AN ASSESSMENT MODEL FOR THE VISUAL ARTS

A Thesis
Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School

University of North Carolina at Pembroke

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Masters of Arts in Education: Art Education

By

Amy Pow Viles

Dr. Ann Horton-Lopez Thesis Advisor

October 14, 2002

Amy P. Viles

AN ASSESSMENT MODEL FOR THE VISUAL ARTS

Abstract

Assessment in the visual arts is a controversial subject. While education reform is demanding accountability from teachers, art educators want to hold on to the integrity and unique nature of the visual arts. Art educators must lead the process by putting assessment practices in place if we do not want them dictated by state mandated legislation that knows nothing about the nature of art and learning in the art classroom. Misunderstood indicators of success in the visual arts must be made clear to non-art educators, including students, other teachers, school administrators and parents. Despite public lack of understanding about assessing art, there are many ways art educators can evaluate work objectively. Art educators must begin to verbalize the present, yet unspoken, evaluation process if they are to lead reform.

This paper investigates different methods of assessment in the visual arts. Considerations as to the qualities of effective assessment and the individualized process of creativity were maintained throughout the investigation. Data from texts, research journals and numerous articles was compiled and categorized to address the varying roles assessment should play within an art program.

The research culminated in the development of both formative and summative assessment and numerous examples with demonstration their implementation. Objectives must be adequately communicated to students before any of these techniques can be implemented. Levels of success should be clearly defined. These assessments include lesson assessment tools, written reflection for both student and teacher, rubrics, portfolios, critiques and traditional testing techniques. These assessment methods are diverse in order to adapt and meet the educational needs of a changing population of students.

The use of clearly stated objectives coupled with both formative and summative assessments becomes a valuable tool in improving the quality of student work in the classroom as a result of better communication between teacher and student. This assessment model helps to clarify teacher expectations, improve instruction, force students to take responsibility for their own learning and provide teachers with feedback for change and planning.

Table of Contents

Amy P. Viles

An Assessment Model for the Visual Arts

Chapter I: Introduction

The visual arts are viewed as subjective and do not fit into the same confines as traditional subject areas. Assessment of the creative process and the results are not always an easy task for art teachers. "The arts in education have long suffered from a perceived inability to provide quantitative measures of student progress" *(Tobias, 2000, p. 20).* This is the reason standards of success in the visual arts are often abstract to non-art educators, including students, other teachers, administrators and parents. "People unfamiliar with the visual arts often mistakenly believe that excellence and quality are merely matters of opinion" *(The National Standards for Arts Education, 1994, p. 22).* Due to this seemingly subjective and abstract grading process, some view "special area" classes as frivolous, and therefore, demonstrate little concern regarding the quality of work.

Trends in art education have also confused the standards in a grade driven society. "Not knowing what to think, persons tend to accept just about anything done in the name of art" *(Levi and Smith, 1991, p. 151).* Art educators arguing process versus product has promoted the controversy of assessment in the visual arts and students continue to use this argument to rationalize the grading process. Since the arts place a premium on personal insight, individual success and creativity, educators must be able to assess them *(National Standards, 1994).* Effective assessment should not hinder, restrict, or interfere with the educational process but rather be a means to improve it.

Involvement in the arts is linked to measurable improvements by students in other academic areas. Increased math SAT scores *(The College Board, 1995),* writing quality *(Moore and Caldwell,*

1993) and reading skills *(New York City Board of Education, 1993)* are only a few ways that research credits the role of the art education programs in our schools. Art educators must be ready to defend and expand evaluation procedures if they are to continue to give credence to these claims. Knowing the value of art education programs, we must find a way to clarify grading and improve the assessment process. The classroom of the 21st century has changed and so must the evaluation of the visual artwork created in it. "These classrooms are far from 'read the chapter and answer the question' contexts of yesteryear" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 302).* Assessment must differ from the traditional mentality of average of test scores grading.

Much of the theoretical framework for the innovation of alternative assessment techniques has foundations in constructivism and schema-based learning *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 302).* Constructivists believe that learning is a self-regulated process that involves experience, discourse, and reflection *(Brooks and Brooks, 1993).* **Constructivism** "frees students from a fact-driven curricula and encourages them to focus on larger ideas; allows students to reach unique conclusions and reformulate ideas…and emphasizes that students are responsible their own learning" *(Brooks and Brooks, 1993, p. 99).* **Schema-based learning** is based on the thought that authentic learning takes place when new information attaches to, and integrates with what is already known. Both of these theories base learning on individual experiences. If learning is indeed individualized, then no one method of teaching or evaluation can be adequately used

McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, compiled current research on assessment and found that "what has emerged is assessment that is multidimensional, dynamic, authentic, collaborative, reflective and standards based" *(p. 303).* *Multidimensionality* is essential because students' strengths are demonstrated in various forms. Some students can give oral explanations to problems that would be difficult for them to put in writing. Others may work best visually, or dramatically. If all assessment is presented in the same manner, students do not have the opportunity to display their strengths.

Assessment should be *dynamic,* and an ever-changing part of the teaching-learning process. "Assessment of student learning is done naturally within the context of lessons and activities" *(Brooks and Brooks, 1993, p. 122).* The evaluation of assignments should constantly be a platform for developing future lessons and activities. *Authenticity* links student assignments and the assessment of these assignments to real life experiences allowing students to see value beyond the classroom. The concept of *collaboration* allows students to find success that they may not find working alone. The value of success cannot be lessened because it was a group effort. *Reflection* allows both the student and the teacher to evaluate processes, learning and content. Students may set goals and coordinate thoughts as they reflect. Lastly, assessment should be *standards-based.* While the learning and evaluating of student work should be tailored to best meet the needs of students, clearly defined goals must frame the process. Teachers should use the national, state and local standards to ensure integrity at the core of the program.

From this current research, we know that the use of effective assessment techniques can improve all areas of the arts program. It can enhance classroom instruction by evaluating the effectiveness of lessons as presented by the teacher. Preliminary testing and reflection provides the teacher with feedback of students' progress. Monitoring this progress can diagnose student strengths and weaknesses, allowing for needs-based planning and student success. Assessment should be "student oriented and teacher- directed" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 6).* This demonstrates the dynamic nature of assessment, ever changing to meet the needs of students. It should empower students through shared decision-making, collaboration, to reflect and in turn, hopefully, to take more responsibility for their own learning. It should heighten student interest and motivation as they gain more control. Assessment should be about gathering information. It should involve student learning outcomes, teacher effectiveness and program effectiveness *(Beattie, 1997).*

There can be no one method that will meet all the assessment needs within a classroom. This researcher found six major categories of assessment strategies that are either formative or summative in purpose. These six areas certainly do not limit the ways that assessment can be used, but they are intended to categorize the areas in art that demand assessment. This means that the "art educator has many different opportunities for analyzing, observing, and measuring students' procedural knowledge" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 9).* The six different categories are lesson assessments, written reflection, rubrics, portfolios, critiques and traditional testing techniques. Their intent within the art program determines whether they are formative or summative assessments.

The importance of quality assessment in art education cannot be overemphasized. Removing the subjectivity from grading and clarifying the process for parents and students secures the arts within the educational framework. Evaluating students with clear objectives only benefits their performance and our own programs. "Clearly, students have different aptitudes and abilities in the arts, but differences are not disqualifications" *(National Standards, 1994, p. 6).* Assessment is about making improvements. Teachers can use assessment to diagnose weaknesses and find solutions, plan programs for success and allow students to take some of the responsibility for their own learning. Authentic assessment is not an aimless job that takes valuable teaching time from teachers. "Rather, it is an integral component of quality teaching" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 2).*

With the enactment of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act,* arts are acknowledged as a core subject, just like mathematics, English, or reading *(National Standards, 1994).* This affirms art as a discipline that has objectives with clear standards that can be assessed. The most effective assessments are multidimensional, dynamic, authentic, collaborative, reflective and standards-based *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000).* The different methods of assessment included in this paper fit into these categories and do not compromise the unique nature of art itself. The purpose of this paper is to examine the different methods of assessment that fit these criteria in the visual arts.

Statement of the Research Problem

Determining success in a highly individualized process, such as creativity, can be difficult. The standards of success in the visual arts are often abstract to non-art educators, including parents, administrators, other teachers, and most importantly, the students being assessed. If art education is to continue claiming a significant role in the educational process, and if we are to improve the practice of teaching the visual arts, then assessment must be clarified. The intent of this research is to develop an assessment model for the visual arts.

Statement of the Research Questions

The question for investigation was as follows:

What are the different methods of assessment in the visual arts?

Specific considerations requisite to determining a response to the research question included:

a) The individualized processes of creativity and how this demands unique assessment strategies

b) The roles of both formative and summative assessment

c) The specific qualities of effective assessment

Significance of the Study

The significance of studying visual arts assessment methods is to provide the teacher with numerous ways to improve the classroom practice of assessment. Beattie, 1997, states that "pre-assessing for prior knowledge, building on prior knowledge through instruction, reassessing, re-teaching based on assessment findings, and final assessing are all part of sound classroom teaching practices"*(p. 3)*. The arts create unique circumstances for assessment. The purpose of this investigation is to develop an assessment model for the visual arts.

Art educators can list numerous ways the arts contribute to learning. We can provide evidence that links involvement in the arts with measurable improvements by students in math,

reading and writing. Although we can prove the crucial role art plays in the educational process, it is often considered a "special" or "extra" activity or class. The view that art is about self-expression, creativity and self-esteem, created an assumption these tasks could not be assigned grades. Often it was actually the art teacher that argued learning in art could not be quantified *(Beattie, 1997)*. This is no longer the case. As art educators claim the educational value of art programs, they are learning authentic ways to measure skill and content. New strategies are being implemented to clarify the process that once was an unspoken or non-existent grading scale.

Simply understanding that there is a need for assessment does not mean that art can be confined to traditional testing techniques. Dr. Arthur Tobias, of the Harvard-Westlake School, explains this dilemma in providing evidence of the triumph of an inner-city arts program. While those involved were aware of its success, they needed to find meaningful ways to explain student outcomes. Testing strategies developed to test other competencies were all dismissed even if they were adapted to fit the art context. Art cannot always be contained like other subject areas, forced to fit into traditional tests or multiple choice type assessments. Eventually, new assessments that fit the framework of art education were developed so learning could be measured. This research provides evidence that art, although unique, can be assessed. "Although some aspects of learning in the arts can be measured adequately by traditional paper-and-pencil techniques or demonstrations, many skills and abilities can be properly assessed only by using methods and criteria that require a sophisticated understanding" *(National Standards, 1994, p. 22)*.

If art educators want the visual arts to have rank as an academic subject, achievement, knowledge and skill in art must be measurable and accountable. Authentic assessment is the barometer with which art educators will achieve that standing, and will, in turn, secure our place as a core, fundamental subject area. These techniques can serve as a model for authentic assessment in the visual arts.

Assumptions and Limitations

This research assumes art educators in public or private schools could implement all of the techniques outlined. Differences in student populations, budget or special education needs are not disqualifications as the variances are considered the norm within any school system. The researcher also assumes that art educators are already in the practice of verbalizing project objectives to students. Time constraints or administrative support may limit the amount of freedom an art educator has to replace traditional grading policies.

Definition of Terms

Assessment- "Method or process used for gathering information about people, programs, or objects for the purpose of evaluation" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 4)*

Alternative assessment- A nontraditional means of recording evidence of learning *(Teaching the Arts, 2001).*

Authentic assessment- "Assessment that uses realistic, meaningful, open-ended problems, true to a discipline" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 3).*

Criterion- A standard, rule, or test on which a judgment or decision can be based *(Merriam-Webster, 1969)*

Criterion Referenced Assessment- The student is assessed in reference to some student outcome that can be expected as a result of an education experience. "A type of score referencing system that compares a student's score on a performance to a whole repertoire of behaviors, which are, in turn, referenced to the content and skills of a discipline. They do not compare students' performance to that of other students but to the standard of the criterion" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 4).*

Evaluation- To examine and judge the quality of *(Merriam-Webster, 1969).* The worth of something as determined by a judgement of value *(Beattie, 1997).*

Formative Evaluation (Assessment)- "process of judging an ongoing, changing process or product for diagnosis, revision, description, information, or comparison" *(Teaching the Arts, 2001, p. 3).*

Ongoing assessment- within the natural classroom environment, a teacher evaluates student learning through observation and tracks student progress *(Teaching the Arts, 2001).*

Outcome- "the successful culmination of a cluster of integrated learning experiences" *(Teaching the Arts, 2001, p. 4)*

Performance Assessment- The evaluation of a student's work based on observing the creation of the product *(Teaching the Arts, 2001).*

Portfolio- A compilation or collection of student work covering a period of time or a particular subject matter *(Teaching the Arts, 2001).*

Rubrics- "are performance based assessment tools and assess complex skills, higher order thinking, and degrees of understanding. Rubrics clearly delineate levels of achievement and show students how to improve their performance in order to proficiently accomplish the standard" *(Borgmann, 2001, p. 1)*

Standardized Test- A uniform test scored under the same conditions for all students *(Teaching the Arts, 2001).*

Summative evaluation- a final end judgments serving purposes of persuasion, verification, prediction or validity *(Beattie, 1997)*

Traditional assessment- essay or restricted answer test for grading purposes *(Teaching the Arts, 2001).*

Chapter II: Review of Literature

The researcher began by studying the curriculum standards from California, New York, and North Carolina State Departments of Instruction. California and New York address student assessment in a very general manner that speaks to end-of-course accountability as opposed to assessment integrated into every aspect of the art program.

California does not refer to any particular means of assessing student work. In grades nine through twelve, California's art students may acquire the proficient or advanced level of achievement. The content standards increase in difficulty as students move from proficient to advanced levels. The researcher contacted the California Department of Education's Standards and Assessments Division about assessment in art education and was informed "the arts are not assessed as part of the state assessment system and any assessment would be done at the local level" *(McLeod, January 2002,e-mail).* This means that teachers are free to interpret state objectives individually and determine student success accordingly. The 1996 California Learning Standards for the Arts address evaluation by stating that "assessment techniques should account for the similarities

and differences among the arts and the varying capabilities and education of students", but it lists no examples.

New York State's content standards go one step further than California's objectives by listing examples of possible evidence of student success. This is helpful because their actual standards are vague. These content standards are listed as objectives with some criteria included determining success. These objectives, called performance indicators, use ambiguous terms that leave too much room for individual interpretation. "Produce a collection…in a variety…different kinds of" are all instructional terms used in New York's standards that can be interpreted differently from person to person *(New York Content Standards for Art, 2001)*. These standards use unclear terms in a former tradition of treating art differently from academic subjects. New York also lists commencement portfolios and a standardized test as ways that students are assessed.

The development of a portfolio is in preparation for post high school education more so than as a tool for reflection during the high school career. The New York State High School Arts Assessment is a standardized test for students in all levels of the arts. The test is "designed to measure student achievement of the commencement-general education level performance indicators for the New York State standards for the arts"(*April 2001, High School Arts Assessments, grade 9, test sampler draft, p. 3)*. This test is to determine how well the content standards are being taught. It uses many different methods to assess success, such as short answer, short constructed response, extended constructed response, performance and portfolio assessment. All of these are effective methods that address the unique nature of art, but the actual test is more about accountability than assessing to improve practice.

North Carolina's arts education curriculum briefly addresses self-assessment as a tool to help students grow as artists. It is not indicated as a teaching tool, but more in terms of a valuable learned skill. The objectives within North Carolina are clearer than the other two systems.

The standards of these three state school systems are objective and measurable only when met under the specifications of individual teacher programs. How then are they being measured? How are teachers qualifying increased level of competence *(California Visual Arts Standard I)* and the "development of skills" *(California Visual Arts Standard II)* without assessment that provides the clear progression of objectives along the way? Even with clear standards, there are no provisions for teachers to avoid subjective assessment. They merely address assessment in terms of standardized test taking techniques and accountability. The North Carolina Standard Course of Study addresses self-assessment as a basis of a quality art education program, but does not provide tools for the teacher within this curriculum.

The researcher reviewed *1994 The National Standards for Arts Education* and found numerous references to the value of arts assessment, but no preferred or recommended strategies. The standards state emphatically "that all these things [the standards] can in some way be measured- if not always on a numerical scale, then by informed critical judgment". These standards provide clear learning objectives with little room for ambiguity. They can "provide a basis for student assessment and for evaluating programs" *(National Standards, 1994, p.23)*. While the significance of assessment is adequately addressed, no specific methods are detailed, only that "a broad range of measures could well be used to assess whether a given standard is met" *(National Standards, 1994, p.)*. While the national standards place a higher premium on the value of assessment than do state standards, both tend to stress accountability more than its value on authentic learning.

The controversial nature of arts assessment has produced numerous papers in art education journals. The researcher found information in art education magazines and research journals that described many techniques specifically designed for the visual arts. Tobias' (2000) article *A Test for the Visual Arts* about an inner-city arts program highlighted the necessity of assessment techniques unique to the nature of art, such as rubrics that can be tailored to individual art assignments. Jones'

(1995) *Recipe for Assessment* details the debate within the arts communities about assessing art. It is in dialogue between an art educator, his principal, and a school board member that addresses the importance of product versus process. The authors believe that achievement in art history and or in aesthetics is not an adequate measure of student artwork and that critical ability must be tested.

Luehrman, a graduate student at the University of Missouri-Columbia, wrote the 1998 article *Authentic Learning and Visual Art.* He attempts to explain the misconceptions of art educators surrounding assessment. Luehrman believes that many art educators see authentic learning as an approximation of students to mirror what art professionals do as opposed to assessing the actual learning that takes place in the process. He states that in order for students to learn authentically there must be the location of information, the application of this information and then synthesis into daily living. Only then will real learning take place *(Luehrman, 1998).* Dorn's (1998) *The Aesthetically Testable Object* relays much of the highly publicized research indicating that students who are trained in the arts perform better on standardized tests with open-ended thinking problems. He addressed the need to encourage and substantiate our cognitive claims by encouraging more intelligent art learning in schools.

Finding the data to support the need for assessment in the visual arts, the researcher reviewed information from the National Assessment of Education Progress, or NAEP. In 1997, the NAEP issued an arts report card that "presented useful information about what students know and can do in the arts, what sorts of arts teaching is happening in our schools and the availability of school resources for the arts" *(The Nation's Report Card, 1997, p. 46).* This assessment of eighth graders claimed to use "innovative scoring methods to evaluate student artistic achievement objectively and reliably" *(Music Educators Journal, September 1998, p. 18).* The NAEP assessments focused on Process and Content by testing in traditional paper and pencil, as well as in performance tasks. Students worked in several different media and "scoring guides had to be developed to provide

accurate assessment of the full range of student achievement on these tasks" *(Music Educators Journal, September 1998, p. 18).* While the NAEP Arts Education Assessment was intended to find out what is being learned in America's art classrooms, it emphasized the need for alternative methods in evaluating art by demonstrating that no one type of task can evaluate learning in the arts.

Barrett's article *Studio Critiques, 2000,* Eisner's *The National Assessment in the Visual Arts, 1999* and Gentile and Murnyack's 1989 article incorporating assessment in the Discipline Based Arts Education program all highlighted the need for quality assessment and addresses different methods to achieve it. The vast majority of literature substantiated the necessity for quality assessment in the arts.

Several texts were extremely beneficial to this research. Donna Kay Beattie's (1997) Assessment in Art Education provided a foundation of good assessment techniques designed especially for the visual arts. Her work with undergraduate and graduate art education students at Brigham Young University provide a multitude of assessment techniques and practiced strategies for success. Beattie's explanation of good practices for art educators is extremely time friendly and respects the unique atmosphere of the art classroom.

W. James Popham's Classroom Assessment: What Teachers Need to Know is a text aimed at introducing regular classroom teachers to alternative methods of assessment. This book "contains mainline material with the day-in and day-out assessment concerns of classroom teachers" *(Popham, 1995, p. vii).* The chapters of this book are designed to help teachers master different assessment techniques. It includes chapter summaries, self-check lists, a fictional classroom situation to work through and an extensive list of resources about that particular topic *(Popham, 1995).*

Maureen McLaughlin and MaryEllen Vogt's book Creativity and Innovation in Content Area Teaching "is designed as a resource, a compendium of ideas, to facilitate teaching and learning in a

constructivist classroom culture" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 1).* Founded on the belief of Eliot Eisner (1995) that

> Teaching can be done as badly as anything else. It can be wooden, mechanical, mindless, and wholly unimaginative. But when it is sensitive, intelligent, and creative- those qualities that confer upon it the status of an art-it should not be regarded, as it so often is by some, as an expression of unfathomable talent or luck but as an example of humans exercising the highest levels of their intelligence. (p. 77)

This book encourages teachers to try new strategies of teaching and to break out of the habitual lecture-homework-test mentality. Stressing skills that will nurture creative and divergent thinking, ideas are non-traditional and suggest a new perspective to teaching. The authors highlight alternative assessment techniques in Chapter 15, focusing on performance, portfolio and profile assessments.

Personalized Instruction: Changing Classroom Practice by James Keefe and John Jenkins (2000) focuses on the need to individualize instruction and tailor learning to students. Theodore Sizer, in the book's forward, states "for over 150 years American educators have struggled to design schools which are at once communities with common structures and routines and places that respect and nurture specialness" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. iv).* While maintaining that all students learn and succeed differently this text discusses the many varied assessment styles and addresses, at length, the need to assess for improvement, not necessarily grades.

Before any assessment techniques can be adapted, there must be a real understanding as to the nature of creativity and the unique way it must be assessed. One recurring theme found is that "good assessment includes a variety of ways of appraising student work and achievement, including performance assessment as well as forced choice of testing often used in the arts as accountability measures" *(Teaching the Arts, 2001, p. 1).* Most of the literature stated that no one method of

assessment could meet the needs of a teacher who wants to look critically at her own program for improvement. The integration of several techniques is needed for a clear comprehensive evaluation.

Assessment is a current topic in education. Much has been written about the subject and the research can be overwhelming. While the foundations, characteristics, and implementation of quality assessment vary slightly from researcher to researcher, the common attributes are presented in this paper.

Chapter III: Research orientation and Design of Study

The purpose of this investigation was (1) to examine the different methods of assessment in the visual arts, (2) to examine the specific qualities of both formative and summative assessment and, (3) to examine the individualized processes of creativity and how this demands unique assessment strategies. The intent of this research was to determine the reasons why assessment in the visual arts is so necessary to a quality program and to discuss different assessment methods.

Collection of the Data

The author collected assessment data, its value, and its implementation from numerous sources. It was collected from libraries through texts, educational research journals and educational periodicals. Public school systems, state and national curriculums provided data for this research and because assessment is a current topic in the art education, several texts were studied for information.

Methodology

Most research indicates that authentic assessment is multifaceted. "No single assessment criterion or strategy will give an arts educator the breadth of information he/she needs in order to ascertain a student's artistic progress" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 6)*. Assessment techniques are compiled into six categories relative to the nature and/or desired outcome of that technique. These categories are classified as either formative or summative assessments. Each category details their benefits within a program, implementation strategies, and examples. While some techniques are more labor

intensive than others, all are designed to improve the effectiveness of the teacher's program, increase the quality of student work, and remove the subjective nature of grading in the visual arts program. The analysis of this data involved systematically searching and categorizing the research. All of the different assessment techniques were compiled into six different areas for clarity and simplification and determined to be either formative or summative in purpose.

Chapter IV: Results:

The following assessment techniques serve different purposes within the art program. They can only be implemented with the assumption the art teacher has clear objectives that can be verbalized to students. Art teachers can no longer have unspoken criteria that are mysterious to students, other teachers, administrators and parents. De-mystifying the evaluation process allows students to finally understand the learning within and the value of art. Objectives must be age appropriate and reiterated to students throughout the whole process. Students should understand the rationale for objectives if they are to internalize the objectives. For example, if the objectives for a papier-mache' mask includes six layers for the base of the mask, the intended objective should be explained. The mask must have multiple layers in the vase for it to withstand the construction of additional features such as horns, noses, or ears. Understanding the rationale for an otherwise ambiguous request internalizes the necessity of meeting the objective.

Objectives should be posted in some manner for student reference and reviewed regularly. Objectives that will later be assessed should never be subjective in nature. For example, students creating a still life should not be directed to use "good" composition unless they have been taught what constitutes the term "good"; a rather generic term that can be subjective from person to person. Students could instead be directed to draw large using no less than 75% of their page and to add interest by drawing off of the top or sides of their paper. Terms that can be interpreted differently by person to person should be avoided or explained in the objectives.

Without clear objectives available to students, these other assessment strategies are futile exercises. Clear objectives help to direct student learning. They guide students through the process and allow them to make meaning of what they are doing. Starting with clear objectives is the basis for all of these assessment strategies.

Formative Assessments

Informal assessments that are quick, yet meaningful, and intended to give teachers immediate feedback about learning in the classroom are called formative assessments. Teachers can use these techniques to gather information about the presentation or acquisition of a lesson, and what additional information students must share for real learning. "Generally speaking, formative assessment monitors the flow of the educational process" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 84)*. In the visual arts, formative assessment generally focuses on the processes and can be focused on individual students or generalized to the class as a whole.

Formative assessment strategies provide ongoing feedback. The purpose is to identify weaknesses or areas that need improvement and to offer suggestions for correction. Formative assessments need not make a judgment. Alternatives and suggestions for success should be provided to the student. This feedback to the student should be helpful and clear. The student must be able to understand the suggestions, accept the information, and to be able to use the information to make improvements.

Formative assessments can be sued with a wide range of content, skills, and processes. Teachers can use them to adapt instruction and sharpen the curriculum. More importantly, formative assessment familiarizes the teacher with student's individual strengths and weaknesses. Lessons can be modified or implemented based on these invaluable teaching tools. If assessment is about helping the learner learn, then formative assessment is the key. The goal should not be about the end grade, but the learning that takes place in the process.

Lesson Assessment Tools: These tools are aimed at giving feedback to a teacher who has just introduced a new concept. Keefe and Jenkins refer to this as "Naturalistic Assessment" or the "day to day", often informal or mental appraisal of what has been accomplished. "Much of this appraisal takes place during typical classroom activities with teacher as participant observer" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 141).* These fact-finding missions are short exercises that quickly inform a teacher what part of the content a student comprehends. Even though the process comes naturally to teachers, it should be formal and include observation and records. A test is not always necessary to determine whether learning is taking place. "Checklists, logs, reports, records and conferences are common strategies to use" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 141).* This observation allows teachers to watch students as they engage in a task. "These assessments offer evidence of student motivation, communication, interaction, risk taking, critical and creative thinking and collaboration" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 309).*

Popham's (1995) book Classroom Assessment states that a distinction must be drawn between evaluation, "an activity focused on determining effectiveness of the teacher" and grading, "an activity focused on letting students know how well they are performing" *(p. 245).* Lesson assessment tools are what Popham refers to as evaluation. These are the ways to determine whether or not the lesson needs to be rethought or if the majority of students successfully mastered the objectives. All of these strategies are mindful of the many demands on teachers, and are simple and easy to implement.

- Half-Minute Note cards- Students are given a note card and a half-minute on each of these prompts. 1) The most important thing learned during this lesson and 2) What crucial question still needs to be answered? No names are given, and these can be used for warm ups or wrap-ups. It is very important that the teacher give feedback from this information to validate the exercise to students and secure its importance *(Beattie, 1997).*

- Pre Instruction versus Post Instruction Paradigm- an effective method for gauging instructional impact. "If you assess your students prior to teaching them, then assess your students after you've taught them, any difference between their pre-instruction and post-instruction performances should be chiefly attributable to what went on in between, or the

teaching" *(Popham, 1995, p. 247)*. Popham believes there is a certain problem with this process in that the effects measured by the post-test will actually be the function of the instruction plus the pre-test, but nonetheless, teachers can see how much learning has taken place.

- Scaffolding- is a "temporary cognitive support developed by a teacher or student to bridge the gap between present knowledge or skill and a learning goal" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 142)*. A scaffold can be in the form of questions, writing prompts, or even an illustration that "bridges" past learning to new learning.

- Clipboard- is a method of quickly, yet effectively, jotting down observations of students. Using a mailing label or sticky note - put each student's name on them and place each on a clipboard. When a student is observed, the teacher records information on the label or note, dates it, and places the information in a portfolio or observation folder. This continues throughout the year. Notes can be managed chronologically or subject wise, whichever seems to work best for the teacher *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000)*.

- Muddiest Point or Clearest Point- Ask students to answer the question "What was the muddiest (or clearest) point of the lesson, subject or reading? Pass out brightly colored index cards and sometimes allow students to work in groups. Clear up any of the muddy, unclear points *(Beattie, 1997, p. 87)*.

- Fast Facts- Towards the end of the class period have students pull out a sheet of paper and list as many facts as they can remember in a specified amount of time. Add some sort of incentive for anyone who states 5 or more, 10 or more, etc… *(Beattie, 1997)*

- Journal entries- Students can reflect on the day's lesson or on a specific question from the teacher.

- Quizzes- Check for understanding through traditional question and answer written tests.

- RDQC2- stands for Recall, Description, Question, Connect and Comment. Working in pairs or groups, each group is responsible for one-step. Then the group shares the information with the whole class.

In 2001, the National Board for Teaching Standards stated, "qualified art teachers should regularly monitor, analyze, and evaluate their teaching and student progress" *(p. 61)*. Lesson assessment tools are for the teacher who wants to look critically at instruction in order to help students succeed. The teacher becomes an active participant in finding out what is going on in that classroom. If students are actively engaged, the teacher knows they are learning. Tests are often poor measures of learning, which involve analysis or problem solving, like most of what is

done in the art classroom. More effective assessment strategies can track student learning and allow teachers to plan more effectively.

Written Reflection- this category can include, but should not be limited to traditional writing exercises and should not be limited to students. It should be a regular part of the visual art class. Students should feel free and safe to reflect on their work, concepts, and ideas. Teachers should keep notes about lessons and ideas. Written reflection can come anytime in the art making process. Time can be set-aside specifically by the teacher, or freely done by students as they appropriately choose it.

Brooks and Brooks *(1993)* note that from a constructivist perspective, learning is understood as a process that incorporates concrete experience, collaborative discourse, and reflection. "Teacher reflections on student performance can assess student's progress, question process and understanding, discover strengths and needs, and support revision and personal goal setting" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 311)*. Written reflection takes the informal activity of simply thinking about what is happening in a classroom and formalizes it into writing. Written reflection is documentation for future reference. Fran Zimmerman *(cited in Mann, 1998)* observes, "reflective practice requires an environment where teachers can ask good questions, collect data, and draw conclusions from critical thinking" *(p. 4)*. This is about assessing for understanding as opposed to simply evaluating for reporting grades. This self-evaluation allows reflective time for the teacher to plan and modify.

Just as the teacher must reflect on what is happening with students, it is vital that students examine their own learning. Deliberate self reflection may lead to insights they were unaware they had acquired. Whether lead by prompted questions or allowed to journal freely, students need to take the time to allow thoughts to form.

The following types of written reflection are appropriate and recommended strategies for both teacher and student:

- Journaling- can be very effectively integrated into a sketchbook component. Students can work through ideas both visually and through written experience. The journal can also function as self-assessment.

- Journal Probes- In combination with a journal, the teacher can use probes or leading questions to be answered thoughtfully by students. These teacher-constructed questions can be about the particular project or task, the grading criteria, or the thinking process involved in the artwork *(Beattie, 1997).* (See Appendix A)

- Dual Entry Journals- The most common form of dual entry journal has the student putting a line down the center of each notebook page to divide it in half. On one side of the line, notes and summaries of information presented by the teacher are written. On the other side of the line, students write reflections or questions that they may have about the information. Students should be encouraged to use these journals outside of the classroom setting. *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000)*

- Annotated Portfolios- "Generally speaking, the annotated portfolio is a strategy that requires students to explain their portfolios in terms of goals and objectives and therefore, assesses the cognitive processes of reflecting and explaining to others" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 74).* These written reflections should be used in conjunction with the traditional portfolio of artwork.

- Annotated Artworks- are reflections actually posted on artwork with sticky notes. Students may leave a border around artwork or make comments directly on their projects. The teacher gives students guided questions to reflect. *(Beattie, 1997).* (See Appendix B)

- Pre-Project writing- In this type of writing, students can address any questions they have prior to beginning a project but after it has been introduced by the teacher. Students and teachers can also work together to create questions that students will, hopefully, be able to answer once the project is complete. *(Beattie, 1997, p. 311)*

- Post Project- Students can reflect about completed projects, what works, what doesn't and what they wish they had done differently. This is reflection that can be done in the student's journal.

- Quickwrites- these require only a few minutes of time, but they provide an effective way of assessing student thinking. The teacher should explain to students what purpose the quickwrite will serve. It is important for the student to be aware of who their audience will be, peers or teacher. Once the purpose has been explained, determine the amount of time allotted (generally 3 to 5 minutes), provide them with a reflective prompt and ask them to respond *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000).*

- Content Histories- "A content history details a person's development in a particular content area from earliest memory to the present" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 311).* This is advantageous for the student as it promotes reflective thought and makes connections from former to present learning. It provides the teacher with insight about a student's prior understanding that aids in tailoring planning.

- Self Reflection- whether done in a journal or through teacher constructed response items, self-reflection encourages students to examine their learning process. They can accomplish this by "contemplating what they are doing, why they are doing it, what contributed to its success, and what they would do to improve it next time" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 310).* Some students may need topics to begin their self-reflection and others will adapt to the reflective process and discuss their work without prompts. (See Appendix C)

- Peer Reflections- "Peer reflections demonstrate that the work in which students are engaging is valued and that all students have ownership of the process" in grading and planning *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 310).*

- Measuring Sticks- Beattie, 1997, describes a self assessment where "students are required to demonstrate knowledge of their own art style, to assess their attempts at using that style, and to reflect upon the relationship between the selected measure and their own work" *(p. 77).* Objectives and standards are taken from the real art world and discussed by students, either in writing or in-group discussion. Students, after discussing the benchmarks for exemplary work, can reflect on their work as if it were being graded on a similar scale. (See Appendix D)

- Student Kept records are a useful self-assessment strategy implemented at the Bronx New School in New York City. Students keep all of their own records or readings, writings, art projects, responsive writing and notes of conferences with teachers. These logs allow them to reflect on progress throughout the year, but also keep records of all work they have accomplished. *(Darling-Hammond et al., 1995)*

All of the above exercises must be adapted within an individual art teacher's program and to the students. These exercises may also be beneficial in conjunction with other techniques. The art of reflection can never be underestimated. Students need the time and encouragement to think about what they are doing, to feel safe in discussing it, and a place to house the ideas that come to them while they are working. " Reflective teacher realize that recognizing student inventiveness and successes teaches us how to improve instruction" *(McCollister, 2002, p. 52).* Both teachers and students need to spend time assessing their own work in reflective contemplation.

Critiques- Current research tells us that the intimidation factor must be removed from the critiquing process for it to be effective. Critiques should be a learning experience and not an exercise in humility *(Barrett, 2000)*. The critique can be a group discussion that prior to scoring the work. "Critiques give us insight into how the class as a whole understands and accomplishes a task" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 67)*. The critique should be non-threatening. Traditionally they were used with the production of art, letting students know ways to improve their work. The proper techniques, along with what is and what is not acceptable, should be modeled to students. The critique format should not pit one student against the other. The teacher should provide direction and ensure that students are sticking to the intended purpose and direction. Students should also be trained to objectively critique their own work. Critiques should be developed according to the student's needs and maturity levels. Teachers should assess and plan appropriate critiques accordingly. A few formats, different from traditional critiques, follow:

- PQP or Praise, Question, Propose- This process, that simply follows that PQP format, emphasizes feedback, not criticism as an introduction to critiques. Students are encouraged first to find a positive aspect of the work, then ask a student why they did something, as opposed to finding fault. Students have to justify their decisions and then the class can propose ideas to make the work better.

Two critique models are based on models developed by Edward de Bono, a leading advocate of teaching thinking in schools, and are close to the concept of the PQP method. The first one is called PMI and the second is the praise-clarification-criticism-amplification model.

- PMI- You can create three columns on the board with a "+", a "–"and an "I" above them. Students look for good things, things that need to be improved and interesting parts to the work. This method of critique charts out students' work in terms of plus, minus and interesting aspects of the work. Students critiquing and students being critiqued see not only the positive, along with the negative, but see their ideas as interesting aspects *(Rowland, 2001)*.

- Praise-Clarification-Criticism-Amplification – Students following this critique procedure first praise the work by finding positive aspects. Then they ask any questions about what the artist has done in the clarification stage. Next students make constructive comments about what they see as negative, and last they discuss ways to improve the work in the amplification stage *(Rowland, 2001)*.

- Word/Phrase Cards- In this format of critique, words or phrases that match with the criteria are written on cards. When art works are exhibited, students choose the work that best exemplifies a particular word or phrase and place it beside the appropriate artwork. Students must then give the reasons for their choices *(Beattie, 1997)*.

- Thumbs Up, Thumbs Down- this format uses the actual assessment criteria as the subjects of this critique. "This particular method works well as an introduction to critique strategies. The art educator should structure the thumbs-up, thumbs-down critique around something students have already learned *(Beattie, 1997, p. 68)*. Teachers ask questions about particular objectives and criteria. If the students see that the artist met the criteria, thumbs are up, if not, thumb down.

Teachers need to become acquainted with the personalities of their students before determining whether these or traditional critique methods would be best. Students should be encouraged as the critique process takes place and excited about getting feedback from students. Critiques should be used as assessment and not grades. Students should have the opportunity to refine and improve work based on the outcomes of the critique, a crucial component to formative assessment.

Summative Assessments

Despite the fact that the long-term educational benefits on student learning are not as significant as formative assessment, summative assessments are, unfortunately, treated as more important *(Beattie, 1997)*. The main reason for this is probably because there is a grade or mark attached to it and unfortunately this end result is seen as the amount of learning acquired. Even with this weight on summative assessments they generally do not provide the information about student learning or the feedback of formative assessments. "Summative assessments are more formal than formative assessments; they require more preparation, cover more content, demand that issues of validity and reliability be addressed, are presented in a more rigid atmosphere, take longer for students to complete, and generally are considered high-stakes because important consequences are attached to them. Summative assessments fall into one of two categories: commercially constructed

and teacher-constructed" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 104)*. Teacher constructed summative assessments can provide more flexibility and they do not have to be confined to paper and pencil tasks.

Summative assessments should be carefully planned around the results of the less formal formative assessments. A teacher that is primarily interested in the learning of students should limit such high stakes assessments or build them up from formative assessments, so that students have every possible chance for success.

The researcher has included three categories of summative assessments. Rubrics and portfolios can fit into that category of assessments that can be formative with a final summative assessment.

Rubrics- "Rubrics are generally used to assess larger units of study, performances or multifaceted projects. They can be used for group assessments as well as individual student work. Rubrics should be created prior to the lesson and distributed to students at the beginning of the unit" *(Payne, 2001, p.1)*. Rubrics can be used as a formative assessment during the process of creating art and then used as a summative tool for the final grading. A rubric is typically used when a judgment of quality is required. Because judgments concerning the quality of a given project vary depending upon the individual evaluator, standards are established even before the project begins. While there are many different definitions for rubrics, the following characteristics are consistently found. Rubrics are designed to accommodate many different levels of performance. The distinction between what is and what is not acceptable or what is quality or superior work fall naturally within a rubric framework. Standards should be clear and students should know exactly what is needed for successful completion of the assignment. A rubric should be easily understood with little or no room for ambiguity. The teacher can derive rubrics or can use input from students, who may feel empowered with some ownership in the process. "There are four types of scoring rubrics: holistic, modified or focused holistic, analytic, and modified analytic" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 158)*.

Rubric should be used when there is a question of judgment. Rubrics remove the subjectivity from grading artwork with concrete objectives, or criteria. A student who makes a "75" out of "100," may not know how to improve their work. "Rubrics respond to this concern by providing descriptions at each level as to what is expected. These descriptions assist the students in understanding why they received the score that they did and what they need to do to improve their future work" *(Moskal, 2000, p. 3).* Scoring rubrics provide at least two benefits in the assessment process. First, they support the extent of objectivity that went into the specified criteria. Second, they provide feedback to students concerning how to acquire the grade they desire or how to improve their work. *(Moskal, 2000).* Rubrics, while used to assess work should also act as a motivational tool for student success. If the grading process and objectives are unclear to students, they have no clear direction to aspire too.

"Rubrics are scoring guides that provide criteria for evaluating performances" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 316).* They are designed to accommodate a range of levels, with four to six being most common. Within these ranges, they provide gradations that might include *exceptional, thorough, adequate* and *inadequate,* while some are simply numbered with the highest number reflecting the greatest degree of achievement. The development of rubrics can seem daunting at first, but gets more natural as the teacher produces them more frequently. Some points for consideration when developing rubrics are:

- Clearly identify what the performance/work at a given level looks like; not what is missing *(Borgmann, 2001).*
- Refer to the common weakness in student's work and indicate ways these mistakes can be avoided *(Project Zero, 2000).*
- Use age appropriate and understandable language for students *(Project Zero, 2000).*
- Train students to use the rubric as a reference to evaluate works in progress, to guide, to revise and improve *(Borgmann, 2001).*

- Articulate clearly what constitutes success to students *(Project Zero, 2000)*
- Allow students to question a rubric for understanding *(Beattie, 1997)*.

Rubrics are not as difficult to develop, as it may first seem. Experienced teachers usually have an implicit, if not always expressed, set of criteria in mind as a starting point. This is often a good place to start *(Ryan and Miyasaka, 1995)*. Rubrics should be developed gradually for the benefit of the teacher and the students. McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, developed these standards for creating a rubric:

1. Start with the standards of the project.
2. Review many rubric models and work with peers who have used rubrics to help you begin your own.
3. Think about each standard in terms of levels of success. Decide how many levels your rubric will have. Decide which criteria should be in the rubric. Decide the levels of success for each criterion. It may be easier to start with an example of exemplary work and then move downward to what would be unacceptable. Make sure that there are clear distinctions between levels for each standard and make the descriptors as detailed as possible.
4. Share the rubric with students before they begin the project. They should have the opportunity to focus on the criteria they are working to achieve.
5. Allow students to use the rubric for self-evaluation and then allow students to compare the teacher's assessment with their own.

"The literature on self-regulated learning and feedback suggests that learning improves when feedback reminds students of the need to monitor their learning and guides them in how to achieve learning objectives" *(Bangert-Drowns et al, 1991, p. 224)*. Students cannot succeed if the guidelines for success are not clear. In an area, such as art, where many elementary students received non-numerical grades such as S, N, or U, grading in higher grades may seem unfair or confusing. Art educators at all grade levels need to explain the criteria for determining graded artwork to the students being graded, and to parents, administrators and other teachers. Only when students have the opportunity to see their success through growth can the learning be authentic.

Once students are introduced to the purpose of rubrics, their involvement in the development of them can be invaluable to their learning. "Student involvement is an important consideration in rubric design. Students may have input into the process from the beginning or after the teacher has created a draft of the rubric" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 316).* This creates ownership within the process as well as more familiarity with the actual rubric. Discussing the rubric with students prior to creating a project can only reinforce their understanding of expectations. "Student articulation is enhanced when brainstorming the content of rubrics" *(McCollister, 2002, p. 51).* Students may also have the chance to use the rubric for self-assessment or peer assessment. They should have the opportunity to revise their work based on the results of the assessment *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000).* This opportunity to revise work gives students the additional confidence in the assessment process and an opportunity to improve their work before final submission. This can only benefit the teacher because the work has gone through several checks and balances before final assessment. If the goal of teachers is to help students learn and to get their best work, then they should have every opportunity to find success. The goal of authentic assessment is to find best practices for teaching, not to make success impossible for students.

Cognitive psychologists, Snow and Lohman, as cited in MeCollister (2002),

> Have described the cognitive orientations that are present within expert or "proceduralized" knowledge. The authors have described the conceptual foundation that undergirds the practices to be learned, the why and the how of the learning. The knowing student becomes able to monitor and facilitate correctness of output, recognizing and avoiding errors. Proceduralized knowledge becomes automatized, requiring less and less thought and attention and maintaining quality in the face of concurrent tasks or demands. The knowledge shows a degree of composition, a wholeness. Steps become less necessary or apparent, and student performance smoothes and occurs more readily. A student with proceduralized knowledge recognizes the possibilities

> and limitations of the transference of that knowledge and makes appropriate generalizations. Finally, students develop metacognition: they think about their thinking" *(pp. 47-48).*

A well-described rubric allows the teacher to relay a great deal of information to all students. This information can answer many questions, and "demystify the learning at hand" *(McCollister, 2002, p. 48).* Students are able to proceduralize knowledge, through reinforcement simply by the act of reviewing the rubric as they work.

"Educators have developed four types of scoring rubrics: holistic, modified or focused holistic, analytic, and modified analytic" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 158).* A holistic scoring rubric is used to score the whole product as opposed to the parts. (See Appendix E) "To design a holistic rubric, three or four competency levels are identified such as novice, intermediate, advanced, or 1, 2, 3, 4" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 19).* Being in a chart or matrix format, this rubric is in paragraph form. Levels are described in depth. Often the product will fall between 3 and 4 and be labeled as a 3.5 or ¾. "Because art teachers are used to sizing up the whole product, a well written holistic rubric may be easier and faster to use than an analytic rubric" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 19).* "The holistic rubric is an overall judgment with no criteria" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 159).* It will provide general information about a student's performance without the individual breakdowns of criteria. It "provides no instructional information about dimensions of learning exhibited by the student's performance [artwork]" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 159).*

The modified or focused holistic scoring rubric has criteria within the rubric. It "combines both scoring plans by scoring the whole first and then several major individual parts or attributes that support the global score" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 19).* It provides general information about the whole artwork and does indicate some information about the level of the student's work relating to the whole.

The analytic scoring rubric judges specific objectives within work. "A partial score is assigned based on the scorer's judgments of specific dimensions. For each learning dimension, features of particular levels of performance and the number of points to be awarded are defined. There is no total score, only several, partial, analytic scores" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 159).* This type of rubric evaluates and scores parts of characteristics of the product, or the process, individually. "Cognitive processes, discipline-specific process, and basic core skills also might be set up as criteria, examined and rated" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 19).*

The modified analytic scoring rubric is analytical scoring with a total score assessed. Partial scores are assigned then an overall or total score is the sum of its parts. This rubric provides general information about the work as a whole, and indicates specific instructional information about the student's level of success in the parts. Even though research has categorized rubrics into these four types, the style can be varied to accommodate the preference of the teacher, students, or project. There are many formats available, which make the rubric, not only effective, but also versatile to use in the art classroom. Following the basic steps to the development of rubrics is key, but modification is important in all aspects of assessment. There may be adjustments that are made for special education or handicapped students to ensure their successes as well. (See Appendix F and G for rubric examples)

Portfolios- can be used for a wide range or purposes. They can be on paper, videotape, or computer disks. They are often called process folios or best works portfolios. Regardless of the format, the portfolio, as used in the art classroom today, emphasizes significant evidence about the progress, achievements and experiences of the student *(Beattie, 1997).* The portfolio is no longer a container for, or merely a collection of, student artwork, but more a means to reveal processes. "its definition has expanded to include a purposeful collection of student work that tells the story of the student's efforts, progress, or achievement in (a) given area(s)" *(Arter, 1992, p. 4).* The portfolio, when

reviewed while a student works can be a formative assessment strategy, but it is generally treated as a summative capstone to a students experience in art.

Insight into the student's motivation for learning, efforts, progress and achievement can be evident in this cumulative portfolio. "The portfolio as used in the art classroom today emphasizes significant evidence about the progress, achievements and experiences of the student. The art portfolio, in its expanded definition, can replace other types of assessment and function as a teaching tool. It motivates and challenges students, promotes learning through reflection and self assessment, encourages student-teacher collaborations, validates different learning styles and approaches, and encourages the research, resolution, and communication of ideas" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 15).*

With all of the different types of portfolios, the teachers can determine which type best fits their program or the needs of students:

- Best-works portfolio- this is an accumulation of the very best work by a student. *(Beattie, 1997).*
- Expanded art portfolio- Included in this portfolio is evidence of a wide range of media, skills and processes *(Beattie, 1997).*
- Progress-Over-Time Portfolio- This is a collection of work showing the student's growth over time *(Payne, 2001).*
- Achievement portfolio- "is a visual or audio representation of who the student is as an artist. Generally, advanced students create this type of portfolio" *(Payne, 2001).* It can be used for scholarships, college entrance, advanced placement classes, or employment.
- Mini portfolio- this smaller portfolio focuses on a theme, media, or a single unit of study. Several mini portfolios can serve to make up a larger portfolio *(Beattie, 1997).*
- Process folio- Process and the learning experience are demonstrated in this type of portfolio. Evidence of growth and learning by a student is the focus *(Beattie, 1997).* This portfolio would include preliminary sketches and any inspiration that went into the development of the artwork.
- Electronic Portfolio- An electronic portfolio can fit into any of the above categories, but is kept digitally on a computer disk or CD. Students can take digital images of work, the artistic process and standards and compile them into a program, such as PowerPoint to maintain a portfolio that is more compact *(Tuttle, 97)*

The key ingredient to a successful portfolio is its depth, regardless of the type of portfolio *(Beattie, 1997)*. To be used for assessment, the art portfolio must contain certain elements. The consensus of research lists the following as the most important aspects of a successful portfolio:

- Decide upon which standards the portfolio will be based *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000)*.
- "Align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and reporting with the standards of the portfolio" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 320)*.
- Specify the goals of the art program or student in an introductory letter by the student *(Beattie, 1997)*.
- Reveal what is significant to the student *(Beattie, 1997)*. "Make sure your students "own" their portfolios" *(Popham, 1995)*. If portfolios are to represent the evolving work and learning of the student and to encourage self-evaluation, the student must see their portfolio as their own, a collection of their work and not simply a receptacle for work the teacher will eventually grade.
- Determine the criteria by which the portfolios will be assessed *(Popham, 1995)*. Students should have some guidelines to direct them as they prepare work for their portfolio.
- Decide on what samples of artwork to collect *(Popham, 1995)*. "Include students in the process of selection, reflection, and justification" *(Beattie, 1997),* but guidelines should be set from the onset of the project. The determination of what should go into the portfolio should not be done at the end of the grading period. The portfolio should be a continuous project.
- Require students to constantly evaluate their process *(Popham, 1995)*. If the portfolio is going to guide students to improve their practice, they must have time to reflect on how they are doing. Student and teacher reflection is important in the refining process.
- "Use the results of portfolio assessment to document student progress and give direction to teaching and learning" *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000, p. 320)*.

Portfolios, when correctly and thoughtfully implemented, can offer teachers a wealth of information about the abilities and progress of students. They can reveal information about the typical work of a student, or the maximum that a student can achieve. "Whatever approach art educators choose, portfolio evaluation utilizes a variety of assessment and judging strategies, such as checklists; rating scales; questionnaires; teacher, peer, parent, and other interviews; and student self-assessments" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 19)*. These different types of assessment strategies yield different

kinds of information to the teacher. Whatever the assessment strategy, everyone involved in the process should be clearly informed of the evaluation techniques. After the portfolio has been evaluated, the teacher should interpret those results. "Beyond a score or a grade, the teacher determines what the portfolio really says about student learning, as individuals and as a class; the effectiveness of the curriculum; and the learning environment" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 19).*

Portfolios can be a time and space consuming endeavor. Most advocates of using portfolios in the classroom "believe that the real payoffs for such assessment approaches lie in an individual teacher's classroom because the relationship between instruction and assessment will be strengthened as a consequence of students' continuing accumulation of work products in their portfolios" *(Popham, 1995, p. 164).* Student interviews or conferences should be a part of the process, as well as involving parents *(McLaughlin and Vogt, 2000)* (See Appendix H and I). Ideally, teachers who make the commitment to portfolios will make them a central focus of the instructional program rather than a peripheral activity that defeats the purpose of growth and student self-reflection. Portfolios, at the very least, allow students and parents to view achievement from the beginning of a marking period to the end. One way is to include a "Mini-Portfolio Parent Interview" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 72)* as a requirement (See Appendix J). Students see exactly what has been accomplished and what has been left undone. Students are accountable for the state of their portfolio and a well thought out corresponding rubric or other assessment strategy can justify, as well as clarify, grades. A good criterion referenced grading system makes it impossible for students to avoid doing a required assignment without accepting responsibility and it provides incentive for students to master the basics and go beyond. Portfolios allow teachers to get a clear assessment of what learning is taking place in the classroom and to take action accordingly.

Traditional Testing Techniques- Tests are, in fact, the most common assessment in classrooms. They are easy to make, quick to grade and made to cover content. "The three greatest disadvantages

of most test strategies are their passiveness, their indirectness, and their diminished cognitive complexity. Students are not allowed to express what they know about a subject in an individual manner or be actively, personally, and creatively involved" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 42).*

Assessment is about more than an end of quarter grade. It is about evaluating student learning and teacher effectiveness in the ideal of improving classroom practice. Traditional test techniques may measure student knowledge of facts, but should be used as just one of the many resources available. "Why should the art educator not capitalize on unique assessment opportunities offered by the art classroom and leave the less personalized, decontextualized testing formats for large scale assessments?" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 57).*

While traditional testing has always played a part in the educational system, "the preoccupation with student test scores as the definitive indicator of educational effectiveness first surfaced in the 1980's" *(Popham, 1995, p. 232).* In part, the focus on test scores came from citizens that demanded to know how public education was performing *(Popham, 1995).* Millions of tax dollars were being spent in public education and taxpayers wanted to make sure they were well spent. This made the 1980's the "era of educational responsibility" *(Popham, 1995, p. 232).* Because the public wanted school systems to be more accountable for educational dollars, contingencies and incentives were attached to these test scores. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) art test was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Getty Arts Center. This standardized arts test was developed and then field tested to approximately 4,500 fourth, eighth and twelfth graders in 1995 and 1997. The results of the test seemed to raise many more questions than it answered *(Dorn, 2002).* "Some professionals have raised concerns about whether 60 minutes spent on multiple-choice and essay questions related to aesthetics, criticism and artistic understanding and only 30-40 minutest spent on performance tasks is realistic given that perhaps up to 90% of all school art programs are devoted to creative studio activity"

(Dorn, 2002, p. 41). These systematic problems of standardized testing in the visual arts will hopefully be resolved by 2007 when full assessment of all U.S. students in the visual arts is scheduled.

Standardized tests are often efficient, but not always effective. There are some areas of the visual arts that can be effectively tested through traditional means such as true and false or multiple choice. "Pencil and paper varieties of tests are useful for ongoing formative evaluation and assessment of facts and knowledge, or in conjunction with performance tasks to help verify, define, or explain certain processes or procedures" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 57).* Traditional tests can be effective for grading facts, such as art history, theory, or even, the steps within a process. There are, however, many other more appropriate options for the varied work created in the art room.

Summary of Results

With school populations growing and becoming much more diverse, the teacher of the 21st century must adapt and learn to meet the educational needs of students. Assessment can only be successful if it as diverse as the students in the classroom. The techniques outlined in this paper cover six different categories for assessment that are either formative or summative. Lesson assessment tools are aimed at giving a teacher immediate feedback about the effectiveness of instruction. Written reflection, important for both teacher and student, allows subjects to ponder and input information as they work through guided questions or thought provoking prompts. The value of reflecting about one's work cannot be negated, as students become responsible for their own learning and direction and teachers choose to use assessment to help the learner learn. Rubrics take the guesswork out of art project standards for students. They can assess their own work and strive for success if they know how to attain it. Portfolios compile student work for review for the teacher, as well as the student. Learning is obvious to both when a progressive body of work can be seen and advancements noted. Where lesson assessment tools give teachers immediate feedback, critiques

can provide invaluable input to students. They can be handled so the intimidation factor is removed and students have the opportunity to discuss, validate, and improve work. Traditional testing does have a place in classroom assessment, and can be effective in gauging student learning. Paper and pencil tests should not be the only source for evaluating student learning.

The use of both formative and summative assessment strategies is crucial in creating success for students in the visual arts classroom. Although they may have different purposes within the visual arts classroom, the set of principles that determine whether formative or summative assessment is authentic are the same:

1. Authentic assessment should take place prior to and after instruction. It should be a continuous process that constantly monitors student progress. Student's strengths and weaknesses should be regularly scrutinized for causes and it should imply strategies for correction.
2. Authentic assessment should include multiple measures. Well-designed assessment must meet the needs of diverse learners and therefore, must be implemented a variety of ways. No single assessment strategy will give the art educator the information needed to guide students and plan for their success.
3. Authentic assessment must be a balance of both formative and summative assessment. While the individual teacher must determine the weight of each, student learning is what should drive classroom assessment. Because the purpose of formative assessment is to gather data about students and to provide feedback, the major emphasis should be on formative rather than summative assessment.
4. Authentic assessment includes objectives that clearly match up to the criteria for success. Students should not have to guess about teacher expectations. Objectives should be clearly introduced to students and directly in line with state standards and assessment criteria.

Chapter V Discussion and Implications

Summary of Findings Relating to Primary Research Question

Learning in the visual arts classroom can be assessed. Creativity and personal expression, while highly individualized, can indeed be measured. The different methods of assessment outlined in this paper create many opportunities for the art educator to evaluate learning by students. There is no one golden standard that should be used, but the incorporation of all of these categories will provide quantitative measures of learning in art. Creativity is highly individualized, but so are learning variables among any population of students. Individualizing art assessment and using many different measures to accomplish this allows each and every student the opportunity to learn, to demonstrate that learning, to be more creative and to achieve success.

Assessment plays many different roles in the classroom; it is about evaluation, and not only for grading purposes. Assessment determines student progress and evaluates, whether objectives should be taught again or differently. Teachers can discern where to put instructional energies and what already mastered skills or knowledge can be built upon *(Popham, 1995).* Assessment should be used to advise and direct students where they are going with the lessons. Only assessing or evaluating students at the end of a lesson undermines the beneficial qualities of authentic assessment. Assessment should be carried out as a preliminary information gathering exercise for the teacher to use in planning, midway through projects to check for understanding, and post project as follow up. All along this process, students should have the opportunity to review their own work for the teacher's objectives.

The qualities of effective assessment must foster the actual purpose of quality assessment: to improve student learning. McLaughlin and Vogt (2000) state that quality assessment should be multidimensional, dynamic, authentic, collaborative, reflective and standards-based. All of these qualities imply that student learning is achieved, not by one method, but a compilation of different

methods consisting of these attributes. The most basic characteristic of the described strategies is clarifying objectives. Once art educators remove the subjectivity of grading by communicating to students the objectives, they have a clear path to success.

Implications

The implications of authentic assessment are as far reaching as the continued presence of art programs in schools, and as close to home as the improved performance of the students we see everyday in class. Art education must validate its place in public education by answering to education reform and securing our place as an academic subject with objectives that can be measured. Art educators must take steps to provide success for students and empower them with the knowledge to find success.

Education reform is demanding accountability from teachers. If a subject cannot be tested, many believe that it is not valuable. Art educators must begin to verbalize the present, yet unspoken, evaluation process if we are to comply with reform. "It is, therefore, suggested that the art teachers in each state begin the process of…developing their own authentic assessment instruments and …developing ways to document student progress and establish sensible and appropriate record-keeping systems that will meet the agreed upon goals of the district and state" *(Dorn, 2000, p. 44).*

Art educators must begin the process of assessment if we do not want assessment techniques dictated to us by state mandated legislation that knows nothing about the nature of art and learning in the art classroom. We must prove that we can provide quantitative measures of student learning to test developers who want tidy statistics, and a public that wants evidence of tax money well spent. Art educators must have these assessment strategies in place if we do not want art testing to be reduced to norm-referenced standardized tests.

Much more personal than testing to all teachers is the successes of their students. Assessment provides tools for the teacher to learn, as well as the students. All of these strategies

arm the teacher with valuable information about student learning in the classroom. This information should be used to guide planning and tailor programs for success. Assessment empowers the teacher and the student. With clear objectives as the basis for all assessment, students are more responsible for their own learning, and subjectivity is removed from the teacher expectations. Teachers want students to succeed, and they want tools to do this. Assessment, and all of its implications, can provide this.

To simplify the impact of assessment would be a mistake of art educators that believe the status quo is succeeding. Improvement is about willingness to make changes to classroom practice as new information presents opportunities. Authentic assessment is an opportunity that art educators cannot afford to miss.

Conclusion

The use of these techniques, in a balance of both formative and summative assessment, provides the visual arts educator with an assessment model for the art classroom. The emphasis should be placed on formative assessment in order to create an atmosphere of helping the student to learn and to encourage the process as opposed to the product. Despite the lack of understanding by the public about grading in art, there are many ways that art educators evaluate work objectively. The evaluation of a product is not based on teacher preference but on standards and specific criteria. It is up to the teacher to clarify those criteria. Students can no longer be expected to create artwork and work to success if expectations are not clear. The unique nature of art is no longer a disqualification.

Assessment seems to pose a unique situation for art educators. Creativity is not as easy to measure as a math problem with a right or wrong answer. For a very long time, art teachers were expected to assign ambiguous grades, such as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, without clear criteria as an explanation. Students were unclear concerning the standards that led to the evaluation of their

product. Many believed it was based on the subjective preference of their teacher. Art educators argued process versus product, yet it was the product being graded. These are the reasons the standards of success in the visual arts are often abstract to non-art educators, including students, other teachers, administrators and parents. Despite the lack of understanding by the public about grading in art, there are many ways that art educators evaluate work objectively. The evaluation of a product is not based on teacher preference but on standards and specific criteria. It is up to the teacher to clarify those criteria. Students can no longer be expected to create artwork and work to success if expectations are not clear. The unique nature of art is no longer a disqualification.

The visual arts are often credited with improving educational performance. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the J. Paul Getty Trust sponsored the Arts Education Partnership Working Group in 1993 to study the effects of arts in the schools. This report, called *The Power of the Arts to Transform Education: An Agenda for Action* cited multiple benefits for schools with strong arts programs. Some of these benefits were increased motivation with more highly engaged students, higher order thinking skills, increased creativity and problem solving skills, more multicultural understanding, and higher graduation rates *(The Power of the Arts, 1993).* Significant documentation exists with similar results. The value of art education is not at question, but simply the manner in which we determine the value of art created in it. How do we rationalize quality in art if it can't be explained? Art educators must be ready to verbalize the evaluation standards if we are to take credit for what it adds to the educational process. Students, parents, other teachers and administrators should know and understand the many objectives of art, just as they would in any other academic class. This and the continued contribution of the arts will secure the place of arts education in schools.

Assessment is about understanding what is going on in our classrooms. Grading student work is only the summative result of student work and should not carry the same percentage

of importance as the process of learning. Essentially, assessment is also about grading ourselves as educators, by evaluating the learning taking place in our classroom and planning accordingly. Arriving at conclusions about the quality of instructional efforts comes from teachers engaged in evaluation. "Teachers' judgments about their own instructional effectiveness, as well as their decisions about what grades to assign individual students, can be greatly influenced by assessment results" *(Popham, 1995, p. 246).*

Authentic assessment is this instrument for understanding. Assessment is about more than grading students' work. "The improvement of student learning is primary purpose of assessment" *(Keefe and Jenkins, 2000, p. 86)* and the improvement of student learning is the basis for formative assessment. Student learning comes from a clear understanding of expectations. Assessment is about clarifying expectations and acquiring accurate information about the learning in the classroom. Effective assessment techniques can "improve classroom instructions, empower students, heighten student interest and motivation, and provide teachers with ongoing feedback about student progress" *(Beattie, 1997, p. 2).* All of these areas impact student learning. The days of traditional paper and pencil tests are quickly being replaced by assessment activities structured to make students take responsibility for their own learning and to find success. The visual arts classroom must create a balance of both formative and summative assessments, with a focus on the formative strategies, to help learners learn and students find success in the arts.

References

Arter, J.A. (1992) "Portfolios in practice: what is a portfolio?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (April, 1992) ERIC, ED 346156, p. 1-5.

Bangert- Drowns, R., Kulick, C., Kulik, J., and Morgan, M. (1991) The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research, 61,* 213-238.

Barrett, T. (2000) Studio critiques of student art: As they are, as they could be with mentoring. *Theory into Practice, 39, 29-35.*

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications.

Borgman, C. (2001) *TheTruth about rubrics, rating scales and checklists.* Herron School of Art, Indiana University, Purdue University. National Art Education Association Annual Conference, New York, 2001.

Brandt, R. (1991) Time for reflection. *Educational Leadership 48* (6), 3.

California Department of Education. (1993) *Prelude to performance: Assessment in the arts.*

California Department of Education. (2000-2001). California Visual Arts Standards. Grades Nine through Twelve. Proficient.

"Critques and College Art Teaching" thread in the Getty ArtsEdNet listserv. Retrieved 1/26/01 from the World Wide Web: http://www.artsednet.getty.edu/ArtsEdNet/hm/Sep96?0494.html

Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J. & Falk, B. (1995) *Authentic assessments in action: Studies of schools and students at work.* Teachers college Press. New York.

Department of Defense Education Activity School, District, Area, and system (1999-2000) *School Profiles*. Section G.

Dorn, C. (July/August 1998). The aesthetically testable object. *Arts Education Policy Review. 9,* 3-11.

Dorn, C. (July 2002) The teacher as Stakeholder in student art assessment and art program evaluation. *Art Education, The Journal of the National Art Education Association, 55,* 4, 40-45.

Eisner, E. (July/August, 1999) The national assessment in the visual arts. . *Arts Education Policy Review. 100,* 15-20.

Eisner, E. (1999) The uses and limits of performance assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80* (9), 658-660.

Gentile, R. and Nurnyack, N. (November, 1989) How shall students be graded in discipline based art education? *Art Education, 42*, 33-41.

Goals 2000 Act: Educate America Act. H. R. 1804. (1994) 103rd Congress of United States of America.

How artwork is graded at Countryside Elementary School. (2001) Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.edina.k12.mn.us/countryside/classess/specials/art/assessment

Jones, L. (1995) Recipe for assessment: How Arty cooked his goose while grading art. *Art Education, 48*, 12-17.

Keefe, J. and Jenkins, J. (2000) *Personalized Instruction.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, Inc.

Levi, A. W. and Smith, R. A. (1991) *Art Education: Disciplines in Art Education: Contexts of Understanding.*

Luehrman, M. (1998) Authentic learning and visual art.

McLaughlin, M. and Vogt, M. (2000) *Creativity and Innovation in Content Area Teaching.* Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Mann, L. (1998) Matching assessment with curriculum. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Educational Update. 40,* (4), 1, 4-5.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2001) *Early and Middle childhood/art standards [on-line]* Available: http://new.nbpts.org/standards/complete/emc_art.pdf

New York State Education Department. New York Standard Course of Study. Learning standards for the arts. Revised edition. 1996.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. North Carolina Standard Course of Study in the Arts.

Payne, J. (2001) *How to create a portfolio assessment.* The Kennedy Center, ArtsEdge.

Payne, J. (2001) *Rubrics: an overview.* The Kennedy Center, ArtsEdge.

Popham, W. *Classroom Assessment: What teachers need to know.* (1995) Allyn & Bacon.

Project Zero's Rubrics and Self-Assessment Project. (2000) President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Rasmussen, K. (1999, Fall) Social Studies: A laboratory for democracy. *Curriculum Update.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Short, K.G. and Burke, C. (1996) Examining our beliefs and practices through inquiry. *Language Arts, 73,* 97-103.

Teaching the arts: Assessment. (2001) The Katherine K. Herberger college of Fine Arts, Arizona State University and the Arizona Board of Regents.

The NAEP 1997 arts education assessment: an overview. (September, 1998) *Music Educators Journal, 85.*

The National Standards for Art Education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts. Standards and Exemplars.

The Power of the Arts to Transform Education, developed by the Arts Education Partnership Working Group (Washington, DC: John F. Kennedy Center for the Arts, 1993.

Tobias, A. (2000) A test for the visual arts. *Visual Arts Research, Vol. 26, No. 1, Issue 51.*

Appendix A

Journal Probes (Example)

Choose four of the following probe questions to answer in your journal:

1. *As you looked at numerous triptychs in an art museum or in a gook, what think/object/idea did you observe keenly in a triptych? Why?*
2. *What puzzled you most when looking at a particular triptych?*
3. *How might you group or categorize the different triptychs you have seen?*
4. *Describe or sketch in your journal the mental image you have of your own proposed art triptych. How are you able to envision your own art triptych before you begin working on it? What causes you to alter or change that mental image?*
5. *What are three underlying art principles or rules you have discovered which appear to be central to making a triptych?*
6. *Have you thought about your proposed triptych as a mathematician might think? An author or a poet? A person concerned with others? A lover of nature or science? Other ways? Explain one or more ways.*
7. *What personal goals do you wish to accomplish in your triptych?*
8. *What assessment criteria should be used for evaluating your triptych?*
9. *What misconceptions did you have about triptychs and what caused you to change your mind?*

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications.

Appendix B

Annotated Artworks

Leave a three inch margin around your artwork or place a larger sheet of paper under your image to create a margin. In that margin, address the three items listed below. Indicate, by using a Post-It® note or a color-coded label dot, the part of your work that relates to your margin notes.

1. Select three "I like this part" areas in your work. Explain reasons in the margin.

2. Select one "I don't like this part" area in your work. Explain reasons in the margin. Suggest a possible solution.

3. Write "Help Me!" question requesting help or advice related to an area that is problematic for you.

When you have finished, give your artwork to a peer, the teacher, or a family member to make critical comments in the margin pertaining to your comment.

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications.

Appendix C

Art Journal Self Evaluation

Note: Even young children can reflect periodically on their journal work, provided they are given simple and clear questions. Depending on the age and development of your students, you might ask them to answer only some of the questions listed below.
Examples of cognitive processes and core skills possible to assess are bracketed.

Please answer briefly the following questions about your journal work.

1. **Do your entries reveal your personal strategies for thinking and learning and solving a problem? Explain.**
   [Cognitive processes: structuring and organizing information, and elaborating information by using mental and symbolic images]
2. **Do your entries show research and study of a task or problem? Explain.**
   [Core skills: searching and locating items/information, and generalizing from information]
3. **Do your entries show evidence of personal, social, cultural, ethnic, or religious influences and relationships to the task or problem? Explain.**
   [Cognitive processes: thinking in intra-personal ways, and using prior knowledge to understand new information]
4. **Do your entries show a progression of ideas? Explain.**
   [Cognitive process: knowing what kinds of goals to set, establishing goals, and determining if they are met]
5. **What entry, in particular, represents a significant change in direction or thinking? Explain.**
   [Cognitive process: modifying practices, and reflecting]
6. **Where might your journal be weak in evidence of your work? Where is it deep or strong with evidence of your work? Give reasons.**
   [Core skills: criticizing and judging/evaluating]
7. **Based on what you have presented in your journal, how have you grown as an artist?**
   [Cognitive processes: reflecting and understanding one's own weaknesses and strengths]
8. **Based on your journal entries, how would you describe your general attitudes toward learning about and valuing art: To answer this question think about your motivation to learn and when, and under what circumstances, you experienced anxiety, pride, and self-confidence.**
   [Cognitive processes: attitudes toward learning, and generalizing from information]

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications.

Appendix D

Measuring Sticks

In this type of self assessment, students are required to demonstrate knowledge of their own art style, to assess their attempts at using that style, and to reflect upon the relationship between the selected measure and their own work. Measurement units or benchmarks used are taken from the real world of art. In essence, this strategy can be likened to a large visual rating scale with exemplars as anchors. Although Measuring Sticks can be easily designed to assess art production outcomes, it also is useful for art criticism or philosophy. As students complete this self-assessment strategy, they learn there is no single, correct way to solve a visual arts problem. Many different approaches can have equally successful results.

The teacher selects five examples or reproductions of artworks that relate to the art task being assessed, but that represent vastly different conceptions or styles. Examples that depict the same theme, problem, or medium in styles ranging from realism to conceptual would work particularly well for this strategy. The teacher places the artworks on a table in a continuum, with both extremes at either end. Students place their own artworks under the example that most resembles their style and give written reasons for their choice. Thus, this task asks students to assess their own artworks in relationship to a selected measure and then write about the relationship.

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications.

Appendix E

Portfolio Holistic Scoring Rubric

Standard 1 Very Limited Achievement	*Standard 3* Sound Achievement	*Standard 5* Very High Achievement
• The student's portfolio is incomplete and lacks organization. • Research is inadequate, resulting in studio or written work that is not resolved and totally dependent upon teacher for direction and guidance. • No problem-solving processes are evident in entries, and the student has not been able to utilize feedback and make revisions to work. • An understanding of visual language, structures, or form as applied to work is rarely seen, and ideas are copied from other sources. • Al entries, whether studio or written, show minimal or no influence of various impacting contexts such as personal, social, cultural, historical, aesthetic, and the like. • No connections are made to other content areas or to daily life. • The student is unable to reflect upon, critically discuss, or assess with a set of appropriate criteria his/her own work and that of others. • Entries indicate absence of an intellectual or a creative curiosity that drives successful work. • The portfolio shows minimum improvement over time and exemplifies very limited achievement toward stated goals and objectives.	• The student's portfolio is complete with required entries and is presented in a satisfactory manner. • An intellectual and creative curiosity frequently develops to help drive work. • Portfolio evidence suggests research is usually sound and often self-directed, leading to successful resolution of most works. • Tasks often exhibit a personalized and expressive approach and some ideas are quite meaningful and important. • With occasional guidance from the teacher, the student is able to transform feedback into acceptable or good results. • Generally speaking, work shows effective application of visual language, structures, or form. • Basic knowledge of several contexts (e.g., personal, cultural, historical, and technological) under-girding studio and written entries is evident. Moreover, a few meaningful connections are made to other disciplines and to daily life as well. • In most cases, the student can reflect upon, critically discuss via a mode, and assess with appropriate criteria his/her own work and that of others. • Portfolio indicates satisfactory improvement over time and proficient achievement toward stated goals and objectives.	• The student's portfolio is complete, with far more evidence than is required, and presented in a slick, professional-like manner. • A passionate and keen intellectual and creative curiosity regarding work is apparent in all entries. • In-depth and adventurous research and an expressive approach to art have resulted in resolution of ideas and tasks that are complex, conceptually strong, and reveal clear personal signatures. • Feedback when given, has been combined with a personal response to problems, and revisions are extremely successful. • Knowledge and skills pertaining to visual language, structures, forms, and vocabulary are highly developed and applied to work. • Entries reveal comprehensive knowledge of many contexts surrounding and influencing work. • The student is able to reflect upon, critically discuss via a model, and assess with appropriate and internalized criteria his/her own work and that of others. Through discussion of the portfolio, a personal value and belief system can be inferred. • Overall, the portfolio shows highly significant improvement over time and outstanding achievement toward stated goals and objectives.

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications.

Appendix F

Rubric for Grading Art

100	95	90	89	85	80	79	75	70	69	65	60	59
---------A---------		---------B---------		----------C---------		----------D----------			------F---------			
Excellent			Above Average		Average			Below Average	Unsatisfactory			

ELEMENTS OF DESIGN: Line, Texture, Color, Shape/Form, Value, Space

PRINCIPLES OF DESIGN: Repetition, Balance, Emphasis, Contrast, and Unity

A. Planned carefully, made several sketches, and showed an awareness of the elements and principles of design. Chose color scheme carefully, used space effectively.
B. The artwork shows that the student applied the principles of design while using one or more elements effectively; showed an awareness of filling space adequately.
C. The student did the assignment adequately, yet it shows lack of planning and little evidence that an overall composition was planned.
D. The assignment was completed and turned in, but showed little evidence of any understanding of the elements and principles of art; no evidence of planning.
F. The student did the minimum or the artwork was never completed.

CREATIVITY/ORIGINALITY

A. The student explored several choices before selecting one; generating many ideas; tried unusual combinations or changes on several ideas; made connections to previous knowledge; demonstrated understanding problem solving skills.
B. The student tried a few ideas for selecting on; or based his or her work on someone else's idea; made decisions after referring to one source; solve the problem in logical way.
C. The student tried an idea and which improved the project, but it lacked originality; substituted symbols for personal observation; might have copied work
D. The student fulfilled the assignment, but gave no evidence of trying anything unusual.
E. The student showed no evidence of original thought.

EFFORT/PERSEVERANCE

A. The project was continued until it was complete as the student could make it; gave it effort far beyond that required; took pride in going well beyond the requirement.
B. The student worked hard and completed the project, but with a little bit of effort it might have been outstanding
C. The student finished the project, but it could have been improved with more effort; adequate interpretation of the assignment, but lacking finishes; chose an easy project and did it indifferently.
D. The project was completed with minimum effort.
F. The student did not finish the work adequately.

CRAFTSMANSHIP/CONSISTENCY/SKILL

A. The artwork was beautiful and patiently done. It was a s good as hard work could make it.
B. With a little more effort, the work could have been outstanding, lacks the finishing touches
C. The student showed average craftsmanship; adequate, but not as good as it could have been, a bit careless
D. The student showed below average craftsmanship, lack of pride in finished work.
G. The student showed poor craftsmanship; evidence of lazy work or lack of understanding.

GROUP COOPERATION/ATTITUDE

A. The student worked well within the group and with group goals, effectively performed a variety of roles in group work, followed through on commitments, was sensitive to the feelings and knowledge level of others, willingly participated in necessary preparation or work for classroom.
B. The student participated enthusiastically, followed through with commitments, performed more than adequately, and assisted in preparation and cleanup.
C. The student mostly allowed others in the group to make all the decision did his or her share of work adequately, assisted in preparation and cleanup when asked.
D. The student allowed others to most of the work, participated minimally, did the minimum amount.
H. The student was part of the group but did nothing toward the goal. Did a minimal amount of preparation and cleanup.

http://www.zimmerworks.com/rubric.htm

Appendix G
Mask Rubric

LESSON TITLE: Papier Mache Masks
OUTCOME: Three dimensional papier mache construction, painted, multi media
OBJECTIVE: Creation of a mask or headdress from selected culture
CRITERIA: Specific behaviors, products, characteristics, and qualities we look for in evaluating finished work.

Criteria	In Progress	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Three dimensional construction	Idea Thinking 3-D Molding/shaping Paper Mache	Attachments Balloon base Papier Mache Mastering Material Side and front view	Control over shape Smoothness Texture Increased complexity Shape of facial features	"Real" as intended Proportions Physical strength Able to fulfill intentions
Use of color	Develop skills in mixing Knowledge of color wheel Choosing paint Using brushes Placement Clean up	Controlling values Changing values Shading Mixing color Effective brush use	Color harmony, schemes Range and variety Imaging choice Texturized with paint Unifying	Visual texture Actual color/texture Enhanced color schemes with various materials
Cultural Meaning and Expression	Cultural Icon	Myth or story, classic, ancient, recent	Myth or story Sensibility: grace, mood, respect, freedom	Evokes aesthetic response Expression can form during making
Use of Materials	Thinking/planning Thinking of different ways to use folders, newspaper, paint, etc… Securing parts	Selecting appropriate materials Combining materials Making contours and creating extremities	Variety of materials Attachments well-blended Gives meaning Emphasize and exaggerate eyes, ears, etc Creating aesthetic question	Creating a unified look with all materials Choosing appropriate paints and materials
Texture	Developing skills with paint, or other materials Joining thoughts with knowledge of what makes a particular texture Visualizing a surface	Manipulate material to make smooth or rough Show lines or wrinkles when needed Create textures with paint or other materials Achieving texture desired Texture corresponds withsubject	Use of paint improves wrinkles and smooth parts start forming Use of fibers Some textures adapted to the mood of the piece Texture adds realness Develop different sections Surface is touchable	Mask looks authentic Flow and unity Accomplish a detailed effect Creative use of materials Placement of pattern, may have added spots, whiskers, different shades of fur

McCollister, S. (2002) Developing criteria rubrics in the art classroom. *Art Education, 55,* 4, 49.

Appendix H

Student-Teacher Portfolio Conferencing Guidelines

When conferencing with students, remember that they are sharing their work with you. The conference is a collaborative effort. Ask questions that will give the discussion direction and access the student' thinking about their progress. If the primary purpose of the conference is to examine the student's progress toward the standards, most questions will reinforce the curriculum-instruction-assessment/evaluation link.

You may wish to share your conferencing prompts with students a few days ahead of the scheduled meetings. This eliminates anxiety and contributes to the efficiency of the conferencing process.

Sample Conferencing Prompts

1. Examine your baseline measure for standard _____. Compare and contrast it with your latest piece of evidence for this standard. How would you evaluate your progress: What new personal goal can you set to promote your continued progress?

2. Examine the evidence you have included to support the standards. List what you consider to be your area of strength. Then list what you feel may be some areas in which you need improvement.

3. Is there evidence in your portfolio that you are especially proud? Is there evidence you wish you could do over? How would you change it?

4. Do you think the portfolio process allows you to demonstrate what you know about our course goals? How do you think it compares to assessment practices of the past?

5. What are some things you think you've learned this marking period? How does your portfolio support your response?

6. What is your favorite piece of evidence in your portfolio? Why do you value it?

7. Our conference with your parents will be held shortly. What would you like them to know about your portfolio? Is there any particular question we addressed that you think we should share in the parent conference?

McLaughlin, M. and Vogt, M. (2000) *Creativity and Innovation in Content Area Teaching.* Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Appendix I

Student-Teacher-Parent Conferencing Guidelines

1. Share the format of the conference with parents before the actual conferencing date. They should know that their child will be sharing his or her portfolio with them and that it will be followed by a three-way discussion involving them, their child and you.
2. Use input from your conference with the student to give direction to this meeting. The student's response to prompt 7 in the "Student-Teacher Conferencing Guidelines" will be particularly helpful.
3. At the student- teacher conference, the two of you may wish to designate pieces of evidence that you would like to emphasize at the three-way conference. These should address areas of strength as well as need. The portfolio evidences can be marked with paper clips, sticky notes, or tabs.
4. You and the student may decide that part of the discussion should focus on the piece that he or she values the most. If so, you may wish to ask the student to write why he or she feels that way. You may then wish to write why you value that particular piece. When sharing this with the parents, you may also wish to ask them to write why they value it. This acknowledges the quality of the students work and affirms that they student, the teacher and the parents are all active participants in the assessment process.
5. Be sure to offer parents ideas about what they can do at home to encourage their child's positive attitude and progress.
6. At the conclusion of the three-way conference, you may wish to request a written record of the parents' reaction to the meeting. This can be returned to you via the student the next day. The commentary then becomes a part of the student's portfolio.

Parent Reactions to Portfolio Conferences

Thank you for taking an active role in your child's portfolio conference. Please respond to the following questions so we can continue to improve our assessment and evaluation process.

1. What is your overall reaction to the portfolio process?
2. Do you feel the conference was beneficial?
3. Is there anything that wasn't included in this conference that you would like to see included in future meetings?
4. Additional comments:

Name_____ Date_____

McLaughlin, M. and Vogt, M. (2000) *Creativity and Innovation in Content Area Teaching.* Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Appendix J

Mini Portfolio Parent Interview

Directions: Take home your competed and organized mini-portfolio. Have a parent or guardian look through all of your projects. Then, interview that person by asking these questions:

1. What did you learn about _____(focus of the mini- portfolio) from looking through this portfolio?
2. Which piece in the portfolio is your favorite and why?
3. Which piece in the portfolio is your least favorite and why?
4. How do you feel about my artistic skills as demonstrated in this portfolio? My analytical skills? My creative skills?
5. If you could give me one piece of advice for work on future art projects, then what would it be?

Beattie, D. K. *Assessment in Art Education.* 1997. Davis Publications