

### **Overview**

*Creativity and Innovation* is an Institutional Learning Outcome which was adopted by Otis College of Art & Design in Spring 2013. Otis describes this learning outcome as follows: Otis graduates will be able to approach their work in imaginative ways characterized by a high degree of experimentation, risk-taking, and divergent thinking, and be able to produce work that challenges convention. (<http://www.otis.edu/institutional-learning-outcomes>)

A rubric developed by the Liberal Arts and Sciences Department to help assess Creativity and Innovation measures six different fields of performance, which align to the six fields of assessment identified by Kleiman (2005, p. 16):

1. Presentation/Production i.e. the finished product presented to an audience
2. Process i.e. the journey that led to the product
3. Idea i.e. the ideas that informed both the process and the product
4. Technical i.e. the quality and utility of the technical features of the product and the skills with which they were assembled and/or operated
5. Documentation i.e. research, design, planning, evaluation etc.
6. Interview i.e. the student's ability to articulate their understanding, utilization and application and use of any of the above

I embarked on a research project this Spring to determine if using a rubric centered around these same six fields of performance could enhance the level of creativity and risk-taking attempted by students on the signature project in Connections through Color & Design, a Foundation-level, interdisciplinary, studio course. I also sought to verify my experience from the previous year, which indicated that teaching the project by introducing the assignment with a grading rubric aided students in their response.

### *Background*

The Connections Through Color & Design final project is a large interpretative painting, executed on-site at the LA River. Students are asked to research historical, cultural, environmental, economic, and spiritual issues related to the LA River. In addition, they attend one on-site lecture given by a political activist working to revitalize the river. Students must synthesize the information they gather into a thesis which directs the problem they must define and solve in their painting. Students are asked to articulate a point of view and then successfully represent that point of view visually. Responding creatively and taking risks is a desirable outcome.

### *Research Design*

1. Write a rubric for the Connections Final Project (LA River Painting), which addresses the six fields of assessment identified in Otis's LAS Creativity & Innovation rubric. (Kleiman, 2005)
2. Present and discuss the rubric with students at the start of the project.
3. Review the rubric with students through each step of the project
4. Ask students to reflect on what they learned about their own creative practice through this project.
5. Use the rubric to assess the projects.

### *Measures of Success*

Success will be evaluated based on the final project outcomes as well as on a summative evaluation of the students' self-reflections.

### **Assessment and Creativity**

As Kleiman describes, it is a daunting challenge to create conditions that encourage creativity and innovation within a quality-assurance, assessment-focused environment:

The problem lies in part with the increasing emphasis on standards and quality assurance, the almost universal use of learning outcomes and assessment criteria, and the division of courses into self-contained modules and units. As long as the expected learning outcomes are carefully set and defined; as long as the assessment tasks are designed to enable the student to meet those learning outcomes; and as long as assessment and grading are carried out fairly and reliably against carefully designed criteria, then the system is deemed to work. Essentially it is a closed system which, like any closed system, will tend to encourage and enforce replication and formulation rather than innovation and origination. (Kleiman, 2005, p.14)

Kleiman thoughtfully acknowledges that the slippery, complex nature of creativity has created the tendency for educators to avoid it and to instead focus on learning and outcomes that appear to be more straightforward, reliable and easier to measure. He developed his six fields of assessment in an effort to “both value and recognize creativity, and meet the requirements of the quality and standards frameworks” of the validating university for the Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts (LIPA). (Kleiman, 15)

Kleiman effectively expands the performance criteria by which his students are measured to include components of the learning and creative process that are more complex and more challenging to measure than the technical qualities of the final product alone: idea, documentation, interview. Opening up the grading criteria allows for more diversity of response and therefore more opportunity for a creative response.

Following Kleiman, this research project attempts to use assessment to promote creativity by expanding the LA River painting grading rubric beyond its singular focus on observable, technical achievements.

The underlying assumption of the research project is that a rubric can be an effective tool to promote a strong educational experience. “For students, assessment provides feedback and a guide towards improving thinking.” (Hargrove, 2011, p.22)

### **Writing and Using the Rubric**

#### *Process*

I wrote the performance criteria for “Process”— what Kleiman calls the journey that led to the product – with significant influence by Hargrove's writings on self-assessment and metacognitive thinking (Hargrove 2012).

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>Process</b>	Demonstrates active, effective and sophisticated assessment of daily progress. Routinely asks and answers: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Self-assessment is thorough, deep and broad.	Demonstrates in-depth assessment of daily progress. Routinely asks and answers: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Self-assessment goes beyond what is obvious and is well-supported by evidence.	Demonstrates somewhat developed assessment of daily progress. Is somewhat able to answer: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Self-assessment is incomplete and is not fully supported by evidence.	Demonstrates poor assessment of daily progress. Is not able to answer: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Is only able to provide a superficial account of process and progress. Self-assessment is not supported by evidence.

The process field of the rubric seeks to make students active agents in their own assessment instead of merely objects of assessment. Hargrove writes that “strengthening metacognitive skills is essential to improving one’s ability to think about and practice creative design.” (Hargrove 2012, p. 3) “Teaching designers to explore their own cognitive processes in a systematic way helps them manage their own creative thought processes and develop their metacognitive knowledge.” (Hargrove 2012, p.4)

My objective was to strengthen each student’s problem-solving abilities by asking them to become more aware and consciously explore their own cognitive processes. “Problem-solvers are actively involved in metacognition when they attempt to evaluate whether what they are doing is effective.” (Hargrove 2012, p. 14)

Hargrove offers four questions that teachers can ask students to help them in evaluating their progress (Hargrove 2012, p. 14-15). These are the four questions that form the base of the “process” field in my rubric. These questions integrate the full cycle of problem solving when considered as a metacognitive process. As Hargrove states, asking what is to be accomplished addresses preparing and planning. Asking which strategies are to be used addresses the selection and use of various strategies. Asking how well the student is doing requires them to self-monitor their strategy use. And, asking what else can they do requires that students consider and orchestrate additional options or strategies. (Hargrove 2012, p. 15)

I reviewed this field of the rubric when I introduced the project to students. In fact, it was the preeminent feature of the project in this initial discussion. I explained that students would need to direct their own progress throughout the project’s duration. The conditions of the project required their self-direction: we would be working off-site; students would be scattered along a two mile stretch of the LA River; my interaction with each student would be limited to one or two meetings per day.

Each one-on-one meeting at the site was guided by these four questions. This shifted the focus of our conversations to evaluation of the process versus evaluation of the painting. I asked students to restate the problem they were trying to solve: to visually represent their conceptualization about the river. The more clearly they were able to state this goal, the easier it was for them to assess their progress. Then I asked how they were using the strategies available to them to achieve their goal: composition, mark-making, color. We reviewed each strategy, asking what options did they generate and consider; was the option they selected appropriate; was it delivering the desired result; was it necessary to try another option?

As each day progressed, I would ask the same four questions. This repetition promoted and reinforced a focus on process and problem solving. For the most successful students, as they progressed, their conceptualization about the river grew more nuanced, more complex, more sophisticated. As they were working with the materials, in the environment and self-evaluating, they were further developing their ideas and their visual response.

In a survey completed after the projects were presented and critiqued, students were asked if they practiced self-assessment routinely during the project. 100% of students answered yes. In the same survey, 71% of students reported that they reconsidered and improved the mark they were using in the painting; and, 94% reported that they modified and improved their color strategy during the course of the project.

Assessing process as an element of the rubric felt somewhat subjective. I had to rely on my memory of each conversation and my attention to and recollection of the development of each student's painting day-by-day. I will further explore what documentation could be collected (e.g., postings to an e-portfolio) that would aid in the assessment of process, without making the project overly cumbersome for students and for me.

*Idea*

For Kleiman, "Idea" includes the ideas that informed both the process and the product. I wrote the performance criteria for the "Idea" field as follows:

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>Idea</b>	Demonstrates a high level of curiosity and exploration by generating 4 different thumbnail sketches; testing a variety of inventive marks; and considering 4 different color strategies. Moves the best ideas to completion.	Demonstrates curiosity and exploration by generating more than 2 different thumbnail sketches; testing a few inventive marks; and considering more than 2 different color strategies. Moves the best ideas to completion.	Demonstrates little curiosity and exploration. Makes only 1 or 2 thumbnail sketches, does not explore a variety of inventive mark making. Uses local color. Does not investigate options.	Demonstrates no curiosity and exploration. Settles quickly on a composition and mark; uses local color. Does not investigate options.

My intention was to encourage and support both divergent and convergent thinking processes. Divergent thinking is the production of multiple possible solutions. It is the expansive phase of a creative project. Convergent thinking narrows down the possibilities and focuses on producing a single solution. (Hargrove, 2012) Divergent and convergent thinking processes are complementary and contribute to a creative response.

"Divergent thinking often leads to originality, and originality is the central feature of creativity, but someone can do well on a test of divergent thinking and never actually perform in a creative fashion." (Runco & Acar, 2012)

"Decision making skills require convergent thinking, which is critical to creativity because it allows individuals to refine ideas and to select the best possible answer or answers from the ideas generated to solve a problem." (Runco, 2007)

By asking students to generate a variety of options for each visual strategy they will employ, and to test out those options (i.e. iteration), students are provided the relevant conditions and interpretative context where a creative insight has the potential to emerge and to be developed into a solution.

Students' use of iteration was observed and discussed during our one-on-one meetings. The rubric encouraged students to make a number of preparatory sketches before choosing a point of view and composition; invent and test a variety of marks before choosing one to use throughout the painting; and develop and rationalize a number of color plans before choosing one to execute. Students were surveyed at the end of the project about their use and the resulting usefulness of iteration. 82% reported generating multiple preparatory sketches; 65% reported testing a variety of marks; and 65% reported developing and considering a number of color plans. 100% of students believed that when they did generate a number of different ideas and options it made their project stronger.

I assessed this field of the rubric through students' documentation of their iterations: preparatory sketches; a worksheet that asked students to describe and rationalize a number of marks; and a worksheet that asked students to articulate and rationalize a variety of color plans.

Going forward, I would retain this field but rename it "Iteration." This would align more closely with Kleiman's "Documentation" field.

I would add a new performance field for "Idea" as follows:

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>Idea</b>	Develops a thesis about the LA River that is an insightful and illuminating interpretation and analysis of the river's conditions. Conditions may include economic, social, political, environmental, spiritual, or sensorial. Continues to actively develop this thesis over the project's duration, assimilating and responding to the environment, the materials, and the process.	Develops a thesis about the LA River that is a thoughtful and nuanced interpretation and analysis of the river's conditions. Conditions may include economic, social, political, environmental, spiritual, or sensorial. Continues to develop this thesis over the project's duration.	Develops a thesis about the LA River that is a sensible interpretation and analysis of the river's conditions. Conditions may include economic, social, political, environmental, spiritual, or sensorial. Modest development of this thesis over the project's duration.	Develops a thesis about the LA River that is a simple or superficial interpretation and analysis of the river's conditions. Conditions may include economic, social, political, environmental, spiritual, or sensorial. No additional development of this thesis over the project's duration.

I did not include a similar field to measure the student's thesis in this year's rubric, though I did allude to a thesis (concept) in the technical measures of the rubric. In practice, students were asked to generate a thesis, however ill-defined, at the start of the project and to repeat and elaborate their thesis at several different junctures throughout the process. My decision to refrain from measuring the thesis directly within the rubric was motivated by my wish not to anchor the students to a finite statement early in the process. I feared that anchoring students to a finite statement would direct them to a literal, overly symbolic, visual response. I wanted to leave room for non-verbal responses as well as development of the thesis and visual response over time. The project is set in a rich environment, outside at the river's edge, which impacts and enlivens the students' perception and responses over time. My goal was to keep students open to the full experience of painting at the river. "Creativity researchers have discovered that exceptional creativity more often results when people work in areas where problems are not specified in advance, where a big part of success is being able to formulate a good question" (Sawyer 2011, p. 91).

As Sawyer (2011) writes in his elaboration of an eight-stage creative process, "... the third stage of the creative process is to remain constantly aware of your environment, and to absorb information from a wide variety of sources" (Sawyer 2011, p. 96). Creativity requires "...a particular sort of perception: one that's active and alert to opportunities relevant to your problem" (Sawyer 2011, p. 96).

The most creative and successful outcomes of the LA River project demonstrated a high level of conceptualization. Successful projects were executed by students who could clearly articulate a thesis and then could advance that thesis by conceptualizing, schematizing and actualizing a variety of visual elements in support of the thesis. Projects that lacked creativity lacked sufficient conceptualization. These projects may have been strong on schematization – with multiple options for mark making and color plan generated, tested and ultimately actualized. However, these works were not able to sustain the originating thesis throughout the progression from thesis to actualization. The selection of a mark, the color plan, and/or the composition were not sufficiently connected to the thesis.

After reflecting on this year's outcomes, I realize that providing more guidance about developing a thesis could be particularly beneficial to students who struggle with conceptualization. My plan moving forward is to include the above new "Idea" performance field that guides students to define their thesis while staying open to new possibilities. I believe adding this performance field will allow more students to succeed at an exemplary level.

### Technical

For Kleiman, "Technical" refers to the quality and utility of the technical features of the product and the skills with which they were assembled and/or operated.

In my rubric, the technical measures remained constant from the previous year's rubric and are as follows:

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>Technical: Point of View/ Subject Area</b>	Chooses subject area that best advances concept.	Point of view advances concept but creates minor complications.	Point of view makes it difficult to decipher concept.	Point of view does not support concept.
<b>Technical: Composition</b>	No donut-hole; eye movement integrated into total composition.	No donut-hole; eye movement does not flow consistently but is effective.	Donut-hole composition obvious; no matter how the eye moves, it ends at the center.	Donut-hole; eye stays in the center essentially voiding the total page.
<b>Technical: Inventive &amp; Consistent Mark Making</b>	Very high level of inventiveness and consistency in mark-making, which clearly supports concept.	High level of inventiveness and consistency in mark-making, which somewhat supports concept.	Average level of inventiveness and consistency in mark-making. Support of concept is weak.	No consistent or inventive mark-making evident.
<b>Technical: Color Plan</b>	Referencing and range of color harmony utilized is superior in support of concept.	Referencing and range of color harmony utilized supports the concept.	Referencing and range of color harmony utilized is limited and not supportive of concept.	Lacks understanding for color mixing in support of concept.

The technical measures are observable in the finished painting and may be assessed objectively using the rubric. Expanding the rubric to include process- and documentation-oriented fields of measurement yielded no deterioration in the quality of the technical outcomes of this project.

### Presentation

The "Presentation" field of measurement that I wrote for this rubric most closely aligns to Kleiman's "Interview" field: the student's ability to articulate their understanding, utilisation and application and use of any of the other five performance fields.

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>Present-ation</b>	Provides a sophisticated and in-depth explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River.	Provides a developed explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River.	Provides a limited explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River.	Provides little to no explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River.

For Kleiman, having an interview performance field creates the opportunity for the student to share in the final evaluation. Students are given an opportunity to present their thinking and practice along with the finished product. "This gave an opportunity to the students to demonstrate or argue that their work not only met a particular criterion in full, but exceeded it." (Kleiman, 2005, p. 17)

On the final day of the LA River project, students were asked to complete a worksheet in which they restated their thesis and described each of the decisions they made and the rationale for each decision. Students used the worksheet as a guide for their oral presentation of the painting to the class. The worksheets were useful in assessing the "Presentation" performance field.

100% of students reported that knowing in advance, through the rubric, that they would have to talk about the choices they made in their painting during critique contributed to the overall quality of their painting.

**Beyond the Rubric – Additional Inputs to the Project that Impact the Outcome**

Sawyer (2011) contends, "...an important part of the creative process is to first become very familiar with prior works, and internalize the symbols and conventions of the domain" (p. 93). An essential component of this project is knowledge transfer. During the introduction of the project, I lectured and showed many images that situated the project art historically and helped to describe a range of possible outcomes. The project derives from Impressionist landscape painting, and the examples I showed stretched from Impressionism to Contemporary Art. On each morning of the project, I started the day with a lecture, and focused on one of the visual elements students must address in their paintings: composition, inventive mark-making, color strategy. The examples I shared filled students with options and ideas. It also modeled an approach students can use in future, self-directed creative projects. When sharing the examples, my approach was inquiry-based. I asked students to describe what they were seeing and to describe what affect and/or meaning was produced by the choices the artist made. This helped students understand how to plan, conceptualize, and execute their own paintings.

The lectures were fully aligned with the technical performance measures in the rubric. Especially at the Foundation level, I believe this is critical to students' success.

**Results**

I consider the rubric a success, though the impact is impossible to measure. Students' responses to a survey I provided at the end of the project are very encouraging. Full results from the survey are posted in the appendix and some of the details have been reported earlier in this document. Notably, 35% of students reported that the grading rubric was helpful and 65% reported it was extremely helpful in guiding them to a creative solution of the project assignment.

This is the second year that I have taught the project which certainly enhanced my ability to teach more effectively. In addition, I added one day to the project's duration this year. Even so, the results this year far surpassed the previous year's results and my expectations. Outcomes from students were more varied, more innovative, and better conceptualized. More students ventured beyond realism into abstraction. Mark-making was more inventive and more connected to their concepts. Color strategies were more considered and moved away from the default to local

color. It is impossible to control for all of the differentiating factors from one year to the next. Reading research on creativity and assessment, and re-writing the rubric had a significant impact on my teaching. Without diminishing my attention to the technical requirements of the project, I was significantly more focused on process, idea and documentation and the students were too. I believe adding these fields of performance to the rubric created an environment conducive to generating creative and innovative responses.

Hargrove, Ryan "Assessing the long-term impact of a metacognitive approach to creative skill development." *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 23.3 (2013): 489-517.

Hargrove, Ryan. "Fostering creativity in the design studio: A framework towards effective pedagogical practices." *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education* 10.1 (2012): 7-31.

Kleiman, Paul. "Beyond the tingle factor: Creativity and assessment in higher education." *ESRC Creativity Seminar*, University of Strathclyde, 7th October. 2005.

Runco, Mark A. "To understand is to create: An epistemological perspective on human nature and personal creativity." (2007) in R. Richards (Ed.), *Everyday creativity and new views of human nature: Psychological, social, and spiritual perspectives*. Washington, DC; American Psychological Association.

Runco, Mark A., and Selcuk Acar. "Divergent thinking as an indicator of creative potential." *Creativity Research Journal* (2012).

Sawyer, R. Keith. *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Appendix 1 – 2015 LA River Painting Rubric

Department Name \_\_\_Foundation\_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_Connections Through Color & Design

Project:\_\_\_Final Project\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Name \_\_\_Joanne Mitchell\_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Exemplary 4</b>	<b>Accomplished 3</b>	<b>Developing 2</b>	<b>Beginning 1</b>
Choice of Point of View / Choice of Subject Area to Paint	Chooses Subject Area that Best Advances Goals	Point of View Advances Project Goals But Creates Minor Complications	Point of View Makes It Difficult to Decipher Project Goals	Point of View Does Not Support Project Goals
Composition	No Donut-Hole; Eye Movement Integrated into Total Composition	No Donut-Hole; Eye Movement Does Not Flow Consistently But Is Effective	Donut-Hole Composition Obvious; No Matter How the Eye Moves, It Ends at the Center	Donut-Hole; Eye Stays in Center Essentially Voiding the Total Page
Inventive & Consistent Mark Making	Very high level of consistency & inventiveness in mark-making.	High level of inventive mark-making but not fully consistent.	Average level of inventive mark-making and not very consistent.	No consistent or inventive mark-making evident.
Utilizing Full Range of Color Harmony as Appropriate to Painting Concept As Well As Referencing Color Notebook	Referencing and Range of Color Harmony Utilized Is Superior in Support of Concept.	Referencing and Range of Color Harmony Utilized Supports the Concept.	Referencing and Range of Color Harmony Utilized is Limited and Not Supportive of Concept.	Lacks Understanding for Color Mixing in Support of Concept.

Appendix 2 – 2016 LA River Painting

Department Name \_\_\_Foundation\_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_Connections Through Color & Design

Project:\_\_\_Final Project\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Name \_\_\_Joanne Mitchell\_\_\_\_\_

	Exemplary 4	Accomplished 3	Developing 2	Beginning 1
Process	Demonstrates active, effective and sophisticated assessment of daily progress. Routinely asks and answers: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Self-assessment is thorough, deep and broad.	Demonstrates in-depth assessment of daily progress. Routinely asks and answers: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Self-assessment goes beyond what is obvious and is well-supported by evidence.	Demonstrates somewhat developed assessment of daily progress. Is somewhat able to answer: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Self-assessment is incomplete and is not fully supported by evidence.	Demonstrates poor assessment of daily progress. Is not able to answer: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using them? 4) What else can I do? Is only able to provide a superficial account of process and progress. Self-assessment is not supported by evidence.
Idea	Demonstrates a high level of curiosity and exploration by generating 4 different thumbnail sketches; testing a variety of inventive marks; and considering 4 different color strategies. Moves the best ideas to completion.	Demonstrates curiosity and exploration by generating more than 2 different thumbnail sketches; testing a few inventive marks; and considering more than 2 different color strategies. Moves the best ideas to completion.	Demonstrates little curiosity and exploration. Makes only 1 or 2 thumbnail sketches, does not explore a variety of inventive mark making. Uses local color. Does not investigate options.	Demonstrates no curiosity and exploration. Settles quickly on a composition and mark; uses local color. Does not investigate options.
Choice of Point of View / Choice of Subject Area to Paint	Chooses subject area that best advances concept.	Point of view advances concept but creates minor complications.	Point of view makes it difficult to decipher concept.	Point of view does not support concept.

Composition	No donut-hole; eye movement integrated into total composition.	No donut-hole; eye movement does not flow consistently but is effective.	Donut-hole composition obvious; no matter how the eye moves, it ends at the center.	Donut-hole; eye stays in the center essentially voiding the total page.
Inventive & Consistent Mark Making	Very high level of inventiveness and consistency in mark-making, which clearly supports concept.	High level of inventiveness and consistency in mark making, which somewhat supports concept.	Average level of inventiveness and consistency in mark-making. Support of concept is weak.	No consistent or inventive mark-making evident.
Utilizing Full Range of Color Harmony as Appropriate to Painting Concept As Well As Referencing Color Notebook	Referencing and range of color harmony utilized is superior in support of concept.	Referencing and range of color harmony utilized supports the concept.	Referencing and range of color harmony utilized is limited and not supportive of concept.	Lacks understanding for color mixing in support of concept.
Presentation	Provides a thorough and inventive explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River.	Provides an in-depth explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River	Provides a limited explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River	Provides little to no explanation of how the composition, color strategy and distinguishing mark create a compelling visual representation of the student's thesis about the LA River

Appendix 3 – LA River Painting Student Survey

Conducted after critique on 5/10/2016

Number of Responses = 17

Question	Yes	No	
Did you assess your own progress while you were painting during the 4 weeks of the project, routinely asking yourself: 1) What am I trying to accomplish? 2) What strategies am I using? 3) How well am I using these strategies? What else can I do?	100%	0%	
Did you generate multiple thumbnail sketches before deciding on a composition?	82%	18%	
Did you test a variety of marks before settling on one for your painting?	65%	35%	
Did you reconsider and improve your mark at any point during the project?	71%	29%	
Did you consider a number of color plans before deciding on one for your painting?	65%	35%	
Did you modify and improve your color plan at any point during the project?	94%	6%	
When you did generate a number of different ideas and options, do you think it made your project stronger?	100%	0%	
Did the requirement to talk about the choices you made in your painting during critique contribute to the overall quality of your painting?	100%	0%	
Was the grading rubric helpful in guiding you to a creative solution on this project?	<b>Not at all helpful</b>	<b>Helpful</b>	<b>Extremely helpful</b>
	0%	35%	65%