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The Program Mission: The mission of the BA in Studio Art program is to support the Art Division’s mission to become the cultural artistic training and information center for the Texoma region by providing:

- Guidance and instruction leading to entrance in the professional fields of art education and studio art.
- Programs of study which develop skills and that promote professional values for career preparation.
- Cultural opportunities for life-long learning and aesthetic experience.
- Focused support of and innovation in general education and aesthetic awareness classes.

Those aspects of the mission most appropriate for the purview of this report concern bullets one and two. Goals and learning outcomes for the program directly relate to the mission of professional and career preparation.
Goals and Learning Outcomes

I. Apply knowledge and understanding of creative and ethical communication, visualization, illustration, and computer technology
   Outcomes
   1. Students will be able to demonstrate successful communication skills, visual, oral, and written.
   2. Acquire knowledge of management principles, ethics, and practices as they relate to electronic media, including the Internet.

II. Broaden their understanding of the nature of art and creative communication within the process of design
   Outcomes
   1. Students will be able to develop computer graphic and multimedia productions that effectively apply basic design principles.
   2. Put into practice contemporary design principles of interactive graphic and communication multimedia to create graphic applications.
   3. Students will be able to organize and present a graphic portfolio and exhibition in a professional manner.

III. Acquire knowledge of electronic publishing devices to create media products and presentations
   Outcomes
   1. Students will broaden their understanding of computer graphic applications including hardware and software.
   2. Students will evaluate, select, and maintain hardware and software
   3. Students will employ a variety of hardware and software to capture, digitalize, and edit audio, video, and graphic files used in graphic and multimedia applications.

Types of Assessment

1. Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric
   The holistic course rubric enables faculty to isolate and describe the primary traits of high level art productions and to use the numeric scale based upon that rubric to evaluate student work against an objective model. It is superior to class grades as an assessment tool in that it assesses student work against an objective external standard rather than a relative standard based upon the requirements of the class project or learning level of the student (class grades). This rubric is used consistently as a classroom tool for evaluation of individual projects, as a benchmark for the evaluation of growth within a particular class, and as an assessment tool at the mid-level and senior portfolio review.

2. Embedded Course pre-and-post assessment instruments
   In November 2008, Dr. Gleny Beach attended a workshop entitled “Using Embedded Assessment to Improve Student Learning and Teaching Effectiveness” at Oklahoma City University with assessment professional Dr. Larry H. Kelly. Following the sharing of this
information with the art faculty, all of the faculty agreed to begin the process of creating embedded assessments classes required by a major program. The following plan was then created:

- Review syllabi for measurable, results-oriented course objectives and/or student learning outcomes. (Fall 2008)
- Identify core competencies/skills covered by the target courses (Fall 2008)
- Identify existing measures (tests, case projects, practical applications, etc.) in which assessment activities could be conducted. (Fall 2008)
- Select 1-2 classes to implement existing or newly created assessments in which data would be tracked for each semester. using either pre-post or portfolio rubric and begin collecting data regularly (Spring 2009)
- Target the Core Classes (listed in #2 above) as the first classes (Spring 2009)
- Add embedded assessment for 1-2 classes each semester following

To date, the following courses have implemented this process and the first data has been collected: ART 1213 Drawing I, ART 1413 Ceramics I, ART 2013 2-D Design, ART 2013 Art and World Cultures, ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism, and ART 3123 Color Theory. These results are included in this report.

3. **Mid-level Assessment**

   This assessment will be an average of all embedded assessment evaluations for the core of art classes required of all program majors: ART 1213 Drawing I, ART 2013 2-D Design, art 2023 3-D Design, ART 2313 Painting I, ART 2333 Computer Graphics I. Because the embedded assessment approach was first adopted half-way through the fall 2008 semester and embedded assessment data was not yet available, an averaging of final grades will be used for this report. As future embedded assessment data is gathered, the Mid-Level Assessment will rely on averaging of final grades in core classes.

4. **Final Grades**

5. **Senior Portfolio Review**

   During the Senior Portfolio Review, faculty review students' visual portfolios, as in the description of the Mid Level Portfolio Review. In addition, students make a public presentation of their work which is evaluated by the combined faculty using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning. A formal written artist's statement and an appropriate Personal Career Plan are also evaluated by the faculty.

6. **Senior Exhibition Critique**

   The realization of a senior show is an important real world application of the goals of the Studio Art program. The senior show of each student is evaluated by the combined faculty and by visiting guest curators. The addition of critical voices outside the University is doubly providential, not only for the students being assessed, but also for the program. It provides an opportunity for assessment of the quality of the program from external "art world" consultants.
Given during the Senior Portfolio Review, students complete the Art History, Design and Studio Art categories. This national assessment tool provides an external context for assessing the effectiveness of the Studio Program in achieving its academic goals.

**Quantitative and Qualitative**

Assessments #is basically quantitative. The nature of the creative process is such that assessments of goals, outcomes and quality is ultimately subjective (although effective rubrics can mitigate against this somewhat). The aesthetic element in the Arts can only be assessed in this manner.

All other assessments are basically qualitative (some embedded assessments are quantitative with a qualitative element within a pre-post assessment tool. These assessments allow for effective assessment of the mastery of academic curriculum.

**Summary and Analysis of Assessment Data**

```
GOAL ONE: Apply knowledge and understanding of creative and ethical communication, visualization, illustration, and computer technology
Outcomes:
1. Students will demonstrate successful communication skills, visual, oral, and written.

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric
   ART 1213 Drawing I (Research Paper Rubric Assessment with Grade)
      Fall 2008 No assessment
      Spring 2009 Average Rubric Rating: 3.7 (16 assessed)
   ART 2903 Digital Imaging I (18 assessed)
      Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0
      Spring 2009, Course not taught
      Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010
   ART 2333 Computer Graphics I (18 assessed)
      Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0
      Spring 2009, Course not taught
      Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010
   ART History and Theory of Design
      Course not taught during this reporting period; Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)
These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.
```
Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique
The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.

Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.8 (10 assessed)
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.3 (8 assessed)

2. Students will acquire knowledge of management principles, ethics, and practices as they relate to electronic media, including the Internet.

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric
ART 2903 Digital Imaging I
Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (18 assessed)
Spring 2009, Course not taught
Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010

ART 2333 Computer Graphics I
Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (18 assessed)
Spring 2009, Course not taught
Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010

ART 3903 Digital Imaging II
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.0, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (8 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011

ART 3333 Computer Graphics II
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.2, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (11 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011

ART 2223 Web Page Design I
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (19 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011

ART 3803 Web Page Design II
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (5 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011

COMM Media Law and Ethics
Seeking cooperation from Communication faculty to develop embedded assessment

Analysis of Assessment / Goal One:
At the end of the each semester the full art faculty meet together to discuss and review assessment data and to make plans for the next semester. The Graphic Design and Visual Media
degree has been a positive addition to the Art Department programs. However, since it was taken on as an art program from a collaborative degree program from 3 different departments, it has been a substantial accomplishment to just get needed graphic content courses created, approved and in a rotating schedule to be taught. Jack Ousey has the sole responsibility for all the graphic software-based courses. Supporting design classes are taught by other faculty. This has made it very difficult to create assessments while working to create substantive coursework in this degree and stay abreast of the constantly changing graphic software. When we took this program Creative Suite (Adobe) was new. Five years later, we have moved through Creative Suite 2, 3, and now 4. Ultimately, previous assessment tools were deemed inadequate to give meaningful data concerning Goal One. The holistic rubric assessment does assess this goal and outcomes; however, it is anticipated that the pre-/post embedded assessment plan for all required courses will add more meaningful data to assess the outcomes in Goal One. In addition, the faculty plan to collaborate with Communication faculty teaching some of our required courses to include assessment tools that assess our program objectives and plan to add that information to the next Outcome Assessment Report. That process is underway and our assessment tools will grow each semester.

Modifications:

- Faculty agreed to create embedded assessment tools for all required courses.
- Faculty agreed to consistently administer and correlate data for program assessment.
- Faculty agreed to work toward adding assessment data from required Communication courses in the program

GOAL TWO: Broaden understanding of the nature of art and creative communication within the process of design.

Outcomes:

1. **Students will develop computer graphic and multimedia productions that effectively apply basic design principles.**

2. **Students will put into practice contemporary design principles of interactive graphic and communication multimedia to create graphic applications.**

**Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric**

- **ART 2903 Digital Imaging I**
  - Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (18 assessed)
  - Spring 2009, Course not taught
  - Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010

- **ART 2333 Computer Graphics I**
  - Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (18 assessed)
  - Spring 2009, Course not taught
  - Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010

- **ART 3903 Digital Imaging II**
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.0, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (8 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011
ART 3333 Computer Graphics II
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.2, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (11 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011
ART 2223 Web Page Design I
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (19 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011
ART 3803 Web Page Design II
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (5 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011

3. Students will demonstrate understanding of design elements and principles.

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio
Course Rubric
ART 2903 Digital Imaging I
Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (18 assessed)
Spring 2009, Course not taught
Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010
ART 2333 Computer Graphics I
Fall 2008 Average rating 3.3, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (18 assessed)
Spring 2009, Course not taught
Embedded assessment under development for Fall 2010
ART 2023 3-D Design
Fall 2008 Average rating 3.1, Median 3.5, Mode 4.0 (13 assessed)
ART 3903 Digital Imaging II
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.0, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (8 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011
ART 3333 Computer Graphics II
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.2, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (11 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011
ART 2223 Web Page Design I
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (19 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011
ART 3803 Web Page Design II
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (5 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011
ART 4513 Applied Graphic Design
Spring 2009 Average rating 3.72, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (11 assessed)

Assessment Tool: Embedded Pre-/Post Tests/Rubrics
Art 2113 / Drawing 1  
Spring 2009 Average Rubric Rating: 3.7 (16 assessed)  

Art 2103 / 2-D Design  
Spring 2009 (pre/post test course content, 50 points, 14 assessed)  
Pre-Test: Average 34%; Median 34%; Mode 40%  
Post-Test: Average 81%; Median 86%; Mode 90%  
Post-Test Score Increase: 47%; Median 47%; Mode 48%  

4. Students will organize and present a graphic portfolio and exhibition in a professional manner.  

Assessment Tool: Faculty Observation/evaluation using Holistic Studio Course Rubric  
ART 4513 Applied Graphic Design  
Spring 2009 Average rating 3.72, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (11 assessed)  

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)  
These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.  
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)  
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.5 (8 assessed)  

Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique  
The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.  
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.8 (10 assessed)  
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.3 (8 assessed)  

Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)  
These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.  
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)  
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.5 (8 assessed)  

Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique  
The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.  
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.8 (10 assessed)  
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.3 (8 assessed)
Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Two:

Senior Portfolio Reviews are steadily improving in quality and sophistication in the graphics area. The faculty agreed that the data from the Senior Reviews and from the studio rubrics indicated some problems with student understanding of color theory and of basic design concepts, but generally majors are demonstrating a higher level of finish and professionalism in their graphic design portfolios. Initiating pre-post assessments that are embedded and part of each required course will provide consistent assessment of particular course content and progress through the program. This assessment strategy will continue to add classes until consistent data is gathered every time the course is taught. Ultimately data will build until a baseline can be ascertained with which to compare subsequent data from semester to semester. Embedded assessments in each required course will provide additional data.

Modifications:

• Faculty agreed to add additional critique opportunities and art critical discussions to class curriculums.
• Faculty agreed that course content in introductory classes should add study modules concerning basic art vocabulary and design concepts.
• Faculty agreed that special emphasis should be placed on color theory in introductory design, drawing and painting classes.
• Dr. Donna Adams, Adjunct, who specializes in color theory and teaches 2-D design classes at Southeastern, was asked to teach Painting I and to emphasize basic color theory concepts in her course curriculum. Graphic design majors will be advised to take this class as an elective and faculty will consider making it a requirement.
• Faculty agreed to use the Studio and Self Critique Rubrics consistently in all classes.
• Faculty agreed to develop and use a consistent rubric and procedure in the Senior Show Critiques

GOAL THREE: Acquire knowledge of electronic publishing devices to create media products and presentations

Outcomes:
1. Students will broaden their understanding of computer graphic applications including hardware and software.
2. Students will evaluate, select, and maintain hardware and software.
3. Students will employ a variety of hardware and software to capture, digitalize, and edit audio, video, and graphic files used in graphic and multimedia applications.

Assessment Tool: Final Grades

ART 3903 Digital Imaging II
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.0, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (8 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011

**ART 3333 Computer Graphics II**
Spring 2009 Average rating, 3.2, Median 3.0, Mode 3.0 (11 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Spring 2011

**ART 2223 Web Page Design I**
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (19 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011

**ART 3803 Web Page Design II**
Summer 2009 Average rating 4.0, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (5 assessed)
Embedded assessment under development for Summer 2011

**ART 4513 Applied Graphic Design**
Spring 2009 Average rating 3.72, Median 4.0, Mode 4.0 (11 assessed)

**Assessment Tool: Senior Portfolio Review (oral presentation)**
These average ratings are based upon the review of the oral presentation using the Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning.
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.7 (10 assessed)
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.5 (8 assessed)

**Assessment Tool: Senior Art Exhibition Critique**
The production of a public Art Exhibition requires a discipline and serious attitude towards artistic production. The quality of the Senior Exhibitions directly reflects the attainment of program goals in a real world application. Senior exhibition critique is conducted for all graduating seniors in the program during the Senior Portfolio Review process.
Spring 09 Average Rating: 3.8 (10 assessed)
Graphic Design Major Average Rating: 3.3 (8 assessed)

**Analysis of Assessment Data Goal Three:**
At the end of the semester faculty and students have the opportunity to review the results of the Senior Portfolio Review and of the Senior Exhibition Critique. Students are encouraged to continue work strengthening areas of weakness and pursuing areas of strength. The program goals were radically altered during our last self-study for Higher Learning Commission Program Review and Assessment Plans for each program altered to reflect those changes. Previously, for the Mid-Level Assessment, a pre-test of basic information was given to entering majors and a post-test given at the completion of core classes, accompanied by a faculty interview/review of each major’s portfolio. Upon several years of low post-test scores, faculty agreed that knowledge of terminology and basic design was minimal as assessed by the pre/post test. Content and teaching of this
information in all core classes needed to be addressed concerning emphasis on basic understanding of formalistic terminology connected to good design. This was one impetus for adoption of program assessment by utilization of embedded assessment in all required courses. By adopting course embedded assessments in each required course, faculty think that each program will benefit from a more comprehensive and valid assessment process not only at Mid Level but throughout the entire program. Embedded assessment in each course will identify weakness and strength more readily than a pre/post test of basic terminology of design and will give more validity to overall assessment of programs.

The Mid-Level Portfolio Review of each major was manageable when the art department had only the art education and the art (studio) programs. With the addition of the BS in Graphic Design program, the art major number doubled from 30-35 to 60-70 majors. This portfolio review method proved unmanageable with a faculty of only three and assessment was not completed consistently. When faculty agreed in fall 2008 to adopt an embedded assessment approach to evaluation and assessment of all programs, the individual portfolio review process was ended. The process of using embedded assessment began with examination of each course syllabus by its instructor, alignment of course objectives with program goals, and development of an embedded assessment instrument in each course that would reflect course objectives and outcomes. This process requires time to implement. When Embedded Assessment was adopted in November 2008, some courses were already nearly over for the semester. To begin the Embedded Assessment process, in spring 2009, ART 1213 an embedded pre/post survey was developed and implemented; ART 2013 2-D used an embedded pre/post comprehensive test; ART 3123 used an embedded pre/post comprehensive test; ART 2103 Art and World Culture and ART 3083 Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism used the pre/post tests and art survey already in use as General Education Assessment instruments. Until embedded assessments of the core art courses are in place, compilation of an average of final grades for each student who has completed all core courses was used in this report. As embedded assessments are added each semester, program assessment will be able to use averaging of course embedded assessments in future assessment reports.

Over the last nine years, the visual art department has undergone three different approaches to assessment. The first was during a time when an outside faculty advised and guided the assessment process. The second was when Visual Art was united with Music in the Fine Arts Department. The Chair of the Fine Arts Department asked that faculty develop a plan similar to music. This third time, the art faculty took the initiative and ownership of development of embedded assessment in a way that makes sense to each faculty. Also, it is attainable without extensive involvement of faculty time to conduct and record data for all assessment purposes. In the interim, as valid assessments for each required course are developed and implemented, our evaluation
and assessment of art programs will improve with each semester and constitute valid and useful assessment to program improvement and growth.

**Modifications:**

- Senior Level assessment and rubrics will be examined, revised and implemented in a timely manner.
- Studio faculty will place more emphasis on student self-critique and collect assessment data of that process.
- Regular data collection and ease of access will become a higher priority by identification/creation and use of embedded assessments in all courses.
- Embedded assessment of all core courses will be in place by the spring semester of 2010. Average of core course embedded assessments will constitute the Mid-Level Assessment of the program.
- Embedded assessment instruments that assess course outcomes will continue to be developed in each required course, with a goal of having embedded assessments of course objectives in every required course of a program.

**IETV and/or Web-based course Assessment**

**Issues in Aesthetics and Criticism** and the **Art in World Cultures** classes are the only courses taught in a web-based format that are required in this degree program. They are both assessed by pre/post testing and by a final survey. Pre/post test scores indicate that significant learning is taking place and surveys indicate a student validation of the techniques and aims of the course and increase in appreciation of the arts. Both courses have already been listed under their appropriate learning outcomes. They are both required classes in the Art and Art Education programs.

**Faculty Contributions**

The Visual Art Division of the Department of Fine Arts is quite small, comprising three full time faculty. Assessment is of necessity a team effort involving the entire faculty at all levels of input. The Visual Art Division offers three degree programs. Dr. Gleny Beach, Jack Ousey and Dave Barnes are each assigned the responsibility of authoring the assessment report for the three programs respectively. This B.S. in Graphic Design Outcomes Assessment report was authored by Jack Ousey. All faculty are responsible for collecting assessment data from their classes and recording it in a timely manner. At this time, Dr. Gleny Beach keeps and organizes assessment data.

At the end of each semester, in conjunction with the Senior Portfolio Review the entire faculty meets to discuss assessment and the problems or issues that arise from the data collected. Discussion of assessment is a regular component of ongoing Division conversation. The entire Visual Art Division faculty was asked to review the report and make editorial contributions.
Observations/Modifications to Assessment Plan Based Upon the Assessment

- Goals and Objectives for all programs have been combined and edited where possible to create clearer and more manageable assessment plans.
- Future assessments will be more effective if assessment tools are embedded into required courses, consistently administered and recorded.
- The Entry Basic Art Achievement Test will no longer be an assessment tool.
- The Mid-Level Portfolio review will move toward using data from embedded assessment in all core program requirements, averaged for Mid-Level assessment data.
- The Holistic Studio Course Rubric will be an option for studio classes but will include a pre and post assessment to provide data for Mid-level averaging and a background against which the Senior Portfolio reviews can be analyzed.
- Faculty will work together to develop simplified and standardized forms for keeping and recording data to facilitate yearly comparisons.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program as related to assessment

Paradoxically, the strengths and weaknesses of the program are both directly related to its small number of majors and small number of faculty. For example, the small number of faculty enabled the program to spin on a dime and to immediately and effectively make modifications that addressed deficiencies in the core program. Those issues were primarily revealed by assessment tools because a great strength of the program is that studio and computer lab instruction is inherently personal. The Graphic Design program continues to grow despite the fact that only one faculty is qualified to teach graphic applications. Another graphic design faculty is crucial to our continued growth.
Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Visual Art

Bachelor of Science Degree in Graphic Design & Visual Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>ADVISOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Major/Minor | 58 hours |

Guided General Education Elective: Art 1103 Art Appreciation

**Required Courses:** (* Prerequisite)

1st Phase -- Core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 1213 Drawing I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2013 #2-D Design</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2023 #3-D Design</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2313 Painting I (*Art 1213, 2013)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2333 Computer Graphics I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a suggested order but may be interspersed as available except for courses with prerequisites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 2633 Web Page Design I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3633 Web Page Design II (*ART 2633)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3313 #History &amp; Theory of Design</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2903 Digital Imaging I (*Core)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3903 Digital Imaging II *( ART 2903)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 3773 Advertising Copyrighting &amp; Design</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3033 Computer Graphics II (*Core, ART 2333)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 3573 Video Production</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 4853 #Media Law &amp; Ethics OR CIS 4103 #Computer Ethics</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 3893 Communication Campaigns</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4513 Applied Graphic Design (Capstone)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**--------------------------------------------------------48 hours

**Electives -- 10 hours:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 1413 Ceramics I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3123 Color Theory (*ART 1213, 2013)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3213 Drawing II(*Art 1213)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3423 Ceramics II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3523 Ceramics III</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3623 Ceramics IV</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3433 Sculpture I (*Art2023)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4443 Sculpture II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2103 #Art &amp; World Culture</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 2113 #Art History Survey I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3133 #Art History Survey II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3083 #Issues in Aesthetics &amp; Criticism</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3103 #Survey of Native North American Art</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3323 Painting II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4333 Painting III</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4343 Painting IV</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4223 Printmaking I</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4970 Special Studies</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 1153 Desktop Presentations</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 2253 Survey of Mass Media</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 3583 Public Relations Case Studies</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 3283 Photojournalism</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 2573 Audio Production</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 1093 Introduction to Comp Graph Appl.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 3193 Comp Graphic Imaging (*TECH 1093)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 1263 Computer Systems Maintenance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 4343 Web Page Design II</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 4263 Digital Video Technology (*TECH 1093)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS 3103 Integration of Productivity Software</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pre-req nine hours of CS or CIS with C or better)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 58 hours**
# Holistic Rubric for Studio Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-5 Rating</strong> / The artist has produced a work that is visually interesting. The artist has taken some chances by pushing the assignment into a personal visual statement. The work reflects the artist's understanding of style and of contemporary art issues. The finished presentation of the work is professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-3.9 Rating</strong> / The composition exhibits unity with appropriate concern for variety. The artist is aware of the quality of the painterly surface. The techniques of the medium are used in a way appropriate to the assignment. Plastic issues are handled well, if appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-2.9 Rating</strong> / The artist attempted to use the techniques of the medium and the elements of value, color, and texture in a way appropriate to the assignment. Composition may be disorganized or overly simplistic. Plastic issues are handled in a naïve manner if appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-1.9 Rating</strong> / The artist followed the basic instruction for the assignment. Exhibited little understanding of visual principles with clumsy execution of the techniques of the medium appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

**AVERAGE**
### Holistic Rubric for Self Critique as Active Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-5.0 Rating / The student uses a wide array of technical and theoretical nomenclature to clearly describe visual choices. She is able to discuss formal influences and to place the work within the context of contemporary art issues. She is able to give insight into the affective dimension of her choice making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.9 Rating / The student is able to describe visual choices clearly using appropriate art making nomenclature. Student is able to explain how the work fulfills the requirements of the assignment and can discuss what art techniques or understandings were gained from the exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.9 Rating / The student <em>attempts</em> to use appropriate nomenclature to describe visual choices. Student <em>attempts</em>, but may not be able to coherently describe the choice making process. Student is able to explain how the work fulfills the requirements of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.9 Rating / The student <em>attempts</em> to describe visual choices but uses art nomenclature awkwardly or incorrectly. Student may be unaware of the relationship between the project and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holistic Rubric for Senior Seminar Artwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding 4-5 points</strong> / The artist has produced a body work that is visually interesting and engaging to the viewer. The artwork demonstrates the artist's mature understanding and attention to the surface, finish, composition and/or content, and presentation of all artworks. The artist has taken some chances by pushing the assignment into a personal visual statement. The works reflect the artist's development of style and of contemporary art issues. The finished presentation of the work is professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commendable-Acceptable 3-3.9 points</strong> / The body of artwork exhibits understanding of media. The artwork demonstrates the artist’s attention to the surface, composition and/or content. The techniques of the medium are used in an effective way. Plastic issues are handled well, if appropriate to the particular artwork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than Acceptable 2-2.9 points</strong> / The artist attempted to use the techniques of the medium and the elements of value, color, and texture. Composition may be disorganized or overly simplistic. Plastic issues are handled in a naïve manner and may lack technical finish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unacceptable 1-1.9 points</strong> / The artist followed the basic instruction for artwork presentation. Exhibited little understanding of visual principles with clumsy execution of the techniques of the medium appropriate to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senior Portfolio Review/Presentation Faculty Rating Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable=1</th>
<th>Less than Acceptable=2</th>
<th>Acceptable=3</th>
<th>More than Acceptable=4</th>
<th>Target=5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student does not exhibits</td>
<td>The student exhibits</td>
<td>The student adequately exhibits</td>
<td>The student admirably exhibits</td>
<td>The student powerfully exhibits</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME_________________________________________ MAJOR_________ SEMESTER__________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artwork/Design: Exhibits use of good composition/design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique/technical knowledge: Exhibits understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge: Exhibits subject area knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills: Quality of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation image quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: Resume, artist's statement, paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation/Professionalism (attendance, participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of exhibition artworks/graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>