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**Section I: Progress Since the Most Recent Review**

Below are the goals from Section IV part E of your last Program Review Self-Study. Describe progress or changes made toward meeting each goal over the last year. Responses from the previous year’s Annual Update are included, if there have been no changes to report then no changes to the response are necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GOALS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| **Improvement Goal**  As previously noted, the small size of the Printmaking studio, Room 13-326, dramatically restricts course enrollment and the expansion of the Printmaking curriculum. Acquiring a more appropriately sized Printmaking studio space would resolve these issues and allow students to gain greater experience in fine art Printmaking processes. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | No progress has been made in terms of the Art Department’s request to expand or relocate the Printmaking studio, Room 13-326. The Art Department will continue to include this goal as being highly desirable; however, this request requires Facilities Management approval to move forward.  During the past 10 years, Kelly Joslin has met with two LCS Division Deans, Facilities Management and the previous Provost, Dr. Helen Grove in an attempt to expand the current Printmaking studio space that accommodates 8 to 10 students to accommodate a class size more closely aligned with the Art Department’s other studio art class sizes of 18 to 20 students. This increase would allow the Printmaking course to meet the Art Department’s target average class size of 18 students per course. Kelly will discuss the issue with current LCS Division Dean, Shari Rethman, to see if any progress can be made as a result of other departments transitioning into the new Life & Health Sciences building. |
| **Curriculum Goals**  Expand Printmaking course options by developing a second-level Printmaking course. This would allow the Art Department to include Printmaking as an emphasis within the Associate of Arts, Art (A.A.) degree program. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | Faculty member, Kevin Harris has drafted a preliminary course plan for a second-level Printmaking course. However, the Department has not been able to move forward with its development due to the restricted space issues in the current Printmaking studio, Room 13-326.  The completion of this curriculum goal is contingent upon the acquisition of a larger Printmaking Studio space that will accommodate 18 to 20 students.  ART 2269, Introduction to Printmaking was initially developed with ART 1111, Drawing I and ART 1161, Black & White Darkroom Photography I as prerequisites. During Spring Semester 2014, Kevin Harris initiated the expansion of the prerequisite options to include VIS 1100, Design Basics, VIS 1110, Design Drawing and VIS 1140, Design Processes I to allow Design majors to enroll in ART 2269 and thus, increase the pool of students who may enroll in the course. This change became effective during Summer Semester 2014. |

Below are the Recommendations for Action made by the review team. Describe the progress or changes made toward meeting each recommendation over the last year. Responses from the previous year’s Annual Update are included, if there have been no changes to report then no changes to the response are necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RECOMMENDATIONS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| The possibility of developing an Advisory Committee was explored in the discussion with the department and the Review Team, and the department was clear in its opinion that a traditional Advisory Committee would not be beneficial. However, in its subsequent discussions the Review Team wondered whether there might not be value in developing a committee composed of representatives from four year institutions that our students transfer to that might meet on an annual basis. The benefits could potentially not only include insights from transfer partners regarding how we could better prepare our students for transfer, but having representatives from different institutions in the same room may help some of them see the arrangements we have with others, and might inspire them to make similar changes to articulation agreements that would benefit our students. The department is encouraged to make a careful and thoughtful consideration of the pros and cons of establishing an “Advisory Committee” of this kind. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | Following the Art Department’s formal Department/Program Review and the receipt of the Review Team’s recommendations, the Art Department’s faculty noted they were surprised by the Team’s recommendation to create a formal Advisory Committee for the Department’s A.A., Art degree program. Advisory Committees have long been associated with career track degree programs as a means to connect faculty in technical or career programs with industry and business professionals. Art Department Faculty noted this does not accurately represent the intent or purpose of the Department’s A.A., Art degree which is oriented toward students who intend to transfer to a four-year college, university or standalone art school.  Faculty further noted they maintain close contact with faculty in their disciplines at four-year institutions and standalone art schools to discuss curricular and transfer issues. However, they believe any move toward the creation of the Review Team’s recommended “Advisory Committee” for the A.A., Art degree program would have to be approached and developed carefully with respect for the fact that the degree program is college parallel as opposed to career track.  Faculty further noted the National Association of Schools of Art & Design (NASAD) accreditation, which the Department has earned, sets a high standard for its member institutions and creates more seamless transfer for students between member institutions. NASAD accreditation ensures the Art Department’s faculty, curriculum and facilities meet a standard that is equivalent with that of 4-year colleges, universities and standalone art schools. It is interesting to note that Wright State University, a school to which many of the Art Department’s graduates matriculate, is not a NASAD accredited institution. Glen Cebulash, Chair of Art & Art History at Wright State has confirmed that the Wright State faculty are not interested in pursuing NASAD accreditation.  During the 2014-2015 academic year, faculty revisited the Review Team’s recommendation and continued to express concerns regarding the feasibility of developing an Advisory Committee. It was noted that in addition to the student transfer benefits associated with the Department’s NASAD accreditation, the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) serves as the core of the Department’s A.A., Art degree program. As such, OTM courses are guaranteed to transfer to any of Ohio’s public institutions of higher education. Faculty also cited the fact that the Department’s entry-level studio art courses are approved as Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG) courses. As such, students completing these TAG courses are guaranteed the transfer of applicable credits among Ohio’s public colleges and universities.  With so many defined areas assuring A.A., Art students’ transfer within the State of Ohio as well as the fact that Sinclair students develop strong portfolios that make them desirable as transfer students at four-year institutions, the faculty continue to question the need to develop a formal Advisory Committee. As previously stated, they believe these types of Advisory Committees are more appropriate for technical or career-track degree programs.  After much careful and thoughtful consideration, weighing the pros and cons, the Art Department has determined that an Advisory Committee is not in our best interest. |
| On a related note, the department is strongly encouraged to continue its development of articulation agreements with institutions where they have not had such agreements before. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that these arrangements incentivize completion of the associate degree at Sinclair prior to transfer to the four year institution. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | An articulation agreement with Wright State University was finalized during the 2014 Spring Semester for the Studio Art Baccalaureate (B.F.A.) Completion Program.  The Art Department continues its development of articulation agreements with other institutions. We are currently working with the Art Academy of Cincinnati, Columbus College of Art & Design, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago and The University of Cincinnati to develop articulation agreements.  During the 2014-2015 academic year, the Art Department shared it’s A.A, Art degree program curriculum template with the aforementioned institutions and also provided the institutions’ representatives with contact information for Sinclair’s Manager of Curriculum, Janeil Bernheisel. |
| The department has done an excellent job of building connections with the local community, and these connections have tended to be focused in the area of the Arts. What other connections might be built? Are there area companies that might employ any of our students who opt not to transfer to a four year institution? Are there positions in local business that would provide employment opportunities for Sinclair graduates who do not go on for a bachelor’s degree? What employment opportunities exist for certificate earners that are not currently being promoted to students by the department? We would not want to weaken the transfer component of the department’s offerings, but the department is encouraged to explore other opportunities for its students in business, and be prepared in the next self-study to discuss what opportunities other than transfer have been explored. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | The Review Team’s recommendation is difficult to address because it challenges the basic premise of the A.A., Art degree as a university parallel program that is oriented toward students who intend to transfer to a 4-year college, university or standalone art school. As such, the A.A., Art degree program leads, by transfer, to baccalaureate degree programs that prepare students to become K-12 art educators, working artists and M.F.A. graduate students who wish to teach at the college or university level.  The A.A., Art degree is not a technical or career track program and it is not intended to prepare students to move directly into the job market. Its sole purpose is to prepare students to enter baccalaureate degree programs at 4-year colleges, universities and standalone art schools.  ART 2295, Graduating Portfolio Development & Exhibition capstone course students completing the 2014 Graduating Student Survey listed the following art-related positions they have occupied prior to graduation: Audio Equipment Tester; Contractor; Freelance Artist; Internships, The Dayton Visual Arts Center (DVAC) & The Connecting Art & Design Community Gallery; Yeck Fellowships, The Dayton Art Institute (DAI). Students were also asked to list their present occupations if other than art-related: Meijer Photo Lab Technician; Food Service; Country Club of the North; Dorothy Lane Market; Assistant Manager at Retail Store; Elite Catering; Ulta Salon Hair Stylist.  In contrast to the A.A., Art degree program, The Art Department’s Short-Term Certificate in Photographic Technology is an entrepreneurial program in which students are prepared to operate their own photography studios as a business venture. Students completing the Short-Term Certificate in Photographic Technology are also well prepared to work for local photography studios and photography labs. This information is discussed with students during their program of study and is strongly promoted by the Department’s faculty. This program is distinctly different in intent and purpose from the A.A., Art degree program in that it prepares students to move directly into a career in which they may be gainfully employed. |
| Math courses were mentioned as a challenge for students in the ART transfer degree. The department is strongly encouraged to find ways to address this. One option would be for the department to familiarize itself with the Quantway course (MAT 1340) and evaluate whether they should identify ART students who may need to take this course to prepare themselves for the MAT 1140 OTM course that is required for their degree. The department is encouraged to invest time in taking a hard look at the impact of the math requirement on its students – is there hard data that could be collected that might confirm that there are a substantial number of students who transfer without a degree due to the math requirement? What impact might the Quantway course have on better preparing students to meet the math requirement? Are there other strategies that might be employed to help ART students better succeed in their required OTM math course? The department is encouraged to reach out to the Math department in investigating the issue to get their guidance. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | The Review Team’s recommendation encouraging the Art Department to reach out to the Mathematics Department to investigate the challenges faced by Art majors and to seek the guidance of Mathematics faculty is definitely something the Art Department has already done and is more than willing to continue.  As noted in the Art Department’s 2010-2011 Annual Update, under the quarter system (Summer 2009), the Art Department and Theatre Department partnered with Mathematics Department faculty Kay Cornelius, Marie Stroh and Ed Gallo to collaboratively revise their approach to presenting MAT 102 course content to more readily appeal to Art and Theatre majors who tend to be strong visual learners. It was hoped the faculty members’ efforts would help Art and Theatre majors improve their grasp of important Mathematics concepts and, ultimately, help these students successfully complete the MAT 102 course requirements. The steps involved in this collaboration and pilot efforts are fully documented in the 2010-2011 Annual Update; however relatively low enrollment caused the course to be eliminated as a Mathematics course offering.  The Art Department invited Mathematics faculty, Ed Gallo and Kinga Oliver to attend an Art Department meeting on Friday, January 13, 2012 to present faculty with information regarding the launch of MAT 114, Mathematical Reasoning, which focused on real life applications instead of mathematical formulas. It was believed this course could serve as an alternative path to MAT 108, Math in the Modern World. Art Department faculty were hopeful the new course would be beneficial for Art majors due to its focus on practical application.  Art Department faculty are interested in learning more about ways in which Art majors could move more seamlessly through their Mathematics requirements. The Department will invite representatives from the Mathematics Department to present information regarding the Quantway course and discuss how it may benefit Art majors.  One interesting solution may be to create an “Advisory Committee” composed of Mathematics faculty and faculty from departments such as Art and Theatre whose students struggle with Mathematics.  The Art Department will also investigate the changes being made to the Accuplacer test that now allows students to start with Algebra instead of Arithmetic. Perhaps, this may allow more Art majors to be placed into the appropriate Mathematics course at the start of their studies at Sinclair which may, in turn, increase course completion rates. |
| What outreach might be done for high school students who are planning on going into Art at Sinclair? How can the department let them know what they need to do to prepare before they begin at Sinclair? Does the fact that many districts have cut their Art programs open up any opportunities for dual enrollment options that might make Art instruction available to students in districts where those courses have been dropped? | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | The Art Department engages in regular outreach activities for high school students. Department representatives attend annual career fairs at Centerville High School and West Carrollton High School. Photography Professor, Richard Jurus, serves as a member of the Miami Valley Career Technology Center’s Photography Advisory Board. In this role, he collaborates with Miami Valley CTC teachers to coordinate curriculum and facilitate ease of transfer to Sinclair. Professor Jurus has also worked with Photography teachers at Wayne High School to evaluate their photography equipment and make curricular recommendations for ease of transfer to Sinclair’s Photography program.  The Review Team’s question regarding preparation of high school students prior to attending Sinclair is interesting because completion of art courses at the K-12 level is not a prerequisite for success in Art courses at the college level. Instructional approaches at the K-12 level and college level differ dramatically.  Students attending schools such as Stivers School for the Arts and other high schools with strong K-12 art programs are not necessarily better prepared to enter college-level art courses than students who have received little or no experience with art in the K-12 setting.  The Review Team’s question regarding “opportunities for dual enrollment options that might make Art instruction available to students in districts where those courses have been dropped” further underscores the distinctions between K-12 art education and college instruction. As increasing numbers of K-12 art educators apply to teach college-level studio art courses as part of College Credit Plus (CCP) in their local high schools, these instructors are often surprised to learn that their Master of Arts (M.A.) in Art Education does not serve as an appropriate credential for college-level instruction. The M.A. in Art Education provides the K-12 art educator with a very broad education in a variety of disciplines. This makes perfect sense for an instructor teaching in a local high school who must provide students with a basic introduction to a variety of art mediums. However, college- and university-level faculty are required to hold a Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) degree in a specific disciplines. The depth of knowledge required to earn an M.F.A. degree in a specific discipline far outweighs the general knowledge required to earn an M.A. degree in Art Education. As such, the M.A. degree in Art Education is not accepted as an appropriate credential for college-level studio art instruction.  However, it should be noted that the K-12 Gallery for Young People, a non-profit art center located in the City of Dayton, does engage in outreach art education programs for schools that have dropped art education from their curriculum. Sinclair A.A., Art graduates are often employed by K-12 Gallery to teach on-site art education courses and off-site courses at area schools. |
| Should embedded short-term certificates be developed within the Art transfer degree to give students exposure to some of the different areas within Art? The department is encouraged to explore what opportunities there might be for embedded certificates to be developed within the transfer degree. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | The Art Department initially offered 4 Short-Term Certificate programs – Arts Administration, Basic Drawing, Ceramics & Sculpture Technology, Photographic Technology.  Following the Department’s formal Department/Program Review in 2007, 2 Short-Term Certificates – Arts Administration, Ceramics & Sculpture Technology - were deactivated in response to the Review Team’s recommendation that the Department consider deactivating these programs due to historically low completion rates. During FY 07-08, 1 student completed the Ceramics & Sculpture Technology Short-Term Certificate Program prior to deactivation. During FY 08-09, 1 student completed the Arts Administration Short-Term Certificate Program following the program’s deactivation.  The Art Department currently has 2 remaining Short-Term Certificate programs – Basic Drawing (9 hours) and Photographic Technology (29 hours). The Basic Drawing Short-Term Certificate is, essentially, embedded in the A.A., Art degree program for students who opt to pursue the Drawing emphasis. While not a truly embedded Short-Term Certificate program, students completing the Photographic Technology program often opt to return to complete the remaining requirements for the A.A., Art degree.  Of the Art Department’s two remaining Short-Term Certificate programs, Photographic Technology has the higher completion rate with a total of 10 completers during FY 12-13 and FY 13-14. Prior to the transition to semesters, the Photographic Technology Short-Term Certificate had 47 completers between FY 07-08 and FY 11-12.  In contrast, the Basic Drawing Short-Term Certificate had a much lower completion rate totaling 4 completers during FY 12-13 and FY 13-14. Prior to the transition to semesters, the Basic Drawing Short-Term Certificate had 21 completers between FY 07-08 and FY 11-12.  In view of the low completion rates for the Arts Administration and the Ceramics & Sculpture Technology Short-Term Certificate Programs and the subsequent deactivation of these programs, the Review Committee’s recommendation to explore the creation of embedded certificate programs within the A.A., Art degree program may not be truly feasible.  In response to the Review Team’s recommendation to explore embedded certificate programs as a means to “give students exposure to some of the different areas within Art,” it should be noted that students completing the A.A., Art degree do receive this exposure during the course of their studies. Students wishing to pursue a 2-D emphasis (Drawing, Painting, Photography) must complete 3-D elective courses (Ceramics, Sculpture). Likewise, students wishing to pursue 3-D emphasis must complete 2-D elective courses. Doing so ensures students receive a well-rounded exposure to a wide variety of art media and disciplines. |
| It doesn’t appear that the department needs to engage in more assessment – however, as the department itself said, it does need to capture and “formalize” the assessment work that is already being done. Can rubrics from different faculty be aggregated to provide an overall picture of how well students are meeting general education outcomes in the department? Are the portfolio review and skill testing exercises being aggregated across different sections of the same course to provide a high-level snapshot of how well students are meeting program outcomes? What steps can be taken to better aggregate and summarize data – both to show where improvements can be made and also to document areas where the department is doing a stellar job of helping its graduates meet program outcomes. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | The Art Department’s ART 2295, Graduation Portfolio Development & Exhibition capstone course serves as a valuable means by which to capture and formalize the assessment work that is already being done within the Department. Faculty have developed a rubric for assessing the capstone course and the data gleaned can be sued to show how graduating students are meeting program outcomes.  Data focusing on Overall Department Success Rates during FY 12-13, FY 13-14 and FY 14-15 show increases in the Art Department’s student success rates. FY 12-13 shows a success rate of 74.3%, FY 13-14 shows an increased success rate of 75.4% and FY 14-15 shows a further increased success rate of 75.9%. These success rates continue to exceed the success rates of the LCS Division (FY 12-13: 66.0%, FY 13-14: 69.2%, FY 14-15: 69.7%) and overall College (FY 12-13: 66.7%, FY 13-14 69.2%, FY 14-15: 69.8%). For FY 14-15, Art Department student success rates are 6.2% higher than the LCS Division and 6.1% higher than the overall College. The data indicate the Art Department continues to improve instruction as a means to encourage student success.  Faculty will continue to discuss ways in which they can formalize the assessment work that is being done in the Art Department. |
| The Review Team noted that while the department overall tends to have high success rates, there are specific courses that appear to have lower rates of success, particularly the Art History courses where success rates in FY 2012-13 were in the 60-69% range (ART 2235 and ART 2236). While these success rates are not catastrophic, these are presumably courses that would be taken by non-majors. It is recommended that the department carefully review course success rates, identify courses where there is room for improvement, thoughtfully develop and implement plans to increase success in these courses, and document any changes in success rates. What information might inform these efforts? Are there changes in pedagogy that might have an impact? The department is encouraged to extensively explore what might be done to increase success in some of its courses. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | Art Department faculty are keenly aware of their courses’ success rates and continue to revise and refine curriculum. As noted in the Art Department’s Self-Study, the transition from quarters to semesters resulted in the creation of new or combined courses. Faculty realized further revisions and refinements would be necessary to ensure student success. As a result, success rates are examined and faculty work to make necessary changes to the curriculum to ensure increased student success. As noted earlier in the interpretation and analysis of the Course Success Trend Data, the overall Department success rates clearly indicate this fact as do the positive increases in success rates.  While student success rates dropped for ART 2235, History of Photography and ART 2236, History of Women Artists following the transition to semesters, improvement is evident for both courses during FY 13-14.  As noted in the Review Team’s comments, during FY 12-13, ART 2235 showed a success rate of 66.3%, FY 13-14 showed marked improvement with a success rate of 75.4%. During FY 12-13, ART 2236 showed a success rate of 69.9%, FY 13-14 showed an increased success rate of 70.9%. While not as dramatic of an increase as that shown for ART 2235, the increase in success for ART 2236 exceeds the overall success rate for the LCS Division and the College.  As previously noted, data focusing on Overall Department Success Rates during FY 12-13, FY 13-14 and FY 14-15 show increases in the Art Department’s student success rates. FY 12-13 shows a success rate of 74.3%, FY 13-14 shows an increased success rate of 75.4% and FY 14-15 shows a further increased success rate of 75.9%. These success rates continue to exceed the success rates of the LCS Division (FY 12-13: 66.0%, FY 13-14: 69.2%, FY 14-15: 69.7%) and overall College (FY 12-13: 66.7%, FY 13-14 69.2%, FY 14-15: 69.8%). For FY 14-15, Art Department student success rates are 6.2% higher than the LCS Division and 6.1% higher than the overall College. The data indicate the Art Department continues to improve instruction as a means to encourage student success.  Faculty will continue to analyze course success data with a focus on courses with lower success rates to ensure corrections are made to ensure higher levels of student success.  Although Art History courses are standardized in terms of content, the use of a common assessment tool to directly measure and compare students’ achievement of course outcomes across course sections would provide faculty with information that could be used to increase student success. Under the quarter system, Art History faculty developed pre-test/post-test assessment tools focusing on desired course outcomes. Faculty could easily reinstate these assessment tools. |
| Regarding the tracking of transfer students from the department, the department is strongly encouraged to contact Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR) to discuss how National Student Clearinghouse data might be used to track students who transfer from its programs, both with and without graduating. Social media may also present another avenue for tracking students once they leave the Art programs. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | **How Transfer/Placement Data is Collected:**  **Graduating Student Survey**  The bulk of the Art Department’s official tracking is obtained via the annual Graduating Student Survey administered to students completing the ART 2295, Graduation Portfolio Development & Exhibition capstone course.  The survey tool was developed by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) and is administered at the end of Spring Semester to all students enrolled in the ART 2295, Graduation Portfolio Development & Exhibition capstone course. The data is compiled into a formal report and maintained by the Art Department for faculty review and NASAD reaccreditation purposes.  The Graduating Student Survey allows students to self-report plans to enroll in a Bachelor’s degree program and identify the institution to which they plan to transfer. The surveys provide the Art Department with important information regarding students’ intended degree programs, institutions and expected graduation year.  As part of the final formal presentation process, graduating students present a select body of work in a formal gallery exhibition and a defense of their work to the Art Department Chair, faculty co-teaching ART 2295 and the student’s faculty advisor. At this point, the students are asked to discuss their future plans for continuing their studies at the Baccalaureate level, identifying their intended institution and program of study. Students are strongly encouraged to maintain contact with the Art Department following graduation regarding their academic/career progress.  **Art Organizations/Exhibitions**  Art Department faculty maintain memberships and leadership roles in a number of area art organizations. Through this participation, faculty maintain close ties with many Sinclair graduates and have direct knowledge of these students’ roles within the organizations.  The Dayton Society of Painters & Sculptors (DSPS) provides the Art Department with rich information regarding many Art Department graduates. Some Sinclair graduates serve as board members and others participate actively as members of the organization’s many committees. The work and accomplishments of many Art Department graduates are featured in the organization’s numerous exhibitions annually. Graduates also exhibit work locally at the Dayton Visual Arts Center (DVAC), Rosewood Gallery and a variety of alternative gallery spaces.  **Social Media**  Many Art Department faculty participate actively in social media venues such as Facebook. Social media provides the Art Department with relevant, up-to-date information regarding graduates and the progression of their academic studies/careers.  Faculty recently created a compilation of student graduates:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Student** | **Transfer Institution(s)** | **Career/Activities** | | **Nicholaus Arnold** | Wright State University, B.F.A.; Syracuse University, M.F.A. | SCC Adjunct; Founder/Director  Blue House Gallery | | **Kristin Bailey** | Wright State University | Decoy Art Gallery - private art instructor | | **Justin Behnkin** | Bowling Green University, B.F.A. |  | | **Joel Bengson** | Ohio University, B.F.A. |  | | **Bethany Booth** | Ohio State University | Art teacher - Northmont City Schools | | **Olivia Sue Bowman** | University of Dayton, Art History | U.D. Cline Fellow based on Sinclair work | | **Jennifer Bristol** | Wheaton College,  B.A., Art  Miami University, M.F.A., Painting | SCC Adjunct | | **Richard Cable** |  | Art published in: *Heavy Metal* issue 259;  *Pin-Up Perfection*, Halloween and Christmas  issues 2013; *Delicious Dolls*, May 2014;  *Atomic Bombshell*, Halloween & Christmas issues 2014 | | **Tricia Calvert** | Wright State University, B.F.A.; Masters Program, Antioch University Mid-West, | Writing/Glass art | | **Nikolea Cole** | Wright State University, B.F.A. |  | | **Andrew Combs** | Wright State University |  | | **Tristan Cupp** |  | Artistic Director, Zoot Theatre Company | | **Annica Damico** | Columbus College of Art & Design, B.F.A. |  | | **Rhonda Duncalf** | Wright State University, B.F.A. |  | | **Tina Eisenhart** |  | President, The Dayton Society of Painters and Sculptors | | **Sheree Emmons** | The Art Academy of Cincinnati |  | | **Nicole Fiely** | Wright State University, B.F.A. | Art Instructor - K 12 Gallery and Rosewood Art Center | | **Heidi Foote** | University of Cincinnati |  | | **Sara Fleenor** | Miami University, B.F.A. |  | | **Atalie Gagnet** | Art Institute of Chicago, B.F.A. | Brim - design/marketing; muralist | | **Janyce Denise Glasper** | University of Pennsylvania |  | | **Joanna Hammer** | Ohio State University, B.F.A. | Patron Services, Wexner Center  for the Arts Columbus | | **Ben Hobbs** | Rhode Island School of Design, B.F.A. | SCC Adjunct | | **Greg Holston** | Ohio State University, B.F.A. | Professional commercial photographer;  Adjunct SCC | | **Travis Hotaling** | Wright State University | Art instruction at Wine & Canvas | | **Brent Hutchins** | College of Charleston, B.F.A. |  | | **Heather Johnston Wright** | Bowling Green University, B.F.A. 2D/Painting | Admissions Advisor Westwood College,  Denver - Visual Marketing | | **Sydney Joslin-Knapp** | Ohio University | B.F.A., Photography | | **Alexandra Keenin-Krilvich** | Ohio State University - forensic art/anthropology |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Ben Keirn** | Ringling College of Art/ M.F.A. Cal State Univ - Northridge | Colorist for Grimmy Inc, Funnies Extra;  One Canoe studio | | **Mary Anne Kirk** | Ohio State University; Wright State University |  | | **Jamie Kivisto** | University of Cincinnati |  | | **Morgan Laurens** | Columbus College of Art and Design |  | | **Megan Lockhart** | School of the Art Institute of Chicago, B.F.A.; Ohio State University, Masters Degree |  | | **Loren Lorenzo** | School of the Art Institute of Chicago | x-ACT Gallery; Art Instruction | | **John Mengerink** | The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, B.F.A. |  | | **Zachary Moore** | University of Cincinnati |  | | **James Murphy** | Northern Kentucky University, B.F.A. |  | | **Arend Neyhouse** | Savannah College of Art and Design |  | | **Marci Peters** | Ringling College of Art, B.F.A. |  | | **Tracey Pennell** | The Art Academy of Cincinnati |  | | **Maggie Reckers (McCollum)** |  | Live painting/performance artist - Abandon With Cardboard | | **Carlos Roa** | Columbus College of Art & Design, B.F.A. | Owner, Roa Studio-Gallery Graphics | | **Nichole Smith** | Wright State University, B.A. program |  | | **Tamiko Stump** | School of the Art Institute of Chicago, B.F.A./ New York Academy of Art, M.F.A. | Adjunct SCC | | **Sarah Tangeman (Fugate)** | Savannah College of Art and Design; M.A. Syracuse University, Florence Italy |  | | **Rebecca Tsaloff** | Wright State University, B.F.A.; Antioch University, M.B.A. | Multi-media Designer - Dayton Art Institute | | **Emma Williams** | Art Academy of Cincinnati, B.F.A. | Artist and Independent Photographer | | **Alexandra Wood** | Wright State University | Art instruction at Barstools and Brushstrokes |   Per the Review Team’s recommendation, the Art Department will also seek assistance from Research, Analytics and Reporting (RAR) to discuss how National Student Clearinghouse data may be used to further track students who transfer from its programs, both with and without graduating. |
| The new Learning Management System that the college will be moving to in Summer 2015 will have an ePortfolio component – the department is strongly encouraged to explore how this might be of benefit to their students. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | Art Department faculty are currently completing eLearn training in preparation for conversion to the new Learning Management System during Summer 2015. As suggested by the Review Team, faculty will explore the ways in which the ePortfolio component may benefit Art students. |
| The department mentioned space challenges in the self-study – is the allocation of space in the department aligned with student demand? What shifting of space utilization might be done to better accommodate the needs of students? The department is encouraged to work with the campus Manager of Space Analysis to explore how its needs might be better met given the existing space constraints. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | Historically, the Art Department has worked to address space utilization issues to better accommodate the needs of students. Meetings have taken place between the Art Department Chair, the LCS Division Dean, The Director of Facilities Management and the campus Manager of Space Analysis to explore how the Department’s needs might be better met given existing space constraints.  As noted in Section II: Progress Since the Most Recent Review, the Department’s greatest space-related challenge exists in the Printmaking studio, Room 13-326. No progress has been made to expand or relocate the Printmaking studio. The Art Department will continue to include this goal as being highly desirable; however, this request involves Facilities Management approval to move forward. |

**Section II: Assessment of General Education & Degree Program Outcomes**

The Program Outcomes for the degrees are listed below. **All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year**.

**PLEASE NOTE – FOR THE PREVIOUS YEAR AND THIS YEAR, REPORTING OF GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN TEMPORARILY POSTPONED. WE WOULD ASK THAT IN THIS ANNUAL UPDATE YOU IDENTIFY AT LEAST ONE COURSE IN YOUR DEGREE PROGRAM(S) WHERE ASSESSEMENT AT THE MASTERY LEVEL WILL OCCUR FOR THE FOLLOWING GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME:**

* **Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship: Apply knowledge of cultural diversity to real world context by acknowledging, understanding, and engaging constructively within the contemporary world.**

**PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

**Do you have a required course in your program curriculum where Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship could be assessed for mastery?**

**Yes No If yes, please list the course: ART 2230, Art History: Ancient Through Medieval Periods**

**If no, is there an elective course that is listed on your Preferred Program Pathway Template where Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship could be assessed for mastery?**

**Yes No If yes, please list the course:** Click here to enter text.

**If no, is there another elective course that is an option in your program curriculum where Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship could be assessed for mastery?**

**Yes No If yes, please list the course:** Click here to enter text.

**If no, where do students master Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship in your program? Do you need assistance incorporating this General Education outcome into your degree program?**

Click here to enter text.

**NOTE THAT THERE WILL NEED TO BE AT LEAST ONE EXAM / ASSIGNMENT / ACTIVITY IN THIS COURSE THAT CAN BE USED TO ASSESS MASTERY OF THE COMPETENCY.**

Students completing ART 2230, Art History: Ancient Through Medieval Periods are exposed to cultural diversity and global issues. Not only do students learn to interpret specific works of art, but, more importantly, they gain an understanding of the diverse cultures from which the works of art evolved. Students complete three exams that may be used to assess their mastery of the Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship competency.

**YOU MAY ALSO SUBMIT ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THIS GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCY IF YOU HAVE THEM, BUT IT WILL BE CONSIDERED OPTIONAL**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| Demonstrate a working knowledge of art and history of art. | ART 2230, 2231,  2235,  2236,  2237,  2238 | 2006-07 | Pre-Test & Post Test | During Fall Quarter 2006, Department Chair, Kelly Joslin, and Art History/Art Appreciation faculty members, Kay Koeninger and Nancy Mitchell created Pre- and Post-Test Assessment Tools for the department’s Art History survey courses—ART 231, Art of the Ancient World; ART 232, Art of the Medieval & Renaissance Worlds; ART 233, Art of the Modern World. The Pre- and Post-Test Assessment tools would help the Art Department determine whether or not students were demonstrating a working knowledge of art and the history of art at the conclusion of their course of study.  During Winter Quarter 2007 and Spring Quarter 2007, Pre- and Post-Test Assessment Tools were administered to students enrolled in Art History survey courses—ART 231, Art of the Ancient World; ART 232, Art of the Medieval & Renaissance Worlds; ART 233, Art of the Modern World.  During Fall Quarter 2007, Pre- and Post-Test Assessment Tools for each Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter Art History survey course were individually scored. The resulting scores were then combined to obtain aggregate scores for each course. Aggregate scores were converted to percentages. These percentages were then compared to determine if Post-Test scores were higher than Pre-Test scores. Analysis of the data revealed the following:  WINTER QUARTER 2007  ART 231:  Pre-Test Aggregate Score: 48% Post-Test Aggregate: 69%  Difference: 21%  ART 232:  Pre-Test Aggregate Score: 39% Post-Test Aggregate: 69%  Difference: 30%  ART 233:  Pre-Test Aggregate Score: 41% Post-Test Aggregate: 62%  Difference: 21%  SPRING QUARTER 2007  ART 231:  Pre-Test Aggregate Score: 56% Post-Test Aggregate: 78%  Difference: 22%  ART 232:  Pre-Test Aggregate Score: 55% Post-Test Aggregate: 57%  Difference: 2%    NOTE: 3 students failed to complete the second side of the Post-Test Assessment Tool.  ART 233:  Pre-Test Aggregate Score: 46% Post-Test Aggregate: 80%  Difference: 34%  In all cases, the Post-Test Aggregate percentages are higher than the Pre-Test Aggregate percentages. This suggests students are making gains in terms of their knowledge of Art and Art History during the course of their Art History studies. |
| Solve visual and technical problems in several media and promote the development of good craftsmanship through evaluations within each class/studio based on the student's own work. | ART 1101, 1102, 1106, 1111, 1112,1121, 1122, 1131,  1132,1133, 1161,1162,1170,1171,2111,2141, 2142,2217,2217,2221,2222,2265,2266,2269 | 2011-2012 (ongoing) | Written assessment & portfolio review | Assessment administered to ART 162, Photography II (ART 1162, Black & White Darkroom II) students at the start of the term to determine comprehension of requisites skills and knowledge gained as a result of successful completion of ART 161, Photography I (ART 1161, Black & White Darkroom Photography I).  Portfolio review conducted at the end of the term used to determine if students have utilized requisite skills and knowledge gained in ART 161 (ART 1161) and expanded on these skills in the creation of a formal portfolio of their fine art photographic prints.  Results:  It became apparent a number of students had not mastered the use of a gray card, did not understand how to properly use a grain focuser, and failed to comprehend the formal elements associated with the composition of fine art photographic prints.  Faculty member, Richard Jurus, used the information gleaned from the assessment and formal portfolio review to more closely mentor ART 161 (ART 1161) Adjunct Faculty to ensure they consistently provide students with requisite course content.  During Fall Semester 2012, Richard opted to teach ART 1161 as a means to better assess students' abilities. During Spring Semester 2012, Richard will compare the assessment results and portfolios of his current ART 1161 students with those who completed the course with Adjunct Faculty members. It is hoped this will allow him to provide Adjunct faculty with even greater resources to ensure student success. |
| Use the critique process for presenting and developing fine art portfolios and Electives exhibitions in a professional manner. | ART 1101, 1102, 1106, 1111, 1112,1121, 1122, 1131, 1132, 1133,  1161,1162,1170,1171,2111,2141, 2142,2217,2217,2221,2222,2265,2266, 2269 , 2295 | 2009-2010 | Artist's Goals Surveys - Pre and Post | Faculty member, Bridgette Bogle, administeres an Artist's Goals Survey to ART 195, Portfolio Development in Fine Arts students at the start of the term and an identical Artist's Goals survey at the end of the term. The survey consists of open-ended questions that allows students to self-report.  Based on her earlier assessments and student feedback, Bridgette determined it would be beneficial to provide ART 195 students with more concrete examples of actual portfolios as well artist’s statements – both good and bad. Providing these examples in an electronic format has helped students gain a clearer understanding of how to write a cogent artist’s statement and develop a quality portfolio of their artwork.  The evidence of this fact is further demonstrated when the students enroll in the final ART 295, Pre-graduation Exhibition course where they must provide an artist’s statement and select a cohesive body of work for exhibition. |
| Demonstrate the use of basic artistic vocabulary and visual literacy. | ART  1110,  2230, 2231,  2235,  2236,  2237,  2238  ART 1101, 1102, 1106, 1111, 1112,1121, 1122, 1131, 1132,1133,  1161,1162,1170,1171,2111,2141, 2142,2217,2217,2221,2222,2265, 2266, 2269 , 2295, 2270 | 2011-2012 (ongoing)  2014 | Written assessment & portfolio review  ART 1110, Pre-Test/Post-Test Assessment | See discussion above regarding ART 161 (ART 1161).  Beginning Spring Semester 2014 and continuing through Summer Semester 2014 and Fall Semester 2014 four course sections of ART 1110 – 2 face-to-face and 2 online – taught by Kelly Joslin were administered Pre-Test and Post-Test Assessments focusing on the following Course Outcomes:   1. **Themes & Purposes of Art:** Describe and discuss the various themes and purposes of art, as well as the motivation for art. 2. **Organizing Principles of Art:** Explain the organizing principles of art. 3. **Iconography:** Describe and discuss how iconography (of various cultures and historical periods) is used in art. 4. **Various Art Media:** Recognize and differentiate various art media used throughout history and describe the steps in the creation of a work of art.   Data is being formally analyzed; however, initial comparison of Pre-Test and Post-Test scores indicates improvement in student success. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?** |  |
| **How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?** |  |