

**Guidelines for Undergraduate/Graduate Program Assessment Yearly Report
Submitted December 2009, Assessment for AY 2008-09**

Department of Art & Design

I. Program's Mission: Master of Arts Degree in Art

The Department of Art and Design offers a Master of Art in Art degree and provides support for the Master of Art in Teaching available through the College of Education. Applicants into the MA program may choose to concentrate in studio art or art education. The emphasis of the MA in Art program is preparation for advanced study and careers in visual art and design, for art educators seeking new skills and additional university credit for career advancement. It is primarily for artists attempting to improve or develop a body of work. The MA is not a terminal degree and we do not certify teachers.

Accordingly, the goals for the MA program in art and design are to:

- Broaden the context and criteria by which students measure their work in the world.
- Foster rigorous and supportive learning conditions that inspire lucid visual, verbal and written expressions by students.
- Graduate students with competitive dossiers suitable for entry into top level graduate programs and/or careers in art and design.

The MA in Art supports the institution's mission by:

- Preparing art and design students to be adaptive thinkers and producers that contribute to society.
- Challenging students to apply their knowledge, creativity, and skill to ask lofty questions and solve everyday problems;
- Providing artistic and cultural programs that further the intellectual, artistic, and cultural life of the individual, community and region;
- Facilitating learning through the preservation, discovery, synthesis, and dissemination of knowledge;
- Enlisting graduate faculty who actively engage and mentor students in scholarly, artistic and creative endeavors;
- Engaging faculty, staff, and students in campus and community service;
- Fostering a climate that appreciates and cultivates diversity and values difference;

- Endowing graduates with the knowledge and skills required for advanced study and careers in the visual arts;

II. Program's Student Learning Outcomes

Students who complete the MA in Art will be able to:

- A. Use advanced design principles to create original art and design works using traditional and non-traditional media.
- B. Apply advanced art and design vocabulary and written communication skills to compose reflective essays that examine works of art, individual artist's, art movements, and/or conventional art historical positions.
- C. Evaluate one's own artistic output by organizing a public exhibition supported by an statement detailing creative intentions and/or establishing a historical context for one's work.
- D. Assemble a high-quality dossier that includes a digital portfolio suitable for advanced study or careers in the visual arts.

III. Assessment Activities:

The 2008-09 review will examine *Student Learning Outcome A* using the following assessment measures. Both assessment measure one and two use the same review form as a tool to evaluate the student.

Assessment Measures (Tools)

Assessment Measure 1: 9 Hour Review – This review consists of a critique conducted by full-time art and design faculty with input from graduate students. It focuses on the development of a students work at or near the completion of the first 9 hours of course work.

Assessment Measure 2: 18 Hour Review – The 18-hour Review is a critique usually conducted by full-time faculty at the end of the second semester or after the student has completed 18 hours of course work. This measure focuses on student progress, growth, and preparedness for the graduate exhibition.

Assessment Measures 1: 9 – Hour Review

The 9-hour review measures and directs the student to develop a plan of study.

Students present artwork to the faculty for review in two ways: a) they display their work in the studio work space or designated space; b) deliver an oral presentation

about their ideas and body of work. Students are expected to show evidence of original exploration of concept and overall competence with media and methods during the oral presentation phase. In addition each student will present and discuss their background experience, explain works in progress and outline goals for their plan of study.

Review forms are used to record faculty responses that rate student performance in numeric and narrative form. The review form lists the following criteria as discussion points and evaluation categories for the critique: oral presentation, concepts presented, execution of concept, craftsmanship appropriate to type of artwork, presentation, and originality. The criteria are rated on a scale of 0 low to 4 high. The graduate coordinator translates the summary scores and narrative comments for each student and shares them during individual conferences. Written documentation is also placed in the departmental student file.

Benchmarks:

Given the subjective nature of art and design production, appreciation and valuation, arts organizations affiliated with higher education like Foundations in Art: Theory and Education (FATE), The College Art Association (CAA), and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), have not established benchmarks for student performance.

Likewise, the department has not established a formal benchmark for the 9-hour review. The mean score from the past four years (2005 – 09) for the 9-hour review is 2.5 on a scale of 4. This score measures the outcomes for the student completing the first 9 hours of course work.

Results/Analysis:

During this reporting period (AY 2008-09) seven students participated in the graduate 9-hour review and successfully passed with an average score of 2.5. The department will continue to collect data to establish a meaningful benchmark for the 9-hour reviews. The average score for the 9-hour review conducted this reporting period are consistent with the average scores collected for the past four years.

The student is required to show their experimentation, explain their ideas and approach utilizing traditional or non-traditional media. The 9-hour review allows the faculty to appraise student work and provide constructive criticism.

Over a four-year period the average score for the 9-hour review is 2.5 on a scale of four. The data shows the highest score to be 3.4 and 1.9 as the lowest. These scores indicate that students coming into the MA in Art program have varied levels of experience. The 9-hour review offers suggestions and constructive criticism in order for each student to take action individually. This helps each student devise a plan and learn structure with goals that are unique to their area of emphasis. The 2.5 average

score over a period of four years shows a consistency that is useful to establish a benchmark that can be used as a standard for the graduate student beginning work in the art program.

Analysis/Planned Action:

It is a plan for the department graduate committee to collect pass/fail data and input from the full-time faculty in order to develop appropriate criteria and concise rubrics for evaluating students taking the 9-hour review. Revisions to the review forms will be designed in a way that will better quantify the outcome enabling clarification for the student, graduate advisor, and assessment team. Data collected with the use of revised review forms will show percentages for scores that fall below the current 2.5 average. This will help to determine a mean score in order to establish whether a student will pass or fail the review. With the current system we use individual scores do not clearly define a standard.

We recognize that reviews conducted on a representative sampling of students should, when benchmarked, measured and assessed over time, reveal useful insights into overall student preparedness and identify programmatic strengths and specific areas where adjustments are warranted.

However, the department is gathering data to help guide internal benchmarking. Before setting marks for student performance the department will consider the way the review is organized, taught and evaluated to address the following shortcomings:

- Delivery inconsistencies in graduate-level advanced studio sequence courses brought about variations in goals and objectives
- Grade inflation compounded with conflicting numerical assessments and narrative comments
- Expectations that are not clearly delineated to students
- Clearly defined rubrics used to score and evaluate student performance

Assessment Measure 2: 18 – Hour Review

The 18-hour review measures student performance and their ability to develop a body of artwork that can express mastery of a chosen medium with content that describes a central theme. The goal is to help the student gauge and advance their level of preparedness for the graduate exhibition.

Using a format similar to the 9-hour review, students present artwork to the faculty for review in two ways: a) they display their work in the studio area or designated workspace; b) give an oral presentation about their ideas and body of work. Students

are expected to show evidence of original exploration of concept and overall competence with media and methods during an oral presentation. The student is to show evidence of progress, development, and growth.

The same review form is used for both the 18-hour review and the 9-hour review. However, as the 18-hour review is used as a stepping stone to the final graduate exhibition the expectations for the student's progress is higher. The review form lists the following criteria as discussion points and evaluation categories for the critique: oral presentation, concepts presented, execution of concept, craftsmanship appropriate to type of artwork, presentation, and originality. The criteria are rated on a scale of 0 low to 4 high.

The graduate coordinator translates the summary scores and narrative comments for each student and shares them during individual conferences and in writing for their file.

Benchmarks:

As was the case in the 9-hour review the subjective nature of art and design production, appreciation and valuation, these are not nationally established or commonly accepted benchmarks for student performance in a studio art model.

Not unsurprisingly, the department has not established a benchmark for the 18-hour review. The mean score from 2005 to 2009 for the 18-hour review was 2.9 on a scale of 4. This score measures the outcome for the students completing a minimum of 18 hours of course work.

As noted previously in the description for the 9-hour review, the department is gathering data to help guide internal benchmarking for the 18-hour review.

Results/Analysis:

During this reporting period (AY 2008-09) the department conducted five 18-hour reviews in which four students passed and one student was scheduled to retake the review the following semester. The primary reason for rescheduling a second 18-hour review was to allow additional time for the student to produce more work that would provide evidence indicating they were prepared for the graduate exhibition. A student does not pass or fail. The collective knowledge of the faculty and consideration for professional standards are used to determine the outcome.

The mean score for the (AY 2008-09) 18-hour review was 2.7 on a four-point scale. The data collected from 2005-2009 show average scores to be 2.9 and are slightly higher in comparison to the average scores for the 18-hour review during 2008-09. The students reviewed this reporting period are equivalent to 50% of the total number of students during the past four years. This suggests collecting additional data will help to determine appropriate benchmark for the 18-hour review.

The 18-hour graduate review also indicates that the average scores are higher over a four-year span than the average scores for 9-hour reviews, even though the review forms are the same. A larger volume of work is evaluated during the 18-hour review so the outcome shows a higher level of sophistication, refined craftsmanship, and conceptual integrity. Between the 9-hour and 18-hour review the student acquires concentrated studio experiences that require a higher level of involvement and rigor in comparison to undergraduate work. The student uses the time period prior to the completion of 18 hours of course work to formulate concepts and organize or develop a cohesive body of work. It is during the 18-hour review that a student can show their progress and development of work for the graduate exhibition.

After the 18-hour review the student can respond to suggestions and comments stated in the results as a guide for their visual inquiry and develop new work for their graduate exhibition. The student is expected to show evidence that they can meet a professional standard accepted by the faculty. The graduate exhibitions demonstrate that a student has successfully produced work on a professional level.

Analysis/Planned Action:

The 18-hour review is used to assess student ability to formulate ideas, demonstrate their involvement with the media, and present quantitatively a body of work that presents clear, thoughtfully executed concepts. The review is also used to address weaknesses and strengths in student development and determine their ability to meet professional exhibition standards. Revising the 18-hour review form and establishing a benchmark will differentiate the 18-hour review from the 9-hour review. Rubrics for the review process will clarify expected outcomes. This action will enhance the review process for both the student and full-time faculty.

The department will continue to collect data and establish a benchmark for both the 9-hour and 18-hour review. The graduate committee will examine current and previous data to develop rubrics and implement new review forms for the review process.

IV. Overview of changes implemented in your program this past year based on results and planned action specified in last year's report.

The department of art and design implemented changes that require all graduate students to actively participate in the 9-hour and 18-hour reviews. The department faculty is engaged in on-going discussions regarding the GRE requirement and eliminating the summer application deadline. The graduate coordinator has prepared a potential graduate handbook for the MA in Art program.

In order to establish meaningful benchmarks, the art and design faculty will continue to discuss a numeric value for passing the 9-hour and 18-hour review. Evaluation

forms will be revised in order to differentiate the rubrics and criteria for the student taking the 9-hour and 18-hour review.

As the department assesses the quality of our graduate program we will discuss the feasibility of offering a terminal degree. A Master of Fine Art degree is the terminal degree that will improve recruitment and raise the caliber of students we accept in our graduate program.

V. Specify any changes/modifications made to your program based specifically on data obtained during Assessment Day Activities.

No previous assessment activities have been conducted in the MA in Art program. Assessment Day activities in the Department of Art & Design were focused specifically on the undergraduate program.

VI. Assistance Needed with Assessment: What assistance can the Office of Assessment give you to help improve your assessment program?

Assistance would be appreciated with providing assessment models from comparable art and design programs from institutions of comparable size, number of students, and course offerings.