

Graduate Degree Program Assessment Progress Report Cover Sheet:

Degree: MA Art **For Calendar Year:** 2008
(Date submitted to college committee: _____) By: M. Williams-Smith
(Date posted on college assessment website: _____)

Overall Rating: _____

Respond to all six parts following the “Degree Program Assessment Progress Report Instructions.” (NOTE: Parts 1 through 4 can be copied from the relevant sections of your assessment plan.) Attach additional pages as needed.

The Master of Arts in Art program offers three concentrations: Art History, Art Education, and Studio Art. We are in the fifth year of a six year assessment cycle.

In years past, the three areas of concentration were assessed annually on a rotating basis. This yearly rotation moved to a two year cycle in 2004 in the hopes that more data could be collected and analyzed for each concentration. Since that time our assessment activities have focused on Studio Art because most of our students are enrolled in this concentration.

Because of the amount of data collected for all goals and learning objectives, this assessment review focuses on Goals 1 and 2, and Learning Objectives 1, 2, and 3.

(1) Student learning goal(s) addressed this year:

The student will:

1. Advance their technical skills in at least one studio area
2. Create a significant body of focused, informed, and inventive work
3. Increase their understanding of art history and apply this understanding to their work
4. Articulate clearly the objectives of their work in a professional manner

(2) Learning outcomes/objectives for those goals addressed this year:

The student will:

1. Use a variety of techniques within one studio area, at a high level of proficiency. (Goal 1)
2. Use the elements of art and the principles of design effectively to solve visual problems. (Goal 2)
3. Create a coherent body of work that is conceptually based (Goal 2)
4. Identify and analyze a broad range of art historical information and utilize this information in the development and discussion of their work. (Goal 3)
5. Discuss the objectives of their work during oral and written critiques in a coherent manner using vocabulary appropriate for the visual arts and their studio discipline. (Goals 3 and 4)

6. Discuss the objectives of, and art historical influences on their work, in a written thesis, using vocabulary and research methods appropriate for the visual arts and their studio discipline. (Goals 3 and 4)

(3) Courses & activities where assessed:

Critiques in all studio art courses, the Advancement to Candidacy Critique and the Thesis requirement were used in the assessment process. Each of these assessment components used an evaluation form as described in the next section.

(4) Methods used:

Assessment focuses on collecting data from three tools used to evaluate a student's progress in art studio: the Studio Critique Form, which is used at the mid-term critique and at the final semester critique for every studio class the student takes; the Advancement to Candidacy Critique Faculty Form, which is used when a student has completed at least 18 hours in the program; and the Thesis Evaluation Form, which is used at the oral defense.

Only the student's faculty committee completes these forms. This committee is composed of the emphasis area instructor, and two other art faculty members: either two studio artists or one studio artists and one art historian. There is discussion among committee members about the student's progress. This helps each member understand the other member's assessment and reasons for the assessment. Most often there is a consensus as to the student's evaluation.

All of the learning objectives/outcomes for studio art are linked to the requirements on these three evaluation forms. Thus data covering every objective/outcome can be accumulated. Therefore the forms serve as valid tools for assessment. Also these forms are used for 2-7 students in any given semester (studio critiques), or 2-5 students a year (Advancement and/or Thesis). This creates a consistent and reliable source of data that can be gathered regularly.

While the forms were designed to gather data on all learning objectives/outcomes for studio art, analysis focuses on the goals and objectives of this year's assessment activities.

The evaluation requirements on the ***Studio Critique Form*** relate to the learning Objectives/Outcomes as follows:

- Work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills related to the chosen studio discipline. (LO 1)
- Work shows an understanding of design and composition. (LO 2)
- Work shows inventiveness, creativity and conceptualization abilities. (LO 2, 3)

The evaluation requirements on the ***Advancement to Candidacy Critique Faculty Form*** relate to the Learning Objectives/Outcomes as follows:

- Work shows a command of the technical skills involved in the studio discipline. (LO 1)
- Body of work shows an understanding of design and composition relative to the studio discipline. (LO 2)

- Work shows inventiveness, creativity, and conceptualization. (LO 2, 3)

The ***Thesis Paper, Exhibition and Oral Defense Evaluation*** form examines the four components of the thesis experience. The evaluation is divided into four categories: the abstract, the body of the text, the exhibition and the oral defense. Data from the exhibition category was used in this assessment cycle because it relates to the student Learning Objectives/Outcomes as follows:

- The body of work is cohesive and directly relates to the thesis proposal and studio discipline. (LO 3)
- Work shows inventiveness, creativity, and conceptualization. (LO 3)
- Work shows a command of the technical skills involved in the discipline. (LO 1)
- Body of work shows an understanding of design and composition relative to the studio discipline. (LO 2)

(5) What are the assessment findings? How did you analyze them?

Materials gathered from 2005-2008 were analyzed. The following information shows how the forms were used:

Data from the **Studio Critique Forms** were tabulated to assess what percentage of the faculty responses in a given year were “exceptional,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory.” (See Appendix I) In the categories assessed, 88% or more of faculty responses indicated the student work was satisfactory or above. These percentages are acceptable. Further analysis reveals that percentages dropped slightly in 2008. This fluctuation is due in part to the reduced number of students enrolled in studio courses that year and in particular one student received unsatisfactory scores from more than one reviewer at mid-term and at the final critique in the fall semester. This is not deemed as a serious deviation at this time.

The **Advancement to Candidacy Critique Form** is very much like the Studio Critique Form in design. The same information can be seen on this form. (See Appendix II) In the categories assessed, 94% or more of faculty responses indicated the student work was satisfactory or above. These percentages are acceptable.

The section of the **Thesis Paper, Exhibition and Oral Defense Evaluation** form also relates to the Learning Outcomes/Objectives assessed at this time. (See Appendix II) 96% or more of faculty responses indicated student work was at the exceptional level. These percentages are acceptable.

(6) What conclusions were drawn and what decisions were made as a result? How were stakeholder groups involved?

Assessment information was also collected from evaluation forms given to current students and thesis candidates, as well as from questionnaires mailed to studio art alumni. These forms allowed for stakeholder involvement. While these forms do not match the design and format of evaluation forms used by faculty, they do give the Art Department information regarding the Learning Outcomes/Objectives. (See Appendix III) All responses to these evaluations/questionnaires are very favorable.

It should be noted that all of these forms asked the evaluator for additional comments. Many students/alumni took advantage of this request. These comments give the Art Department information which may help us improve service to our students. For example, more than 50% of respondents on all forms raised the desire for more graduate student-to-student contact. The graduate art classes are very small. Students are dispersed over several studio emphasis areas, which makes it difficult for the students to connect to each other.

The analysis of all assessment material for 2008 was reviewed by a faculty committee. This data will be presented to the full faculty for discussion in spring 2009. The committee's overall finding is that Learning Objectives/Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 are being met. The committee recommends that the faculty develop ways to foster more student-to-student contact such as group critiques which combines more than one emphasis area. Also the committee recommends the development of a graduate student organization that gives these students the opportunity to interact and discuss issues relevant to their experiences in our program. These recommendations will not require curriculum changes.

Previous assessment reports indicated that assessment activities for the Studio Art Concentration would conclude in 2008. However, analysis of the remaining goals and learning objectives/outcomes must take place. This will happen in 2008. Once this is concluded the Studio Art concentration will be fully assessed and activities can move to another concentration within the program.

APPENDIX I - STUDIO CRITIQUE FORMS - TABULATION RESULTS

2005

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
Work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills related to the chosen studio discipline.	54.5%	31.5%	14%
Work shows an understanding of design and composition.	57.5%	32.5%	10%
Work shows inventiveness, creativity and conceptualization abilities	53.5%	40%	6.5%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 2 students (Sp) with 6 faculty participating; 5 students (F) with 15 faculty participating.

2006

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
Work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills related to the chosen studio discipline.	50%	41%	9%
Work shows an understanding of design and composition.	62%	33.5%	4.5%
Work shows inventiveness, creativity and conceptualization abilities	58.5%	32.5%	7%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 7 students (Sp) with 21 faculty participating; 7 students (F) with 21 faculty participating.

2007

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
Work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills related to the chosen studio discipline.	56%	40%	4%
Work shows an understanding of design and composition.	50%	48%	2%
Work shows inventiveness, creativity and conceptualization abilities	53%	45%	2%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 6 students (Sp) with 18 faculty participating; 6 students (F) with 18 faculty participating.

2008

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
Work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills related to the chosen studio discipline.	17.5%	60.5%	22%
Work shows an understanding of design and composition.	31%	59%	10%
Work shows inventiveness, creativity and conceptualization abilities	10%	60%	30%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 2 students (Sp) with 6 faculty participating; 4 students (F) with 12 faculty participating.

4-YEAR AVERAGE:

88% Satisfactory or above – work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills

93% Satisfactory or above – works shows an understanding of design and composition
 88% Satisfactory or above – work shows inventiveness, creativity, and conceptualization skills

APPENDIX II

MASTER OF ART IN ART – STUDIO

ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY CRITIQUE (Faculty Form)

MAY 2005 – DECEMBER 2008

TABULATION RESULTS

(11 Student Advancement Critiques – includes 33 faculty evaluations)

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
Work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills related to the chosen studio discipline.	56%	38%	6%
Work shows an understanding of design and composition.	50%	44%	6%
Work shows inventiveness, creativity and conceptualization abilities	75%	19%	6%

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

94% Satisfactory or above – work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills
 94% Satisfactory or above – works shows an understanding of design and composition
 94% Satisfactory or above – work shows inventiveness, creativity, and conceptualization skills

MASTER OF ART IN ART – STUDIO

THESIS PAPER, EXHIBITION AND ORAL DEFENSE EVALUATION

MAY 2005 –MAY 2008

TABULATION RESULTS (9 Student Thesis Presentations – includes 27 faculty evaluations)

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
The body of work is cohesive and directly relates to the thesis proposal and studio discipline.	100%		
Work shows inventiveness, creativity, and conceptualization.	96%	4%	
Work shows a command of the technical skills involved in the discipline.	96%	4%	
Body of work shows an understanding of design and composition relative to the studio discipline.	100%		

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

100% Satisfactory or above – work demonstrates progressively advancing technical skills
 100% Satisfactory or above – works shows an understanding of design and composition

100% Satisfactory or above – work shows inventiveness, creativity, and conceptualization skills

APPENDIX III

CURRENT STUDENT EVALUATION OF PROGRAM TABULATION RESULTS

Do you think the studio courses have advanced your technical skills and conceptual abilities as related to your studio area? (LO 1,3)	YES	NO
2005 – 3 completed evaluations	100%	
2006 – 11 completed evaluations	100%	
2007 – 13 completed evaluations	100%	
2008 – 5 completed evaluations	100%	

THESIS CANDIDATE EVALUATION OF PROGRAM TABULATION RESULTS

Do you think the studio courses have advanced your technical skills and conceptual abilities as related to your studio area? (LO 1, 3)	Yes	No
2005 – 0 evaluations	-	
2006 – 3 evaluations	100%	
2007 – 1 evaluation	100%	
2008 – 2 evaluations	100%	

UALR GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDIO ART PROGRAM TABULATION RESULTS

(Questionnaires were sent to 12 studio art alumni. Four completed questionnaires were returned.)

	Yes	No
Do you think your experience in the studio art courses advanced your technical skills sufficiently to benefit your current work in art? (LO 1)	100%	
Was the body of work you created as a graduate student significant enough, with regard to form and content, to prepare you for your professional artistic endeavors? (LO 2,3)	100%	