of those submitted]	12	79.8%	100%	*58%*	25%
ART350: FA17	Evidence of Artistic Research	3	78%	100%	67%	*0%*
VART401	Weekly Journal/Artistic Research	4	78%	*75%*	50%	25%

Interpretation:

Students in ART262 and ART385 produced a rather bifurcated spread in these outcomes; a few students fully met expectations, but far more merely met minimum acceptable standards (at or above D), and uniquely, few met moderate expectations. As such, it's clear to see a significant range of performance within these classes. This is concerning, primarily if accounting for the students who simply turned in nothing. Aside from this, of the students who did turn in work, success criteria were still not met at the "B" level. As described elsewhere, this could likely be attributed to students' prioritizing art projects over their writing assignments in these courses. In future, it may be necessary to tie these grades more directly to that of artworks. As described elsewhere, coursework and methods in ART119, BKRT120, and ART260 (Project 3) used a variety of used such models, and correspondingly had a more successful range of student outcomes.

Although no students in ART350 (Fall2017) performed at an A-level in this category, on the whole they demonstrate a far stronger consistency in this coursework than the

previous cohort. Also, tellingly, this previous cohort—now those students tracked in this year's VART401, show improved follow-through and execution of similar ideation coursework this year ("Weekly Journal/Artistic Research"). The positive impact of this may likely be understood in reviewing "*Goal 5, Objective 2,*" below.

Goal 5: 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.				
#2 Reach self-awareness of one's own powers of observation, analysis, writing style and creative vision.	#1 Students in the Art History concentration will demonstrate descriptive and analytical skills that reflect their individual style and point of view.	Formal oral report; in-class discussions; research papers; response papers	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 in the Studio & Book Arts concentrations will demonstrate analytical and critical thinking skills by analyzing and describing artworks and exhibitions from their own informed perspective, in their own voice.	Written assignments; response papers, class discussions and critiques	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

Data (Outcome #2):

	Validation		AVG	% Above D	% Above B	% above A
ART260	Project 3 Written Analysis	14	71%	*79%*	64%	21%
ART261	[Project 3 (of those turned in: 11/14)]	11	84%	100%	82%	27%
ART385	Museum Response Essay	9	58%	100%	*33%*	22%
ART385	[Museum Response Essay: of those submitted]	7	75%	100%	*42%*	29%
ART350: FA17	Evidence of Artistic Research	3	78%	100%	67%	*0%*

| VART40 1 | Weekly Journal/Artistic Research | 4 | 78% | *75%* | 50% | 25% |
| VART40 2 | Thesis Statement: Rubric Category: "Analysis & Argumentation" | 4 | 89% | 100% | 75% | 50% |

Interpretation:

The lower-than-desired performance in ART385 for this essay is likely due in part to the due date. Students were tasked with evaluating an exhibition seen early in the semester, after also reading about the featured artist and learning to produce some of her signature methods. However, the essay was due at the end of the semester, allowing students the possibility of returning to the exhibition or researching more deeply. This may have been overly optimistic, and may have contributed to the weak analysis present in some essays -- students may have simply forgotten the work they viewed. In the future, deadlines will correspond more closely to the field trip event.

While perhaps anecdotal, students enrolled in both ART350, VART401, and VART402 showed higher-than-usual openness and proclivities for growth, experimentation, and development. In a telling metric not anticipated in last year's Assessment Plan, all but one student enrolled in these courses arrived at the end of the semester with substantially different and more complex methods, motivations, and interests. This growth may likely be attributed to greater focus on the writing and artworks of artists they find correlate with their ideas (as validated in coursework such as "Evidence of Artistic Research" and enhanced expectations for the VART402 Thesis Statement), in addition to the greater focus described above on openly discussing failure, process, and project management.

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

IV. PROGRAM CHANGES

Changes to Assessment Plan:
- Quantify success criteria for those validations stating that "all students must effectively..."

Changes to Coursework and Instructional Methods:

- 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.

- 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)*
- 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*)
- Potentially: Increase frequency of graded, in-class responsibilities (to track participation and emphasize necessity for attendance)

- ART119:
   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).*

- 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)*

- 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)*

- 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.

v. Action Plan

Areas of focus for 2018-2019:

Throughout the Spring 2018 semester, faculty determined the following areas need continued evaluation in the future:

1. Continued attention on new Objectives introduced in Spring 2017 (Goal 3, Objective. 2: Establish responsible work habits through development of project and time management skills)
2. Continued attention to students' writing across the curriculum.
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:

- 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 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, 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 2018. 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, at least once a semester, and during a final culminating Assessment meeting after 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	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. 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. 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.
B	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. 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. 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.

C	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. 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. 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.
D	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. 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. 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 or presented.
F	Class Work: Student fails to demonstrate skill or understanding of the issues involved. Quality of work submitted is insufficient, and poorly integrated. 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. 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.

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 VART401:
- 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).

B: Artist's Research Rubric:

	Quality
A	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 • **Writings** show critical thought, self-awareness, and ability to draw connections within and beyond knowledge in the discipline; • **Sketches, maquettes, and studies** demonstrate development, thinking-through-making, and sincere engagement with visual or material investigation; **Sample artists** are discussed insightfully, identifying relevance to student's own ideas; • **Research** sources have integrity and show breadth in pursuit (legitimate academic sources from a range of locations/experiences)
B	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. • **Writings** show critical thought, self-awareness • **Sketches, maquettes, and studies** demonstrate thinking-through-making, and development or identification of general skills; • **Sample artists** are discussed (even if only briefly) for their relevance to student's own ideas; • **Research** consists of legitimate academic sources
C	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. • **Writings** show some degree of self-awareness, but demonstrate only cursory critical thought or engagement with knowledge in the discipline • **Sketches, maquettes, and studies** serve as an inventory of techniques, but with little cohesion or sense of intention; • **Sample artists** are identified as relevant to student's interests, but not explained; • **Research** sources are identified, but may be occasionally unreliable.

	Quality
D	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) • **Writings** show little self-awareness or critical thought, and occasionally may be characterized by unquestioned generalizations, inaccurate information, or unfounded assertions. • **Sketches, maquettes, and studies** serve as an inventory of techniques, but with no cohesion, or evidence of development; • **Sample artists** are identified, not explained, and have illegible relationship to student's stated interests; • **Research** sources are only occasionally identified and may be occasionally unreliable.
F	Almost no evidence of new thought, skill or ideas. Student does not possess even cursory knowledge of disciplinary context for their intentions or ideas. • **Writings** show little self-awareness or critical thought, and are entirely characterized by unquestioned generalizations, inaccurate information, or unfounded assertions. • **Sketches, maquettes, and studies** do not show introductory skill with techniques, and demonstrate no cohesion, evidence of development, or purpose whatsoever. • **Sample artists** are misidentified, not explained, and have illegible relationship to student's stated interests; • **Research** sources are not identified and/or are unreliable & inaccurate.

C: General Rubric for Papers, Theses and Statements

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

A	Thesis: Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear. Connects well with paper title.
	Structure: Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.
	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.
	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.
	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.
	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.
B	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.
	Structure: Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.
	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.
	Analysis: Evidence often related to mini-thesis, though links perhaps not very clear. Some description, but more critical thinking.
	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.
	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.

C	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.
	Structure: Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.
	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.
	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.
	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.
	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.
D	Thesis: Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.
	Structure: Unclear, often because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.
	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.
	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.
	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.
	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.
F	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-1: Rubric for Artist's Writing: Artist's Statements, Artist's Research Statements, and Thesis Statements

	Critical Self-Awareness/Insight	Structure	Analysis & Argumentation	Mechanics
A	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	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.
C	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.
D	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,
F	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

	Critical Self-Awareness/Insight	Structure & Format	Preparation & Plan for Execution	Mechanics
	40%	10%	40%	10%
A	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	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.

	Critical Self-Awareness/Insight	Structure & Format	Preparation & Plan for Execution	Mechanics
	40%	10%	40%	10%
C	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 or 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.
D	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,
F	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

Standard Reading Response Rubric: 100-200 level Studio Art Courses	
5 points	Fully Read & Responded to entire reading assignment; reflection demonstrates engagement with main ideas and any assigned questions/topics
3 points	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.
0 points	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)

Formal Analysis Writing Rubric

Task	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Organization	unorganized list of points; lacks a defined intro or conclusion	has clear intro, may be a restatement of assigned question; identifies some main points but lacks a sense of their relative importance; may not distinguish between major points and supporting details; includes much repetition or restatement, without development	clear introduction and summary at end; generally clear structure but may lack direction or progression; some points may not contribute to meaning or goal of paper; conclusion is merely a summary of points made or a repetition of intro.	organization shows reader how to understand topic; introduction contains an idea, not just restatement of question; main points well supported by details; examples well chosen; strong conclusion that attempts to bring ideas together.
Description	The artwork is not identified; vocabulary is incorrect or ineffectively used to describe the artwork	The artwork is identified, but vocabulary is incorrect or ineffectively used to describe the artwork	The artwork is identified; vocabulary is mostly correct and used to describe the artwork somewhat effectively	The artwork is identified; vocabulary is used correctly to describe the artwork effectively and clearly
Analysis	The relationship of different formal elements are ignored or incorrectly explained.	Focus given to specific formal element(s) without considering relationships between different components; mentions multiple formal elements but lacks developed discussion or analysis	Focus give to one or two formal elements with some consideration of relationships; includes some discussion of how elements aid viewer understanding	Focus two or more formal elements; clear explanation of relationship of different elements and how they contribute to viewer understanding
Interpretation and articulation of own ideas	merely restates course or reading assignment information	some attempt to convey own ideas but includes errors of fact, does not support ideas with concrete examples	some informed interpretation of the art or historical contexts but may include errors and lack visual or documentary support.	balanced treatment of observation and documentary evidence, leading to student's own, informed interpretation of materials and concepts.
Writing Skills	lacks verbal competence	writing is basically correct; paper may contain several errors of spelling, punctuation, grammar; there is little variety in sentence structure.	generally clear writing with no serious errors or sloppy syntax; avoids excessive passive voice or convoluted sentence structure.	vigorous style, correct grammar and vocabulary; integrates visual description into discussion effectively; avoids over-use of jargon; presents an individual voice