

Graduate Degree Program Assessment Progress Report Cover Sheet:

Degree: MA Art 65 **For Calendar Year:** 2009
(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.

In years past, the three areas of concentration were assessed annually on a rotating basis. Since 2004, assessment activities have focused on studio art because most of our students are enrolled in this concentration, and this time allowed us to properly develop our assessment tools. This year concludes the assessment of studio art.

Because of the amount of data collected for all goals and learning objectives, the 2008 report focused on Goals 1 and 2, and Learning Objectives 1, 2, and 3. The report this year focuses on Goals 3 and 4, and Learning Objectives 4, 5, and 6.

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

The student will:

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:

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 or, 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 artist 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:

- References to cultures and art historical traditions relative to the studio discipline are utilized and articulated. (LO 4)
- Student is able to orally express the objectives of their work produced using vocabulary relative to the discipline and visual arts. (LO 5)

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

- All requirements of the advancement paper are addressed in depth. (LO 5)
- The advancement paper is organized in a concise and cohesive manner. (LO 5)

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:

- Thesis proposal identifies the research problem and its relationship to the studio
- All goals presented in the thesis problem are covered and discussed in depth. (LO 6)
- Topics are organized in a concise and cohesive manner. (LO 5)
- The research is supported by documentation of scholarly sources. (LO 6)
- References to cultures and art traditions, relative to the studio discipline, are utilized. (LO 4)
- Department standard footnotes, bibliography, and illustrations are used effectively. (LO 6)

(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, overall, an average of 87% 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 2006 and 2008. The fluctuation in 2006 is due to two students receiving unsatisfactory scores from more than one reviewer at mid-term and at the final critique in the fall semester. The fluctuation in 2008 is due in part to the reduced number of students and to one student receiving unsatisfactory scores from more than one reviewer at the mid-term and final critiques. These fluctuations are not deemed as serious enough to warrant curriculum changes 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, 97% 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) 100% or more of faculty responses indicated student work was satisfactory or above. 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, 100% of respondents indicated the program had increased their knowledge of cultures and art historical traditions that related to their studio discipline. However, 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.

A faculty committee conducted analysis of all assessment material, for 2009. This data will be presented to the full faculty for discussion in spring 2010. The committee's overall finding is that Learning Objectives/Outcomes 4, 5, and 6 are being met. The committee recommends that the faculty develop ways to foster more student-to-student contact such as group discussions, which could combine 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.

Assessment for 2010 will focus on the Art History Concentration because it has the second largest concentration of students at this time. We want to devote two years to the assessment of this concentration and then rotate to Art Education. If we rotate every two years to a different concentration of our program, we should have enough data collected from each area to successfully do assessment.

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.
References to cultures and art historical traditions relative to the studio discipline are utilized and articulated.	44.5%	47.5%	8%
Student is able to orally express the objectives of the work produced using vocabulary relative to the discipline and visual arts.	41%	45.5%	13.5%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 7 students (Sp) with 14 faculty participating; 7 students (F) with 10 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.
References to cultures and art historical traditions relative to the studio discipline are utilized and articulated.	42.5%	36.5%	21%
Student is able to orally express the objectives of the work produced using vocabulary relative to the discipline and visual arts.	33.5%	51%	15.5%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 6 students (Sp) with 7 faculty participating; 8 students (F) with 9 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.
References to cultures and art historical traditions relative to the studio discipline are utilized and articulated.	31%	66%	3%
Student is able to orally express the objectives of the work produced using vocabulary relative to the discipline and visual arts.	40%	56%	4%

Tabulation includes evaluations for 6 students (Sp) with 12 faculty participating; 6 students (F) with 12 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.
References to cultures and art historical traditions relative to the studio discipline are utilized and articulated.	14%	60%	26%
Student is able to orally express the objectives of the work produced using vocabulary relative to the discipline and visual arts.	47%	41%	12%

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

4-YEAR AVERAGE:

86% Satisfactory or above – references to cultures and art historical traditions relative to the studio discipline are utilized and articulated

89% Satisfactory or above – student is able to orally express the objectives of the work produced using vocabulary relative to the discipline and visual arts

APPENDIX II

MASTER OF ART IN ART – STUDIO ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY CRITIQUE (Faculty Form)

MAY 2005 – DECEMBER 2008

TABULATION RESULTS (11 Student Advancement Critiques – 9 faculty participating)

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
All requirements of the advancement paper are addressed in depth. (LO 5)	75%	22%	3%
The advancement paper is organized in a concise and cohesive manner. (LO 5)	75%	22%	3%

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

97% Satisfactory or above – in all requirements

MASTER OF ART IN ART – STUDIO THESIS PAPER, EXHIBITION AND ORAL DEFENSE EVALUATION

MAY 2005 –MAY 2008

TABULATION RESULTS (9 Student Thesis Presentations – 9 faculty participating)

Requirements	Exceptional: Work meets or exceeds all of the requirements.	Satisfactory: Work meets most of the requirements.	Unsatisfactory: Work does not fulfill the requirements.
Thesis proposal identifies the research problem and its relationship to the studio discipline. Thesis goals are clearly stated. (LO 4,6)	86%	14%	
All goals presented in the thesis problem are covered and discussed in depth. (LO 5)	82%	18%	
The research is supported by documentation of scholarly sources. (LO 6)	64%	36%	
References to cultures and art traditions, relative to the studio discipline, are utilized. (LO 4)	64%	36%	
Department standard footnotes, bibliography, and illustrations are used effectively. (LO 6)	89%	11%	
The oral presentation of the objectives of the thesis project is thoughtful and includes the use of vocabulary relative to the studio discipline. (LO 5)	82%	18%	
The impact of art history on the thesis project relative to technical and aesthetic influences is clearly articulated. (LO 4)	68%	32%	
Questions or concerns raised about the work are effectively addressed relative to the studio discipline and the graduate experience. (LO 5)	75%	25%	

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

100% Satisfactory or above – in all requirements

APPENDIX III**CURRENT STUDENT EVALUATION OF PROGRAM****TABULATION RESULTS**

Do you think the program is developing your knowledge of cultures and art historical traditions (Western and Non Western) beyond the BA level to enhance your understanding of your chosen studio area? (LO 4)	YES	NO
2005 – 3 completed evaluations	100%	
2006 – 11 completed evaluations	90%	10%
2007 – 13 completed evaluations	100%	
2008 – 4 completed evaluations	100%	

THESIS CANDIDATE EVALUATION OF PROGRAM**TABULATION RESULTS**

Do you think the program has helped develop your knowledge of cultures and art historical traditions (Western and Non-western) beyond the BA level to enhance your understanding of your chosen studio area? (LO 4, 6)	YES	NO
2005 – 0 evaluations	-	
2006 – 3 evaluations	100%	
2007 – 1 evaluation	100%	
2008 – 2 evaluations	100%	

UALR ALUMNI 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.)**

Questions	YES	NO
Do you think the program helped to increase your knowledge of cultures and art historical traditions (Western and Non-western) that relates to your studio discipline? (LO 4)	100%	
As a result of your graduate experience are you able to express the objectives of your work verbally or in written form? (LO 5)	100%	