## Program Mission Statement

**From your Program Assessment Plan** (Statement should articulate the unit/program mission in support of the institutional mission and include a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education.)

The University’s mission is to promote global perspectives, support the regional employment objectives of its students, prepare students to participate as responsible citizens in a diverse, global, and knowledge-based society and to continue learning throughout their lives. The primary mission of the Visual Arts program in Art Studio, emphasis in Graphic Design is to support the University’s mission by improving our students’ ability to be effective visual communicators and to increase their perception of the global environments of design, as well as to consider global shifts in visual codes. The integrated content areas of design theory: production, history, criticism, and aesthetics, develops the necessary creative and technical skills involved in graphic problem solving required by professional practice. Attention is paid to ethical practices, students’ roles as citizens, and the impact their designs could have on society.

### Goal 1

**From your Program Assessment Plan** (Describe broad learning outcomes and concepts (what you want students to learn) expressed in general terms (clear communication, problem-solving skills, etc.). Goals should focus on discipline-specific outcomes relevant to the program.)

Students will be able to think and write critically about art and design: historical periods, movements, artists, styles, cultures, criticism, theory, and design analysis.

#### Objectives SLO’s

**From your Program Assessment Plan** (Describe the specific skills, values and attitudes students should be able to exhibit that reflect the broader goals. Objectives (student learning outcomes) transform the general program goals into specific student performance/behaviors that demonstrate student learning and skill development along these goals.)

Students will be able to:
1. Demonstrate the ability to situate and interpret visual art and design in their historical and cultural contexts.
2. Demonstrate the ability to write about his/her own visual research.
3. Demonstrate the ability to write effective professional communication.

#### Assessment Methods

**From your Program Assessment Plan** (Describe the measure(s) by which the department will know the students are meeting the departmental learning objectives. Includes both direct and indirect assessment. Each SLO should have at least one assessment method.)

1. Writing assignments are evaluated in SART 201 Graphic Design Studies courses; SART 214 Graphic Design I; SART 314 Graphic Design II, using attached rubrics.
2. Senior Seminar artist statements reviewed by Visual Arts faculty using attached rubric.
3. Senior Seminar résumés and mock job application cover letters reviewed by Visual Arts faculty using attached rubric.

#### Assessment Criteria

**Level of achievement you are targeting** (indicate benchmarks, scores on assessment instruments, etc… that would indicate acceptable achievement under your plan)

1. Average score at or above a 2, utilizing scoring rubric for written work.
2. Average score at or above a 2, utilizing scoring rubric for written work.
3. Average score at or above a 2, utilizing scoring rubric for written work.
### Assessment Results

**Actual results and data collected** (Make sure to break down data by subgroups (e.g. other campuses or emphases). As appropriate, also include item or category analysis.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>SART 201 Graphic Design Studies writing assignments (using 1–5 scoring range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: The score was calculated by extracting the “Research” score of each project and then dividing the total score by 5 in order to produce a rating number between 0 - 4 to support the assessment of Goal 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011/2012 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research alone: 3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing 3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010/2011 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.2  | Senior Seminar artist statements (using 1-4 scoring range) overall student performance is above average with a mean score of 3.8 |

| 1.3  | Senior Seminar résumés and mock job application cover letters (using 1-4 scoring range) overall student performance is above average with a mean score of 4.3 |

| 2011/2012 | Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.12 |
| 2010/2011 | Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.35 |

| 2011/2012 | Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.69 |
| 2010/2011 | Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.3 |
Students will write various areas of design research in two levels of Graphic Design (I&II), SART 201 Graphic Design Studies, and again in Senior Seminar with an assessment of their artist statements and professional writing. Graphic Design I and Graphic Design II have a required research paper and SART 201 Graphic Design Studies requires several short papers. Faculty will use the standard writing rubric for each assessment element from each course and will determine which course/data would best be used for assessment purposes.

1.1 Graphic Design Faculty continues to believe that the collection of this data would provide the means to pinpoint potential areas for improvement and attention. Faculty use the attached writing rubric and applied it to the papers collected/graded in SART 201 Graphic Design Studies for this SLO. (Graphic Design Studies course is an overview of graphic design history with related studio projects). Faculty continues the collection of data and is evaluating this method of assessment across a number of semesters. Data bears out that this is an effective means of assessing listed items in Goal 1.1. In general, comparisons of SART 201 data to data from research papers assigned in Graphic Design I and II, we see some improvement in scores. Areas of concern are grammatical and often organizational in regards to content and cohesiveness. Faculty is rigorous in their attention to correct grammar usage. Some stand-out students write remarkably well and have obviously received good instruction and practice in their education.

Data will continue to be collected from the two levels of Graphic Design courses and from SAT 201. The data will continue to be compared, but expanded with a “same student” writing cross-section using SART 201 and SART 214 and 314. So we plan to monitor the same students through 3 levels of courses. This will help determine if improvements occur with further study, or if more writing instruction/assistance is needed in any of the three courses.

1.2 The artist statement continues to be a valuable means of evaluating the writing abilities of students and their ability to write about their own work. These statements, while not lengthy, earmark issues students have in regards to writing concise, informative, yet creatively and descriptively about their work. Faculty works with students on improving and revising so the end product is well written, hence the higher scores. Faculty continues to use this method of assessment and will collect data over several more semesters to determine its usefulness as an assessment tool. Now that data has been collected in Graphic Design I and II, we may now be able to include the statement as a continuation of the cross-section mentioned above with the same students being evaluated. Hopefully this will yield information pertaining to weaknesses in grammar, conciseness of writing, skillful organization, and content quality.

1.3 The writing of the résumé and a cover letter suitable for prospective employment continues to prove its worth as a means to assess and students’ scores indicate an increase from last year. The goal is supported by students’ ability to write and format effective résumés and job applicant cover letters. In order to give us even more information for improving this means of assessment, these writing examples will now be compared as a continuation of the cross-section mentioned above with the same students being evaluated. Hopefully this will yield information pertaining to weaknesses in grammar, conciseness of writing, skillful organization, and content quality so that faculty may make adjustments to instruction.

Faculty have and will continue to stress the use of the writing center, to use library instruction workshops in Graphic Design I, and to discuss common grammatical/research/documentation missteps before the assignments are due in all the assessment courses we use for evaluation (SART 201, 214, 314, and Senior Seminar).

New considerations: Another consideration of the kinds of writing our students will use in professional practice is general communication. We are not at all sure if the artist statement or the cover letter/resume are clear benchmarks for their abilities to write informative and creative copy for project briefs, annual reports, brochures, website content, and general communications. Faculty will consider adding exercises to senior seminar in order to determine if students can write the aforementioned kinds of writing.
**How was the action plan identified in the previous year’s report implemented this year, and what was the impact?**

The previous action plan was implemented regarding this Goal. Writing continues to be evaluated in a number of courses and has been and will be continued to be collected for evaluation. After reviewing each component, faculty has determined that all are good assessment tools and find the data collected reveals improved scoring as coursework progresses. Faculty will stress use of the writing center, continue to use library instruction workshops in Graphic Design I, and discuss common grammatical/research/documentation missteps before the assignments are due.

Now the data needs further review based on a cross section of students. The students’ writing will be followed and compared across several subsequent courses. Faculty will collect rubrics for each course and use them for comparison in order to determine course content and instructional needs.

We have also discussed the need for students to write informative and creative copy for project briefs, brochures, annual reports, standards manuals, website content, and general communications. Assessment could take the form of exercises in upper division coursework such as Graphic Design III and/or Senior Seminar.

### Unit/Department: Art Studio
### Division: Fine Arts & Communication Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal 2**                    | From your Program Assessment Plan (Describe broad learning outcomes and concepts (what you want students to learn) expressed in general terms (clear communication, problem-solving skills, etc). Goals should focus on discipline-specific outcomes relevant to the program.) | Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge and communicate art historical periods, movements, artists, styles, cultures, criticism, theory and design analysis in visual formats and show the development and application of the skills necessary to create original designs and components of visual communication. Adam Smith, a famous philosopher, once said, “Education is the most important investment a society can make.” Students will be able to:  
2.1 Demonstrate the ability to visually situate and interpret visual art and design in their historical and cultural contexts.  
2.2 Demonstrate the ability to identify and apply technical and conceptual properties of design.  
2.3 Demonstrate the ability to solve design problems using critical thinking and design analysis.  
2.1 A) Senior Seminar course: Includes selection of works for exit portfolio  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
2.2 A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
   B) Sophomore Portfolio Review using the attached rubric  
2.3 A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
   B) Sophomore Portfolio Review using the attached rubric  
Assessment descriptions:  
A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design: students revisit and revise past research projects and create new research projects, developing quality and content in preparation for public presentation.  
B) Sophomore Portfolio Review: Portfolio Review Committee assesses each portfolio on a scale of 1 to 5 with 3 being average and 5 superior. A minimum of 3 is required to pass the review for acceptance into the BA Art, Graphic Design program. Specific art and design skills are necessary to succeed in the BA Art, emphasis Graphic Design Program and it is prerequisite to a students’ success that he/she be informed of potential success at the sophomore level. |

| Objectives SLO’s            | From your Program Assessment Plan (Describes the specific skills, values and attitudes students should be able to exhibit that reflect the broader goals. Objectives (student learning outcomes) transform the general program goals into specific student performance/behaviors that demonstrate student learning and skill development along these goals.) | Students will be able to:  
2.1 Demonstrate the ability to visually situate and interpret visual art and design in their historical and cultural contexts.  
2.2 Demonstrate the ability to identify and apply technical and conceptual properties of design.  
2.3 Demonstrate the ability to solve design problems using critical thinking and design analysis.  
2.1 A) Senior Seminar course: Includes selection of works for exit portfolio  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
2.2 A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
   B) Sophomore Portfolio Review using the attached rubric  
2.3 A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
   B) Sophomore Portfolio Review using the attached rubric  
Assessment descriptions:  
A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design: students revisit and revise past research projects and create new research projects, developing quality and content in preparation for public presentation.  
B) Sophomore Portfolio Review: Portfolio Review Committee assesses each portfolio on a scale of 1 to 5 with 3 being average and 5 superior. A minimum of 3 is required to pass the review for acceptance into the BA Art, Graphic Design program. Specific art and design skills are necessary to succeed in the BA Art, emphasis Graphic Design Program and it is prerequisite to a students’ success that he/she be informed of potential success at the sophomore level. |

| Assessment Methods          | From your Program Assessment Plan (Describes the measure(s) by which the department will know the students are meeting the departmental learning objectives. Includes both direct and indirect assessment. Each SLO should have at least one assessment method.) | 2.1 A) Senior Seminar course: Includes selection of works for exit portfolio  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
2.2 A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
   B) Sophomore Portfolio Review using the attached rubric  
2.3 A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course  
   1. Exit portfolio reviewed by faculty and industry professionals using the attached rubric  
   B) Sophomore Portfolio Review using the attached rubric  
Assessment descriptions:  
A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design: students revisit and revise past research projects and create new research projects, developing quality and content in preparation for public presentation.  
B) Sophomore Portfolio Review: Portfolio Review Committee assesses each portfolio on a scale of 1 to 5 with 3 being average and 5 superior. A minimum of 3 is required to pass the review for acceptance into the BA Art, Graphic Design program. Specific art and design skills are necessary to succeed in the BA Art, emphasis Graphic Design Program and it is prerequisite to a students’ success that he/she be informed of potential success at the sophomore level. |
## Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Level of achievement you are targeting (Indicate benchmarks, scores on assessment instruments, etc… that would indicate acceptable achievement under your plan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2.1; 2.2; 2.3

A) Senior Seminar in Graphic Design course: Average score at or above a 3 (1-5 scoring range) is required in the course.

Exit Portfolio: Average score at or above a 3.

B) Sophomore Portfolio Review: Average score at or above a 3 is required (utilizing attached rubric) in order to pass/acceptance into the program.

## Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actual results and data collected (Make sure to break down data by subgroups (e.g. other campuses or emphases). As appropriate, also include item or category analysis.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2.1; 2.2; 2.3

A) Senior Seminar Graphic Design (1-5 scoring range)

- Senior Seminar exit portfolio research projects (combining professional reviewers scores with faculty)
  - Spring 2012 Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.0
  - Fall 2011 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.87
  - Spring 2011 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.96
  - Fall 2010 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.67

B) Sophomore Portfolio Review (1-5 scoring range)

- 2011-2012 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.54
- 2010-2011 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.23
- 2009-2010 Student average is above average with a mean score of 3.53
- 2008-9 Student performance is above average with a mean score of 3.31
- (2006-2008) overall student performance is above average with a mean score of 3.35.
## Action Plan

### What actions or modifications have been or will be made based on this assessment?

2.1: Faculty is still determining, within coursework across the curriculum, individual projects that address this SLO in a historical/cultural context. Courses have been identified that contain projects specific to this SLO: SART 201 Graphic Design Studies; SART 314 Graphic Design. Data has not been collected yet, as individual projects have not been chosen. Faculty needs to decide and begin collection.

2.2; 2.3

A) Senior Seminar:

Scores are holding steady and faculty believe that averages could be higher but as is often the case that one or two students are not as successful due to their own motivation or personal reasons.

Advisory Board: A meeting was not held in Spring 2012 as final selections/acceptances were being made. Due to the Fall 2012 faculty reassignment of Lisa Anderson the advisory board has not met yet. A spring semester meeting is planned. Discussion with outside reviewers (following senior portfolio review) reveals that our students need to have more web-based skills and related work in their portfolios.

*Possible modifications to Senior Seminar content and program changes are developing because of Lisa Anderson’s faculty reassignment. Anderson is researching industry from all angles including but not limited to the trends/styles of work and type or kind of projects (websites, brochures, etc.) most employers require when hiring; the quality and quantity of said work; skill sets needed including technology proficiencies, presentation and writing skills; kinds of jobs available and means of job searching; networking; job application/submission; recruiting agencies; hiring practices; the interviewing process; education levels and advanced degrees; and more. Other institutions’ methods and programs are being examined, both peer institutions and providers such as institutes and private schools. The collection and dissemination of this information should provide a battery of new information.*

B) Sophomore Portfolio Review: After reviewing the data of the past several years, faculty find that the review itself is not producing a compete picture of a student's proficiencies. We are not sure as to why this method of assessment, which has historically been used in visual arts programs across the nation, is not working as well as it has in the past. One aspect is that the number of transfer students we receive into the program increases every year, so it is more difficult to establish consistency in project content and skills for what items students choose to submit. Transfer students come from various institutions and skill levels. They do not have the same projects as we in our foundations classes, causing disparity in ranking. Therefore, we need a different assessment method apart from what we use for our existing student base. So with that in mind, we are working on two forms of program acceptance/portfolio reviews—one for transfers/transfers from other majors and one for new students (students who began their design studies at Upstate). We are studying peer institutions for ideas and methods. One consideration is a non-credit required course where students either get direction on putting a portfolio of work together for review or have portfolio projects assigned and they are ranked, all within a course format. We are also considering another approach of targeting specific projects within our foundations courses as portfolio projects. With this method we give the students flexibility by having 12+ targeted projects to choose from and then having them cull it down to 9 excellent projects.

We like the idea of an earlier benchmark to use in comparison to the exit portfolio review from Senior Seminar. Earlier detection of possible weaknesses could help students in later courses.

NOTE: Our discipline/degree program does not have a full-time tenure track faculty member coordinating foundations courses that are used by the Art Studio and Art Education majors. All are taught by adjuncts (2-dimensional design; drawing; and computer graphics) and often courses are taught by different adjuncts each semester. Our chair and dean are aware of this and a formal request for a full time tenure track foundations position has been approved for the near future. This position would coordinate course content well and will also help fulfill foundations coursework required in the Art Education degree as well.
## Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Year’s “Action Plan”

How was the action plan identified in the previous year’s report implemented this year, and what was the impact?

The previous year’s action plan was implemented in part for this Goal. Professionals in the industry reviewed the work and provided input to senior portfolios. Review of comments provided information for use earlier in Senior Seminar. Suggestions included (for some individuals) more variety of projects, ramping up the quality of work, correct labeling of projects, practicality of physical portfolio, and more. So these were considered when looking at the next groups’ work and were addressed. They additionally added general input to our program including the need for more web-based coursework and projects. The advisory board will meet next Spring 2013.

The adjunct faculty teaching foundations courses and full time faculty reviewed the work submitted for the sophomore portfolio review. Full time faculty ranked the work. This review resulted in a general consensus that some major revisions need to be implemented in order to get optimum results from this method of assessment. Researching of peer institutions’ methods, rewrites to the existing portfolio review document, and consideration of a non-credit, pass/fail required course (This course could be repeated if student didn’t pass) are under consideration. We are researching these options.
# Component Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>From your Program Assessment Plan (Describe broad learning outcomes and concepts (what you want students to learn) expressed in general terms (clear communication, problem-solving skills, etc). Goals should focus on discipline-specific outcomes relevant to the program.)</th>
<th>Demonstrate the ability to apply and present verbal articulation in analysis of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives SLO’s</td>
<td>From your Program Assessment Plan (Describes the specific skills, values and attitudes students should be able to exhibit that reflect the broader goals. Objectives (student learning outcomes) transform the general program goals into specific student performance/behaviors that demonstrate student learning and skill development along these goals.)</td>
<td>3.1 Utilize appropriate art and design theory terminology in verbal discussion of assigned materials/topics. 3.2 Demonstrate the ability to apply and present verbal articulation in analysis of his/her own work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td>From your Program Assessment Plan (Describes the measure(s) by which the department will know the students are meeting the departmental learning objectives. Includes both direct and indirect assessment. Each SLO should have at least one assessment method.)</td>
<td>3.1 New curriculum implementation of an assigned presentation using a standardized rubric in one level of Graphic Design (Graphic Design I) 3.2 Senior Seminar oral presentation of research to outside reviewers and faculty member teaching course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criteria</td>
<td>Level of achievement you are targeting (Indicate benchmarks, scores on assessment instruments, etc... that would indicate acceptable achievement under your plan)</td>
<td>3.1 Average score at or above a 3 utilizing scoring rubric for SART 214 3.2 Average score at or above a 3 utilizing scoring rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>Actual results and data collected (Make sure to break down data by subgroups (e.g. other campuses or emphases). As appropriate, also include item or category analysis.)</td>
<td>3.1 Graphic Design I (SART 214) assigned chapter presentation (1-5 scoring range) 2012 Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.26 2011 Student average is above average with a mean score of 4.22 3.2 Senior Seminar oral presentation of research to outside reviewers/faculty (1-5 scoring range) 2012 Student performance is above average with a mean score of 4.25 2011 Student performance is above average with a mean score of 3.95 2010 Student performance is above average with a mean score of 3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What actions or modifications have been or will be made based on this assessment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.1: Implementing student presentations of textbook chapters occurs in SART 214 Graphic Design I, and students are continuing to respond well. They do seem to learn the material better when they have to teach. They use powerpoint to present the chapters and include content and visuals from the textbook plus adding examples of their own to enhance their presentation of the material. This has been successful thus far and faculty has moved it from the participation portion of the grade to an assignment with its own point value.

3.1; 3.2: Graphic Design faculty notes that oral presentations occur regularly in every course as students often present their work as part of each project's completion or as a component of critique. Faculty still needs to decide on one or two projects to pull out of the regular coursework for use in this means of assessment or they need to pull the ‘presentation’ data from each project's evaluation. Also a standardized rubric similar to the outside professional reviewers’ rubric will be crafted.

### Senior Seminar

Faculty is pleased with the increase in scores for their Senior Seminar verbal presentation portion. Data from this component of the industry professional reviewers and faculty’s assessment is continuing to prove useful because reviewers rank each individual student using the criteria on the attached rubric. In addition, they also make useful comments on various aspects. Faculty has been addressing these issues earlier in the semester so that the same mistakes are not occurring again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Year's &quot;Action Plan&quot;</th>
<th>The previous year's action plan was implemented for this Goal. Graphic Design I now uses a chapter presentation as part of the coursework and critique methods are in place. This is a very successful assessment tool in that it occurs early enough in their academic career to remedy common mistakes. Presentations of portfolios to outside professional reviewers has enabled faculty to target weaknesses earlier in senior seminar so that the mistakes made in previous years by other students are not repeated. This is an extremely important tool for faculty to use in their instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was the action plan identified in the previous year's report implemented this year, and what was the impact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>