Capstone Projects or Final Summative Assessment

(Note: How might this assessment model be different from a course vs. in assessing a program-level SLO? Could you use this model for both levels of assessment?)

Case Study 12 – Digital Art

a. **Discipline**: Digital Art Project – Linear Perspective and Realism

b. **Student Learning Outcome**: (a) Produce, print, and mount assignments within a set deadline, using digital hardware and software. (b) Evaluate and appraise other design projects and differentiate between effective and ineffective solutions during in-class critiques. (c) Demonstrate knowledge of drawing tools and effects in vector software. (d) Demonstrate understanding of design principles and elements. (e) Demonstrate an understanding of the language of two-dimensional design. (f) Demonstrate an understanding of the use of color, type, and image. (g) Produce and discuss a portfolio of work.

c. **Background**: Students are assigned a series of projects with increasing difficulty and focusing on specific concepts of digital design. Each project becomes a component of the student’s portfolio for the course. Each project includes the evaluation by the instructor but also a critique by each of the other students in the course.

d. **Assessment Process**: Both portfolio samples and written student evaluations 1) students are effectively participating in critiques, 2) the critique process shows evidence of critical thinking, 3) if the critique process is positively impacting project success and thus grades.
   i. **What was done**: Students were provided a set of guidelines and rubric for a project, Digital Art Project – Linear Perspective and Realism [See Appendix N].
   ii. **Why was this selected**: 
   iii. **Design work/modifications to existing tool**:  

e. **Implementation**:  
   i. **Collection of data**: Student projects were graded using the rubric that was consistent for each project and the overall portfolio.
   ii. **Analysis of data**: For the majority of students the critique process has a positive impact (approximately 80 to 85%). Evidence of active participation in the process, critical thinking skills, and a positive impact on learning and final grades was noted by all participants. Faculty discussions revealed that there is no single method used by any of the faculty in the critique process. The rubric above is a specific example of one faculty member’s rubric. The department does not require every faculty member to use the same rubric but through discussion criteria and expectations are normed. Although guidelines for critiques may be written and shared within in the department, it is ultimately up to each professor to use the process in the form which is most appropriate for the project and students involved.

f. **Outcome/Results**: The faculty members feel that the combined assessment involving both faculty and student critiques are important to the discipline and represent real life situations where artists must learn to take a variety of critiques and learn how to improve their work.

g. **Key Learning**: Portfolios are a good method to visualize student growth and increasing skills.
i. **What worked well:** Having each faculty member determine their own rubric. Having student critiques as an integral aspect of the overall project work. Using the combined portfolio as the summative assessment but having individual formative projects to build upon. The SLOs actually represent expectations and criteria important to the overall evaluation.

ii. **What should be done differently:**

h. **Contact Information at Case Study Site:** dkoeth@bakersfieldcollege.edu