

## Institutional Effectiveness Report Template

<b>Name of Program/Department:</b>	Visual Arts Program
<b>Year:</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>Name of Preparer:</b>	<i>Gregory G. Fry &amp; D. Keith Best</i>

### *Program Mission Statement*

The visual arts program focuses on developing the artistic abilities of students within the liberal arts tradition. The purpose of the art major is to give students a solid foundation in the studio arts and develop visual awareness. The actual production of works in the studios, followed by critiques of their works, enhances the students' understanding. They are prepared for graduate school or for independent work in the arts through their coursework in the studio areas, supplemented by art history and related fields of study. Graduates of this program have gone on to graduate studies and jobs in art related careers.

### *Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's)*

PLO 1.0: Students will have a solid foundation in the studio arts and art history.

PLO 2.0: Students will develop a heightened visual awareness.

PLO 3.0: Students will enhance their understanding of artworks through hands-on production of artwork.

PLO 4.0: Students will enhance their understanding of artworks through various critique methods employed in the evaluative process.

PLO 5.0: Students will be prepared for independent work in the arts and/or graduate school programs through their coursework in the studio areas, supplemented by art history courses and related fields of study.

### *Executive Summary of Report*

Student learning outcomes continue to be reviewed for effective use in connection to the program learning outcomes. Assessment methods and how they are applied to the report continue to be evaluated for effectiveness. Assessment results will continue to be monitored for better alignment to the outcomes. The intent is for the benchmarks to rise as results become more apparent and altered for a stronger outcome.

Action items show specific areas for improvement and areas where teaching is being done to support new and existing benchmarks. SLO 5 needs to test more effectively on memory retention of

knowledge. Also, SLO 8 needs more reflection on senior exit exams as it moves into the final application stage and implemented. The benchmark shows the department is close to a desired outcome. However, a full academic year will be more instrumental in determining outcome expectations. This is the first semester for this exit exam and needs some refinement as the department moves forward with implementing it. Other items seem to be in accordance with departmental objectives.

A new IE reporter for the Visual Arts has been named and given appropriate access and support from the Chair and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. During the academic year, PLO's have been reviewed by Visual Arts Program faculty and approved. These were based on the NASAD report and are reflective and in alignment with the goals of the department. Creation of the Visual Arts Student Handbook is obtaining departmental approval for the fall of 2017 to help students more effectively understand the departmental goals and requirements. Also, integration of data from exit interviews needs to be addressed in assimilating data into SLO's more effectively for the 2017-18 IE Report for a more comprehensive overview. (see data from **Appendix A**)

### ***Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's)***

- SLO 1.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% on art history identification test (artist, subject matter, style, technique, and/or terminology) will reach or exceed 75%.
- SLO 2.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class presentations (see rubric **Appendix B**) will reach 75%.
- SLO 3.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class essay writing (see rubric **Appendix C**) will reach or exceed 75%.
- SLO 4.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on reading comprehension/critical thinking (see question sheet **Appendix D**) will reach or exceed 75%.
- SLO 5.0: The percentage of students in ART330 achieving 75% mastery in understanding information on typography, measurements, and pre-press will reach or exceed 75%.
- SLO 6.0: Graphic Design candidates will be able to demonstrate competence at the 80% performance level with a portfolio of foundation work for determining appropriateness of graphic design emphasis for progression in emphasis.
- SLO 7.0: The percentage of students in ART215 achieving 85% mastery over serigraph printing process will reach or exceed 75%. This covers information on screen processing, preparation, set-up, printing and clean up stage. Issues of artistic content are addressed.
- SLO 8.0: The percentage of students achieving 75% when demonstrating an understanding of basic drawing, two-dimensional design, art history and emphasis will reach or exceed 75%.

### ***Assessment Methods***

- SLO 1.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% on art history identification test (artist, subject matter, style, technique, and/or terminology) will reach or exceed 75% (Benchmark = 75%)
- SLO 2.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class presentations as measured by a departmental rubric (see rubric **Appendix B**) will reach or exceed 75%. (Benchmark = 75%)
- SLO 3.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class essay writing as measured by a departmental rubric (see rubric **Appendix C**) will reach or exceed 75%. (Benchmark = 75%)
- SLO 4.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on reading comprehension/critical thinking as measured by grading of fill-in the blanks sheet (sequence of paragraphs taken from the required course text book) will reach or exceed 75%. (Benchmark = 75%) (See question sheet **Appendix D**)
- SLO 5.0: The percentage of students in ART330 achieving 75% mastery in understanding information on typography, measurements and pre-press as measured by a 50 point multiple choice and short answer quiz will reach or exceed 75% (Benchmark = 75%).

SLO 6.0: Graphic Design candidates will be able to demonstrate competence at the 80% (Benchmark = 80%) performance level with a portfolio of foundation work for determining appropriateness of graphic design emphasis for progression in emphasis as measured by a departmental rubric. (See rubric sheet **Appendix E**)

SLO 7.0: The percentage of students in ART215 achieving 85% mastery over serigraph printing process as measured by a departmental rubric will reach or exceed 75%. (Benchmark = 75%) This covers information on screen processing, preparation, set-up, printing and clean up stage. Issues of artistic content are addressed.

SLO 8.0: The percentage of students achieving 75% when demonstrating an understanding of basic drawing, two-dimensional design, art history and emphasis as measured by a senior exit exam will reach or exceed 75% ((Benchmark = 75%). (See example of one of emphasis question sheet **Appendix F**).

### ***Assessment Results***

SLO 1.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% on art history identification test (artist, subject matter, style, technique, and/or terminology) reached 78%

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that 7 of 9 students met 90% target score (78% success rate). This target was achieved.

SLO 2.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class presentations (see rubric **Appendix B**) reached 89%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that 8 of 9 students met 90% target score (89% success rate). This target was achieved.

SLO 3.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class essay writing (see rubric **Appendix C**) reached 78%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicates 7 of 9 students met 90% target score (78% success rate). This target was achieved.

SLO 4.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on reading comprehension/critical thinking (see question sheet **Appendix D**) reached 78%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicates 7 of 9 students met 90% target score (78% success rate). This target was achieved.

SLO 5.0: The percentage of students in ART330 achieving 75% mastery in understanding information on typography, measurements and pre-press as measured by a 50 point multiple choice and short answer quiz reached 70%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on quiz was less than the target. Data indicated that 70% achieved a rating of 75% or above. Since the goal was 75% the target was not achieved.

SLO 6.0: Graphic Design candidates were able to demonstrate competence at the 80% performance level with a portfolio of foundation work for determining appropriateness of graphic design emphasis for progression in emphasis as measured by a departmental rubric.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 80% on sophomore portfolio was achieved. Data indicated an 80% level of performance. Since the goal was 80%, this target was achieved.

*Fall 16:* 5 students applied - 60% passage rate from those that applied  
 3 were approved-2 were not  
 -1 did not have high enough GPA in major area  
 -1 did not have strong enough portfolio presentation (limited time put in)

*Spring 17:* 3 students applied - 100% passage rate from those that applied  
 3 were approved

SLO 7.0: The percentage of students in ART215 achieving 85% mastery in measuring student's retention of information over subject material on quiz reached 88%. This covers information on screen processing, preparation, set-up, printing and clean up stage. Issues of artistic content are addressed.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 85% on the project was 88%. This target was achieved.

SLO 8.0: The percentage of students taking the senior exit exam (basic drawing, two-dimensional design, art history and emphasis) achieving 75% reached 71%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on the senior exit exam was 71% rating. (see sample emphasis test sheet **Appendix F**). Since our goal was 75%, this target was not achieved.

### ***Action Items***

To address concerns identified in the evaluation of data from the 2016-2017 academic year, the Department of Fine Arts—Visual Arts Program developed the following action plan to be implemented during the 2017-2018 academic year.

SLO 1.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% on art history identification test (artist, subject matter, style, technique, and/or terminology) reached 78%

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 7 of 9 students met 90% target score (78% success rate). Since the target was met, the goal for SLO 1.0 was achieved and no action is required at this time

SLO 2.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class presentations (see rubric as **Appendix B**) reached 89%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on the quiz was achieved. Data indicates 8 of 9 students met 90%

target score (89% success rate). Since the target was 75%, the goal for SLO 2.0 was achieved and no action is required at this time..

SLO 3.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on in-class essay writing (see rubric as **Appendix C**) reached 78%

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on quiz was achieved. 7 of 9 students met 90% target score (78% success rate). Since the target rate was 75%, the goal for SLO 3.0 was achieved and no action is required at this time.

SLO 4.0: The percentage of students in ARTH 221 achieving 90% mastery on reading comprehension/critical thinking (see question sheet as **Appendix D**) reached 78%

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on quiz was achieved. 7 of 9 students met 90% target score (78% success rate). Since the target rate was 75%, the goal for SLO 4.0 was achieved.

SLO 5.0: Quiz in ART330 to measure student's retention of information over subject material. This covers information on typography, measurements and pre-press.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on quiz was not achieved. Data indicates 70% rating. Since the target was 75% the target, the goal for SLO 5 was not achieved. Since the target was not achieved, the department made changes to bring about improvement in this student-learning outcome. In 2017-2018, additional time will be spent reviewing information and in-class examples of practical application of information related to typography, measurements and pre-press will be demonstrated prior to the quiz.

SLO 6.0: Graphic Design candidates would be able to demonstrate competence with a portfolio of foundation work to show for determining appropriateness of graphic design emphasis for them.

Data collected during the 2016-2017 academic year indicated the percentage of students achieving a rating of 80% on passing Sophomore Portfolio Review was 80% as measured by the departmental rubric. The goal for SLO 7.0 was achieved and no action is required at this time (see rubric sheet **Appendix E**).

SLO 7.0: Project 1 in ART215 to measured student's control of information over subject material. This covered information on screen processing, preparation, set-up, printing and clean up stage. Issues of artistic content are addressed.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 85% on quiz was achieved. Data indicates 88% rating. Since the target was 75% the target, the goal for SLO 7.0 was achieved and no action is required at this time.

SLO 8.0: The percentage of students taking the senior exit exam (basic drawing, two-dimensional design, art history and emphasis) achieving 75% reached 71%.

Data collected during the 2016-17 academic year indicated that the percentage of students achieving a rating of 75% on the test was 71%. Since our goal was 75%, this target was not

achieved. This is the first semester this test has been given to the graduating seniors. Since the target was not achieved, the department will review items from the test and adjust our instruction to address any identified shortcomings. Solid benchmarks and clear outcomes are expected in one to two years once the test (see sample emphasis test sheet **Appendix F**) has been given a number of times for full academic year data. However, this is a good step toward gaining data on graduating seniors' knowledge retention.

## Appendices

### APPENDIX A

### Tabulated Graduating Senior Exit Survey Results

#### FMU Fine Arts Department

**Total of 11 for 2016-17: Fall 2016 (4 response) and Spring 2017 (7 responses)**

– Visual Communication (6), Painting (2), Photography (3) Ceramics (0)

Benchmark of 90% includes both agree and somewhat agree columns where appropriate.

#### Continuing education

(0/11 = 0%) Applying for graduate school in art	(2/11 = 18%) Considering graduate school in the future	(1/11 = 9%) Considering further education in art field	(1/11 = 9%) Considering other education in unrelated field	(7/11 = 63.6%) Not pursuing further education at this time
--	---	---	---	---

#### Employment

**Currently employed in art related field: (8/11 = 72.7%)**

- This number is only based on numbers as of graduation.

#### Well-Prepared in Art

<b>for Employment?</b> (5/11 = 45.4%) Agree	(6/11 = 54.5%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
<b>for Grad. Study?</b> (4/11 = 36.3%) Agree	(4/11 = 36.3%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(3/11 = 27.2%) No opinion

#### Career guidance by faculty was helpful (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)

(10/11 = 91%) Agree	(1/11 = 9%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

#### Quality of Art courses was as good as, or better than, non-major courses (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)

(9/11 = 82%) Agree	(2/11 = 18%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

#### Prerequisites for Art courses were appropriate (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)

(11/11 = 100%) Agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

#### I was properly advised by my faculty advisor (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)

(11/11 = 100%) Agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

#### The Art Faculty were accessible for advice (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)

(11/11 = 100%) Agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

#### Quality of Art Faculty - They were prepared, interested, effective (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)

(9/11 = 82%) Agree	(2/11 = 18%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

**Quality of Facilities is adequate - space, equipment, access, comfort (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)**

<b>Art Studios</b> (3/11 = 27%) Agree	(7/11 = 64%) Somewhat agree	(1/11 = 9%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
<b>Art History Classroom</b> (7/11 = 64%) Agree	(3/11 = 27%) Somewhat agree	(1/11 = 11%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(1/11 = 9%) No opinion

**Quality of Library is adequate**

(8/11 = 73%) Agree	(3/11 = 27%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

**I am satisfied overall with the specialty area(s) in my Art Major (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)**

(10/11 = 91%) Agree	(1/11 = 9%) Somewhat agree	(0/11 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

**Museum, Gallery field trips of value (Benchmark = 90% satisfied)**

(8/11 = 73%) Agree	(2/11 = 18%) Somewhat agree	(1/11 = 9%) Somewhat disagree	(0/11 = 0%) Disagree	(0/11 = 0%) No opinion
-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

- “Awesome to see other art student’s work, spaces and gallery.”
- “It was great to get out of Florence! Cities were so busy and had huge variety.”
- “Both trips were beneficial because they showed artists in the workplace, making a living through creating their art.”
- “Yes! It was very helpful & useful for what I was doing for my senior show.”

**Professional Portfolio Review**

- **Participated in travel opportunities** (5/11 = 45% of students had a portfolio review).

**Was the portfolio review of value:**

(4/5 = 80%) Agree	(1/5 = 20%) Somewhat agree	(0/5 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/5 = 0%) Disagree	(0/5 = 0%) No opinion
----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Travel**

- **Participated in travel opportunities** (5/11 = 45% of students traveled).

**Was the travel of value:**

(5/5 = 100%) Agree	(0/5 = 0%) Somewhat agree	(0/5 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/5 = 0%) Disagree	(0/5 = 0%) No opinion
-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Conferences**

- **Participated in conference opportunities** (6/11 = 9% of students went to a conference).

**Conferences attended of value:**

(1/1 = 100%) Agree	(0/1 = 0%) Somewhat agree	(0/1 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/1 = 0%) Disagree	(0/1 = 0%) No opinion
-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**Internships**

- **Participated in conference opportunities** (6/11 = 54.5% of students did an internship).

**Internships of value:**

(4/6 = 67%) Agree	(2/6 = 33%) Somewhat agree	(0/6 = 9%) Somewhat disagree	(0/6 = 0%) Disagree	(0/6 = 0%) No opinion
----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

**University Service**

- **Participated in campus organizations/activities** (9/11 = 82%)

**University Service of value:**

(5/9 = 56%) Agree	(1/9 = 11%) Somewhat agree	(1/9 = 11%) Somewhat disagree	(0/9 = 0%) Disagree	(2/9 = 22%) No opinion
----------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------

**Community Service**

- **Participated in campus organizations/activities** (7/11 = 64%)

**Community Service of value:**

(4/7 = 57%) Agree	(1/7 = 14%) Somewhat agree	(0/7 = 0%) Somewhat disagree	(0/7 = 0%) Disagree	(2/7 = 29%) No opinion
----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------

**Juried Art Competitions**

- **Participated in a juried art competition or show** (10/11 = 91%)

**Courses that should be added to the program arranged by discipline**

- **Visual Communication**
  - o More web design classes (intermediate) (1)
  - o For non-majors
  - o History of graphic design (3)
  - o Multi-Media Design
- **Painting / Drawing /Foundations**
  - o Additional Drawing courses
- **Ceramics / Sculpture**
  - o Sculpture or woodshop course
- **Photography**
  - o Videography (2)
  - o History of Photography
- **Art History**
  - o Ancient Egypt course

**Suggestions for improvement**

- Better accessibility to facility (keycard) and equipment
- Drawing as specialty area
- Larger lighting room
- More portfolios
- Better communication within department
- More offerings of art/art history courses
- Less foreign languages
- More specialty course (drawing, printmaking, illustration, multi-media, and web (UX, animation, etc...))
- Student lounge in HFAC
- Senior work space

**APPENDIX B**

- EVALUATION OF ORAL PRESENTATION RUBRIC

***EVALUATION OF YOUR ORAL PRESENTATION ABOUT A SINGLE ART WORK***

**IMMEDIATE IMPRESSIONS OF THE OVERALL TALK. . 20 \_\_\_\_\_**

Was speaker **FORMALLY/PROFESSIONALLY ATTIRE**D as if being interviewed for a major position?  
 Was there a sense of basic **RAPPORT** (i.e. verbal and body language communication) established between speaker and his audience so that **(S)HE HELD YOUR ATTENTION**?

Was the **LENGTH** appropriate (3 min. for ARTH 220-1 or 5 minutes for upper level ARTH courses)?  
 Was the **OPENING** a humdinger or did speaker stumble at beginning?--i.e. was there some way by which the speaker got his listeners interested from the very start or did it take too long to get warmed up?  
 Was the **CONCLUSION** a recap of major points or a "sneaking up" of some surprise conclusion that still managed to make complete sense? Did it fail in leaving mark on the listener, through anticlimax or because there just was no conclusion?

**BODY LANGUAGE & DEMEANOR**? Did speaker exude an **ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT** and a **SENSE OF CONFIDENCE, even FLAIR** both about him- or herself and material? or act tentative and unsure? visible nervousness?

**BASIC SPEAKING STYLE & DELIVERY. . . . . 20 \_\_\_\_\_**

Appropriate **VOLUME & DICTION**? Too loud, too soft? Clear or unclear enunciation?  
 Was the speaker's chosen **TONE** appropriate to the material? (smooth, humorous, earnest, dramatic, elegiac, declamatory/aggressive, intimate/conversational, clever, witty, etc.)

Was speaker at all hampered by reading from notes or did (s)he courageously deliver extempore?  
**VIVID** descriptions of works of art, recreation of events, profiling of personalities?

Real **PRECISION** in using just the right word? or verbose and vague?  
 Was there **EFFECTIVE EYE CONTACT**? Use of helpful and appropriate **HAND GESTURES**?  
 Was the speaker fun to listen to for the **SOUND & RHYTHM OF HIS/HER VOICE**?  
 Any problems with the **PACING** and **TIMING** of the talk? Awkward pauses?  
 Marred by any unnecessary distractions?

**THE TALK'S MESSAGE/CONTENT. . . . . 20 \_\_\_\_\_**

A **WELL-INFORMED TALK**? Were multiple aspects of the single art work explored? Did speaker use **PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS AND OPINIONS** where appropriate? Ultimately, did speaker get to the heart of what could be said about the chosen subject in the short time allowed or just waste your time with a few miscellaneous observations? Short bibliography of relevant sources submitted in advance?

**STRATEGY OF TALK: ARRANGING WHAT YOU SAID . . 20 \_\_\_\_\_**

Was the talk logically organized, and if so, then by what means? or did it lack a clear game plan and just ramble? obviously thrown together at last minute?  
 Were the observations the talk made persuasively argued?  
 Was there a clear linkage or smooth transition between the different observations made by the speaker?  
 Did (s)he occasionally get off the subject? Unjustifiable digressions?

**SUPPORT FROM VISUAL MATERIALS . . . . . 20 \_\_\_\_\_**

Sharp & full-screen digital image(s)? Faithful color? Any close-up details shown?

**TOTAL: 100 \_\_\_\_\_**

**APPENDIX C****- RUBRIC****RUBRIC [GUIDE SHEET] FOR YOUR "NO-NOTES" TEST ESSAY**

impromptu essay writing is a key job skill

"Know your subject inside & out because you need to sound like an expert with a worthwhile opinion."

**LANGUAGE & WRITING STYLE (HOW WELL YOU EXPRESS YOURSELF) 5 \_\_\_\_\_**

**CLARITY/READABILITY**--i.e., was writing clear, concise? . . . or muddled, awkward, verbose, i.e. **JUST HIGH SCHOOLISH?** Varied sentence structure? Vivid descriptions of works of art when appropriate? Real precision in using just the right word? Is writer confidently using a college-level vocabulary? Essay must sound like student wrote it in his/her own words and is not merely mimicking phrases from sources -- that will immediately trigger a web search for plagiarism.

**WATCH OUT FOR THE FOLLOWING COMMON GRAMMATICAL ERRORS:**

- **VERBOSE, RAMBLING, PADDED, WASTED WORDS**-- tip off student doesn't have much to say and is serving mostly BS
- **"WASHBOARD EFFECT"** (same sentence structure repeated -- essay needs more variation in rhythm)
- **"ECHO CHAMBER EFFECT"** (i.e., annoying/distracting repetition of word or phrase)
- **SENTENCE FRAGMENT** (i.e., not a whole sentence, lacking a subject and/or verb)
- **lack of subject-verb AGREEMENT** (NOT: "I are . . .", "Students is. . .")
- **inconsistent VERB TENSES/unexplained CHANGE OF VOICE** (1st person to 3rd, etc.)
- **incorrect/unclear ANTECEDENT** (referent or pronoun is too imprecise to be sure of the subject)
- **incorrect use of PREPOSITION or POSSESSIVE** (its ≠ it's)("My Adventure to Art")
- **SCATOLOGICAL RHETORIC** foul language, f-bombs, etc

**FORM/STRUCTURE (ORGANIZING & ARRANGING WHAT YOU SAY ) 5 \_\_\_\_\_**

**TOPICAL SENTENCE TO START ESSAY? WAS THERE A SMOOTH FLOW TO THE ESSAY?**, i.e. logical organization/sequencing of essay with proper transition between paragraphs/ideas? or haphazard arrangement of ideas that don't logically relate ("head scratchers")? Sense of "build-up and pay-off" for the reader?--i.e., an **INTRODUCTION** that grab's reader's attention (dramatic, amusing, intriguing, etc.) & prepares reader for what is to come? & a **CONCLUDING SENTENCE** that leaves reader satisfied?

**SUBSTANCE/CONTENT (OBJECTIVE/SUBJECTIVE INFORMATION ACTUALLY SHARED)**

15 \_\_\_\_\_

Dry, boring, or pointless essay? Evidence of personal thinking & absorption of specific information to show full mastery of the material? Skillful visual readings and analyses of specific art works/artifacts? Did writer grapple with the subtleties, nuances, implications of ideas and cause the reader **THINK**? Were personal observations and opinions inserted where appropriate?

**ESSAY TOTAL POINTS 25 \_\_\_\_\_**

Index Card with 1-3 sources \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX D

### - DIRECT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC (TEST SAMPLE)

#### Reading Comprehension/Critical Thinking Test for ARTH 221 (start of Chapt. 10 Hugh Honour & John Fleming, The Visual Arts: A History, 7th. ed rev.) STRICT TIME LIMIT: 20 minutes

The battle of Agincourt occurred while which sculpture was being made? \_\_\_\_\_  
 How long between the executions of Joan of Arc and Savonarola? \_\_\_\_\_ What other noteworthy events occurred in Spain the same year that Columbus embarked for Asia? \_\_\_\_\_

What two benchmark events occurred in 1453, just a year after Leonardo da Vinci was born? \_\_\_\_\_ &

The grey figure in the box of dates comes was painted by which artist in this chapter? \_\_\_\_\_

The English names of these two saints are mentioned in the box? \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_

Quote Petrarch on his late medieval/early Renaissance sensibility: “ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_.”

Alberti ranked which of his contemporaries as worthy successors to the ancients?

(A) \_\_\_\_\_ (B) \_\_\_\_\_ (C) \_\_\_\_\_ (D) \_\_\_\_\_ (E) \_\_\_\_\_

“The humanists found in Classical antiquity \_\_\_\_\_.”

The ideals of chivalry and nobility measured one on the basis of \_\_\_\_\_ whereas the Renaissance valued \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ more.

Italian city-states “epitomized the new ideals of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, civic and mundane, not chivalric or contemplative.”

“Although humanists were not initially \_\_\_\_\_ they were preoccupied by problems of the here and now rather than of the hereafter.”

Florentine art acquired its international prestige in part because of its association with \_\_\_\_\_.

Why the visual comparison between Fig. 10,1 and Fig. 10,3? \_\_\_\_\_

When the space in Fig. 10,1 is described as “tectonic”, what do the authors mean? \_\_\_\_\_

Are “cerebral” churches necessarily unspiritual? \_\_\_\_\_ Why or why not? \_\_\_\_\_

The divinity embodied in Christian churches involves harmonious relationships of parts to the whole as with \_\_\_\_\_.

What did Gianozzo Manetti say about the truths of Christianity? \_\_\_\_\_

To which church is the Pazzi Chapel attached? \_\_\_\_\_

# APPENDIX E

## - RUBRIC

### Graphic Design Sophomore Portfolio Review Form

Fall / Spring / Summer 20\_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_

#### EXECUTION OF ELEMENTS

**PROCESS** 10 (Excellent) 1 (Unacceptable)

Elements/Principles									
Conceptual Ideas									
Control of Processes									

#### AWARENESS & CREATIVITY

**REALIZATION** 10 (Excellent) 1 (Unacceptable)

Visual Organization									
Creativity									
Historical Awareness									
Visual Vocabulary									
Design Process									
Ability for Growth									
Craftsmanship									
Production									
Attention to Details									

#### DIRECTION & PRIDE

**PROFESSIONALISM** 10 (Excellent) 1 (Unacceptable)

Active Listening Skills									
Deadlines									
Verbal Articulation									
Written Articulation									
Participation									
Final Presentations									

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES:

## APPENDIX F

### - DIRECT ASSESMENT RUBRIC (TEST SAMPLE)

#### *Sample of Senior Exit Exam for Painting Emphasis*

1. Paint is made up of
  - a] a pigment and a solution
  - b] a pigment and a binder
  - c] a pigment and a primer
  - d] a pigment and a solvent
  
2. In oil painting, “fat over lean” means
  - a] early stages should be thinned with solvent
  - b] early stages should use more linseed oil
  
3. A layer of color made transparent using a medium is called
  - a] a scumble
  - b] a glaze
  - c] a wash
  - d] a solution
  
4. The wooden frame a canvas is stapled to is called
  - a] a picture frame
  - b] a stretcher
  - c] an armature
  - d] a cradle
  
5. To make such a frame, cut all corners
  - a] with a band saw at a 70 degree angle
  - b] with a jig saw at a 30 degree angle
  - c] with a miter saw at a 45 degree angle
  
6. Circle the **two** types of brush hair used in oil painting
  - a] stiff bristle from Chinese hogs
  - b] soft hair from Chinese hogs
  - c] stiff bristle from Russian weasels
  - d] soft hair from Russian weasels
  
7. The bare canvas is primed with a white acrylic ground called
  - a] alkyd
  - b] gesso
  - c] gel
  - d] modeling paste
  
8. Effective realistic painting compositions are begun by first
  - a] quickly drawing size and placement
  - b] showing value relationships
  - c] using large brushes; details come later
  - d] all of the above
  
9. The three properties of color are
  - a] value, temperature and intensity
  - b] hue, emphasis and harmony
  - c] value, contrast and harmony
  - d] hue, temperature and intensity
  
9. Match the acrylic mediums with their appropriate uses:
 

a] __ gel medium	1] antique or weathered surfaces
b] __liquid gloss medium	2] thick textures
c] __modeling paste	3] translucent impasto effects
d] __crackle paste	4] collage glue, transparent effects
  
10. To create successful poured abstractions with thinned acrylics:
  - a] wet the paper first for any soft effects
  - b] to achieve transparent colors, avoid white
  - c] let paint flow; don't over-manipulate
  - d] all of the above