

Fall 2018
Core Curriculum Assessment Report

of

Values

from the

Fine Arts

Core Curricular Area



submitted by

Stacy Pendergraft

on behalf of the

Fine Arts

Core Area Assessment Committee

Methods

How was student work (artifacts) collected for assessment?

Artifacts were collected across most sections of each discipline's core course (ARHA, MCOM, MUHL, THEA). The CAAC member from a specific discipline worked with his or her core faculty to select the most appropriate artifact for the value being assessed. Artifacts were collected from face-to-face and online modalities. No concurrent enrollment was determined for the assessment period.

What type of artifacts were collected?

Each discipline determined the most appropriate content to assess. Artifacts were gathered from common assignments in both Mass Communication and Visual Arts. In Theatre Arts and Dance, faculty submitted artifacts from varied assignments. In Mass Communication, answers were extracted from quizzes; in Visual Arts reflection papers from a gallery experience were collected; and in Theatre & Dance both reflection papers and online Discussion answers related to a production viewing served as the artifact. Each discipline maintained its own files of artifacts and assessed materials within its area.

How were the artifacts sampled for assessment?

Mass Communication sampled all artifacts from all face-to-face sections offered. Visual Arts collected 3 artifacts per student for students #2, #5, and #9 on each instructor's roster. Theatre Arts and Dance gathered a single artifact from odd numbered students on course rosters in 3 of 4 courses for the spring 2017 semester. Artifacts were sampled from both online and face-to-face modalities.

How were the artifacts scored?

All three disciplines found it necessary to create individual rubrics to accurately assess the area of Values. Each academic area decided to assess for Values 1 in different ways. Visual Arts utilized a 4-point scale, while Theatre Arts and Dance used a 2-point scale that expressed presence or absence of plagiarism. Mass Communication did not assess Values 1.

For Values 2, Mass Communication utilized a 4-point scale developed to assess test questions related to the use of film in varied cultural contexts and its role in the formation of societal and cultural norms. Both Visual Arts and Theatre & Dance used a 2 point scale that assessed attendance at arts events.

For Values 3, Global and Cultural Understanding, all areas assessed artifacts utilizing individualized rubrics as well as 4-point scales.

In the cases of Mass Communication and Theatre Arts & Dance, artifacts were scored by two tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching in the content area. Visual Arts artifacts were assessed by one tenure-track faculty member. Team members then submitted findings to the CAAC report preparer who compiled both narrative feedback and data.

How was reliability in scoring determined and ensured?

Prior to the assessment period, committee members from all four areas met to discuss how best to interpret the Goal: Values for each discipline. The CAAC determined that an individualized approach was most effective in truly assessing Values for each area. In order to insure reliability, each discipline determined its own internal process, involving other faculty members in the discipline. For both Mass Communication and Theatre Arts & Dance there were two internal reviewers. Visual Arts only utilized a single reviewer.

Reflection

In what areas are students doing well?

For those students in disciplines for which civic engagement is measured by attending a live performance or exhibition, we found almost complete participation in this requirement for the students assessed. Additionally, in the areas for which timely, ethically-produced artifacts were required, we found no significant areas for address. Mass Communication reported adequacy in students meeting the criteria for Values 3.

What areas need attention to improve student outcomes?

A greater focus on elements of film related to global understanding, rather than a more minor one, might lead to superior performance in this category. Students demonstrated some difficulty in their ability to adhere to the assignment's criteria in the case of reflection papers. There was also inconsistency in the awareness of how artistic artifacts related to a greater global and cultural context.

Continuous Improvement

What changes in the curricular area and/or courses will be made to improve student learning?

The CAAC in Fine / Performing Arts is not prepared to offer specifics related to this question. Now that the cycle of assessment for all goals has been completed, CAAC team members agreed that a broader look at each core Goal is needed at the department level in order to consider retooling methods for improving student learning.

What changes in the curricular area and/or courses will be made in the assessment process (i.e. different artifacts, common assignments, different time in the semester to collect artifacts, etc.)?

A few primary discussion points at this time are: considering that all courses in a discipline are assessed rather than a single course in each modality; specifying clearer guidelines and focus for reflection papers as well as streamlining artifacts; and always striving towards greater reliability.

Feedback

What changes are recommended for Core assessment?

None at this time.

Comments

Other comments?

None at this time.

END OF REPORT