

Outcomes Assessment Report
Department of Art – New Mexico State University
Undergraduate Program
2003

As stated in the revised Outcomes Assessment plan, a new Studio Foundation course has been developed and will be used as a measure for outcomes assessment in combination with the BFA Capstone Exhibition.

The BFA Capstone Exhibition is reviewed and discussed by the full faculty, however, as the forum for that discussion does not include the background of an in-person critique the category of critical analysis has been removed. The BFA exhibition occurs in the spring and fall.

At the end of each semester faculty gather for a meeting dedicated to the discussion of student progress and the state of the program as it is reflected in cumulative scores generated through Outcomes Assessment. Curricular changes are developed as needed.

Cumulative numerical scores are based on criteria outlined in the attached Outcomes Assessment plan.

I. Studio Foundation Course

Data not available as this component of outcomes assessment is still being implemented. First round of data will be available at the end of Fall 2003.

II. BFA Capstone Exhibition

Fall 2002

The cumulative score in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.40
Content	2.39
Creativity	2.40

With a overall composite score of 2.40

Spring 2002

The cumulative score in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.59
--------	------

Content	2.49
Creativity	2.47

With a overall composite score of 2.49

Fall 2001

The cumulative score in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.55
Content	2.40
Creativity	2.41

With a overall composite score of 2.45

III. Conclusions

Without the implementation of a studio foundation course to create a unified measure of student performance it is difficult to identify any specific modifications of the curriculum. However, the faculty believes that the implementation of a lower division studio foundations course will not only deliver outcomes assessment data, but more importantly will more thoroughly prepare undergraduates for upper division coursework.

Outcomes Assessment Committee
NMSU Department of Art

Julia Barello, Chair
David Taylor

6 January 2003

Outcomes Assessment Plan

Department of Art - New Mexico State University

Undergraduate Program

The Art Department is instituting a variety of methods to generate outcomes assessment data in order to track the achievement of students as they advance through the undergraduate program. The information derived from both the individual and cumulative analysis of the evaluations will inform adjustments in Art Department curriculum and teaching.

The outcomes assessment committee has identified the following points in the undergraduate Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) degree program at which students may be evaluated.

Undergraduate Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) Program Student Evaluation

There are two measurable instruments in the progression of a student achieving their BFA degree that can be utilized for the purposes of outcomes assessment – Studio Foundations course and the BFA Capstone Exhibition.

I. Studio Foundations:

The new Studio Foundations course incorporates the current curriculum of the existing 2-D Design and 3-D Design courses and expands basic course material in the art department to include color theory. This is done with the intent of creating a unified experience for lower division (freshman, sophomore and transfer) art students that can effectively measure their basic art making skills. This newly developed six credit, one semester course will be a consistent component of the curriculum beginning in the fall of 2003. At course completion, student portfolios will be reviewed by the entire art faculty and evaluated for competence in craft, content, and creativity. This will create the basis for comparison with the BFA Capstone Exhibition, which all majors must complete to successfully exit the program. Students must satisfactorily complete the Studio Foundations course in order to pursue upper division course work in the Art Department.

The Art Department recently instituted a procedure for undergraduate advising which requires that all art majors (BA, BFA) be advised, and pre-registered for art classes on a particular day. This new procedure has streamlined student progress through areas of study within the art department. In addition it will ensure that students enroll in and complete the Studio Foundations Course prior to taking any upper division studio courses.



The review of student work from the Studio Foundations course will serve as the mechanism for the measure of applied performance while the student is progressing through the BFA program. Portfolios will be evaluated by the entire art faculty utilizing the “*Studio Foundations Course -Individual Undergraduate Evaluation Form.*” (Attachment A) Criteria for evaluating the studio foundation course portfolios will be as follows: Craft, Content and Creativity. (Please note that the category “Critical Analysis” is not included in the context of this review as that information only becomes relevant as students develop a body of work based upon independent research.) Definitions of criteria will follow at the end of this section.

Data from the portfolio reviews will be collated in the “*Cumulative Evaluation – Studio Foundation Course*” (Attachment B) and the resulting information will be used by the faculty in outcomes assessment of the undergraduate studio art program.

II. BFA Capstone Exhibition

Undergraduate students must complete a BFA thesis exhibition under the guidance of their major professor. A student's major professor is determined by the student's area of concentration (e.g. metals, painting, etc.)

The BFA thesis exhibition serves as the instrument for the measuring of applied performance in the student's capstone experience. The exhibitions are installed throughout the department or in a public display area for a period of approximately two weeks at the end of the student's final semester.

The BFA exhibitions are evaluated by the full faculty of the Department of Art utilizing the “*BFA Capstone Exhibition - Individual Undergraduate Evaluation Form.*” (Attachment C) The following three criteria are judged: Craft, Content and Creativity. Definitions of these terms will follow at the end of this section. The results of the thesis exhibition evaluations will be collated in the form titled “*Cumulative Evaluation -BFA Capstone Exhibition*” (Attachment D) and the resulting data will be used by the faculty in outcomes assessment of the undergraduate studio art program.

Evaluative Criteria:

The Art Department has formulated and defined the following evaluative criteria for the measurement of applied performance. Criteria are derived from widely accepted publications on art criticism and theory, and conform to general use definitions.

Craft: A demonstrated aptitude in use of tools and execution of techniques.

Content: A demonstrated aptitude in formulating/conveying expression, essential meaning, significance or aesthetic value. Content refers to the sensory, subjective, psychological or emotional properties we feel in a work of art -- this is in opposition to

our perception of an artwork's descriptive aspects alone.

Creativity: The demonstrated integration of the aforementioned components of craft and creativity.

Undergraduate Bachelor's (BA) in Art History Student Evaluations

The art historians within the Department of Art have developed methods to generate outcomes assessment data in order to track the achievement of students as they advance through the program. The information derived from both the individual and cumulative analysis of the evaluations will inform adjustments in Art Department curriculum and teaching. The following procedures for generating data for programmatic outcomes assessment was finalized by the faculty of the Art Department at a meeting on December 4th, 2001.

There are two measurable instruments in the progression of a student achieving their BA degree that can be utilized for the purposes of outcomes assessment – a Junior Year Review, and the Capstone Experience Review.

I: Junior Year Review

The junior review serves as the mechanism for measuring applied performance during the students' progression through the BA in Art History program. The review is based upon a 10-page research paper, which is due at the end of the junior year. This thesis paper will be generated in an art history course under the supervision of an art historian.

The research papers will be evaluated by a team of three faculty: one art historian, and two studio faculty utilizing the "*Junior Year Review - Individual Undergraduate Evaluation Form*" (Attachment E). The papers will be marked using the following criteria.

Originality/Creativity	Ideas are creative and original.
Organization of Ideas	Ideas are presented clearly, with a strong, supported thesis.
Presentation	The paper includes a bibliography, correct citations and clear illustrations. Grammar and spelling mistakes are at a minimum and do not detract for the meaning of the argument.
Critical Analysis	The student is thinking, making clear and original connections and assessments in their scholarship.

The resulting data will be collated in the form titled "*Cumulative Evaluation– Junior Year Review (Attachment F)*."

II: Capstone Experience Review

The capstone experience review will consist of a slide presentation on a particular research topic selected by the student and presented at an annual student symposium. The presentation will be evaluated by the entire faculty utilizing the form titled “*Capstone Experience Review – Individual Undergraduate Evaluation Form*” (Attachment G) and collated into data on the “*Cumulative Evaluation – Capstone Experience Review*” (Attachment H). The information derived from both the individual and cumulative analysis of the evaluations will inform adjustments in Art Department curriculum and teaching.

The papers will be marked using the following criteria.

Originality/Creativity	Ideas are creative and original.
Organization of Ideas	Ideas are presented clearly, with a strong, supported thesis.
Presentation	This speaks to the professionalism of the presentation itself. The student speaks clearly and uses the slides to support their analysis.
Critical Analysis	The student is thinking, making clear and original connections and assessments in their scholarship.

Outcomes Assessment Committee

NMSU Department of Art

Julia Barello, Chair

David Taylor

6 January 2003

MEMO

To: Outcomes Assessment Committee
From: Joshua Rose, Head, Department of Art
Subject: Outcomes Assessment
Date: November 18, 2000

GRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

In order to better understand outcomes assessment in the Department of Art it is important to have an understanding of the context and climate of the department and how it differs from other academic programs in the university. We are very serious about monitoring the quality of our program and have been so from the start. It is also important to recognize that the required courses in our degrees or rather "emphasis" within our degree have been developed to dovetail with each other so that students gain not only an expertise within their area of choice but an overall understanding of the visual arts as a whole. Not only does a painting graduate learn about painting, drawing and printmaking, but also learns about the history (social, political, philosophical and critical context) of these things as well as history of architecture, sculpture, photography, etc.. The nature of our instruction is far more intimate than the more usual lecture format. The sixty hour degree brings the student into very close proximity with faculty over a three year period. There are group critiques of work and faculty reviews of a student's progress every semester. One of the changes coming out of our last retreat was the decision to return to a full faculty review at the end of the first three semesters culminating in an advancement to candidacy. The main consequence of this approach is that we tend to "tweak" our program in an ongoing fashion. We respond to problems and arising needs rapidly so that programmatic changes evolve in a flow rather than revolve as definitive events. The major changes that do occur in our program happen at faculty retreats or meetings and are often in response to verbal communications from students to faculty. Again, this is due to the intimate nature of dialogue between graduate students and faculty; faculty to faculty and the culture of the Art Department and perhaps the arts in general.

The culminating public M.F.A. exhibition in which a student must mount a show of work with the input of her/his thesis committee is taken very seriously. It is the equivalent of a dissertation defense in other areas.

1- Attached is a copy of our graduate outcomes assessment plan

2- I addressed the nature of our department above as a means of describing a greater overall context for assessing student development. Since we have a cyclical number of grad students graduation in any given year this past graduation was really the first opportunity to get back any real number of O.A. questionnaires. It was handed out to the graduate students at the end of their first semester and again after they participated in the M.F.A. thesis exhibition. This past

Page 2

November 18, 2000

May it became clear that this method would not work as a viable means of assessment. This is due to the refusal of five out of 9 graduates to fill out our form. The four who did respond used the questionnaire primarily to complain the lack of perceived support (financial) to both the student and the department. (I have attached a copy of the 4 compiled answers)

We discussed this problem at our recent retreat and decided that a new method of gathering information must be put in to use. A different questionnaire will be developed by a newly formed Outcomes Assessment Committee. These will be filled out our by students in the Graduate Studio Seminar as part of the class. This course is required of all graduate students and is not specific to any area or emphasis in the department making it a good vehicle for this task. More over a an assessment document will be developed and used at the conclusion of the grad students orals. This will be used by the examining committee including the Dean's Representative.

3- Mainly we have learned that the present Outcomes document has failed to provide any real useful information to develop our program. A two new documents will be developed next semester and before the next students graduate. One will tally all of the factual information such as GPA's in Art History, etc. and the other will be used by the student's committee at the conclusion of orals. We have instituted (starting this semester) some changes in the way we review the grad students. There is now a full faculty review where a student puts up a temporary show of the semester's work and they are asked a number of questions. All the other graduate students are invited to attend though not participate. We have just concluded the first semester reviews and the conclusion is that they were very successful.

4- No changes other than those mentioned are anticipated in our program at this point.

5- We have discussed O.A. in some detail in August and will continue to do so at faculty meetings. We will also discuss the new documents as an agenda item at our faculty meeting in the semesters where we are graduating students.

GRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. In their first semester in the graduate program, graduate students will be asked to respond to questions regarding their expectations of the program. Students will also be asked to evaluate the program each year.

Assessment

- a. Faculty will review and discuss this information and use it as a basis for improving the graduate program.
2. Students completing the M.F.A./M.A. in Studio will be able to demonstrate through course work, critical understanding of a major period and/or movement in Art History, related to their studio major.

Assessments:

- a. For 80% of all graduating MA and MFA's, the combined average grade of graduate level art history and graduate seminar courses will be at least 3.5.
 - b. All students in graduate level art history courses will be required to successfully complete an article-length research paper.
3. Students completing an M.A. in Art History will achieve a breadth of knowledge of art historical periods and will demonstrate sophistication in research methodology and critical reasoning.

Assessments:

- a. As part of the requirements for the degree, all students will successfully complete at least six graduate level period courses in Art History to achieve breadth.
 - b. As part of the requirements for the degree, all students will successfully complete a scholarly thesis paper on a focused topic in their major area of study. The paper will demonstrate a mastery of field resources and imagination in the use of knowledge of scholarly methods. The paper will be evaluated by the Art History faculty and the graduate student's other committee members.
4. To meet the requirements of candidacy, students will participate in a public presentation of their work with a supporting artist's statement. Art History students will give an oral presentation of their work with a supporting artist's statement. Art History students will give an oral presentation of their proposed thesis topic with slides.

Assessments:

- a. The studio candidacy presentation should demonstrate a clarity of objectives and a knowledge of the materials and processes of the appropriate studio area. The Art History candidate should present a narrowly defined thesis, a research methodology, an awareness of pertinent resources, and a proposal of future research findings.
 - b. A subsequent decision by the committee in consultation with the faculty to advance student to candidacy for the M.A. or the M.F.A. degree.
5. The M.F.A. student's thesis exhibition will professionally present an comprehensive body of work

Assessment

- a. The student's graduate thesis committee will determine that the student's exhibition is professionally presented, that it demonstrates an understanding of their area of research, and a mastery of materials and processes

GRADUATE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
SPRING 2000

TO: GRADUATING MA & MFA STUDENTS

FROM: Dept. of Art

Your responses to the questions below will help the department argue for more support to improve facilities and curriculum. Specific, tactfully phrased statements (i.e., quotable) will be most beneficial. The department must have responses from all students in order to complete outcomes assessment self-evaluation. You are to complete these anonymously, but Olivia or Angelica will mark off your name on a master list so we will know when all have been submitted.

Please submit this to Olivia or Angelica in the Art Office by Friday, April 28th.

1. Do you have suggestions for improving the academic experience of art graduate students? (i.e., course size/topics/media/discipline/external [off-campus] activities - experiences, etc)

Difficult question-continue to develop a sense of community.

I particularly enjoyed the trips to see art in other cities. I just wish the expense could have been underwritten.

Improve undergraduate program. Require all to take graduate drawing for one semester, first year

An ongoing, informal, once a month artist lecture series involving grads and faculty would go a long way to foster a sense of community. When fledgling off campus events do occur they receive very little support and no monetary support at all, targeting spaces on campus, (as was done with "the sound project" in the music bldg) is an excellent way to start extending presence and community. And should receive university support.

2. Are there any problems you have experienced as a graduate student that should be brought to the department's attention? (i.e., program application, registration, TA selection, communication, curriculum)

When registering for classes, always problematic because grad students have to take same classes over and over - so the computers spit out our registration - grads are university employees and they should set registration up in a way that is more efficient.

The business office policy of not allowing registration until an art bill is paid cause a little confusion when they drop you and you have to re-register.

Decisions regarding TA selection should be open to all or none. Graduate students ought to be able to register before undergraduates. Faculty should bear the responsibility of scheduling orals.

I feel alienated from the TA selection process. Double talk has occurred and its my personal feeling TA selection is based on politics and favouritism, being told there are no funds available is no salve to someone who wants to learn to teach, but must beg, borrow and struggle in debt to bet by on a ½ TA, especially in their final year, when a thesis show is an enormous budget stretch.

3. Please comment on the adequacy of studio and art history facilities and equipment (be specific).

Studios are much much too small also there is no common area where the students can meet. All other departments have lounges and meeting areas.

The art history TA's should have a space that has Internet hookup for research.

Graduate studios need adequate light and ventilation. Painting and photography studios should be located closer to Williams Hall. Art history facilities are adequate. Library needs more and better art books. Could use an art history computer lab. Slide library needs more 20th century!

Faculty must take an ethical stance on the personal use of consumables for non demonstration purposes, as these costs are divided among the students. While students should be expected to provide some minor tools and equipment. There is a totally inadequate budget which does not cover the cost of replacement and repair of equipment due to normal wear and use. For example, the woodshop potentially services over 50 students and faculty each semester, and yet there was no initial funding to purchase new saw blades. 30 students share 4 drills, 3 angle grinders, 2 jigsaws. Taking any of these small tools to a qualified technician for repair depletes up to 1/7 of the yearly budget! Either the dept needs to hire an "in-house" skilled technician or expand the studio budget to cover maintenance cost. Poor equipment becomes a safety issue.

4. What do you like best about NMSU's graduate art program?

The feeling that we are part of a family.

I like the closeness between faculty and students. It makes faculty approachable.

Opportunity to reach 3 year program.

Because of its small size, grad students rely on each other and the undergrads for criticism and support. Grad can gain experience and knowledge in a working relationship w/ undergrads. More opportunities (ie. Increasing studio offerings in each field) to TA or develop projects/curriculum would insure grads in each field have a chance to develop this skill and TA in their major.

5. If you could take a new course from one of the current professors, what topic/area would be of interest, and which professor should teach the course?

Contemporary art - issues and ideas that includes areas of interest for students getting ready to enter the art world. (Rindge) - (Fitzsimmons).

Dr. Rindge - a course on contemporary art

Professional practices - any professor

Teaching methods - any professor

Figure painting - Spencer, Josh, Jacklyn

Contemporary art history and issues the 80's/90's in all disciplines. Not just primarily painting. Taught with current periodicals and journals as basis for discussion/theory groups. Taught by a studio professor.

6. If a visiting studio or art history professor were to teach here for one semester, what topics/areas not currently offered should be taught?

Contemporary art

Contemporary art and culture

A course in sculptural techniques and materials. No, better would be an interdisciplinary studio course which involved mixed media and exchange between departments. This could be linked by content (thematic) exploring a particular issue, or could also involve collaboration between students in different fields. Ie. A class on "metaphor" where painters work w/ sculptors and ceramicists work with photographers. All media are involved, contributing to dialogue.

7. Other comments/ideas/suggestions:

Having only one faculty member in each discipline is a severe limitation in gaining an alternative insight into your work and process. Either an interdisciplinary approach, must be taken - or more money allotted to long-term (ie. 2 weeks or more) Visiting artist - who breathe fresh air into the dept. If more faculty cannot be hired even if only part-time.

MEMO

To: Outcomes Assessment Committee
From: Joshua Rose, Head, Department of Art
Subject: Outcomes Assessment
Date: November 18, 2000

UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

In order to better understand outcomes assessment in the Department of Art it is important to have an understanding of the context and climate of the department and how it differs from other academic programs in the university. We are very serious about monitoring the quality of our program and have been so from the start. The nature of our instruction is far more intimate than the more usual lecture format. A student in our major must spend some six hours a week in each studio class. Because we are basically (with one exception) a one professor per area or "emphasis" department, a student must take a minimum of 18 (6 courses) and more likely 21 (7 courses) credit hours with a single professor over four years. Please keep in mind that the studio classes represent a two contact hours per credit per class. Our class size, depending upon area range from ten to twenty students. The professors get to know individual students very well and the level of individual attention to these students can parallel the mentoring of graduate students in many other programs. In the more traditional Art History lecture classes we have only two faculty members and students must take 6 classes between them. Even in these classes student become well known to the faculty. The main consequence of this is that we tend to "tweak" our program in an ongoing fashion. We deal with small problems and needs quite rapidly so that programmatic changes happen as a flow rather than as large events. Many of the changes that do occur in our program happen at faculty retreats or meetings and are often in response to verbal communications from students to faculty. Again, this is due to the intimate nature of dialogue between students and faculty; faculty to faculty and the culture of the Art Department and perhaps the arts in general.

Over the years we have initiated many methods for assessing the quality of our instruction. Works from all of our studio classes are always on display throughout Williams Hall so that students and faculty alike are constantly aware of artistic production. The public BFA exhibition in which a student must mount a show of work with the input of her/his major professor is taken very seriously. The yearly student exhibition in the University Art Gallery using outside jurors is another example of this. These methods fulfill the description of what direct measures for student learning might be according to "Enclosure A" that includes "...student portfolios, theses or culminating research projects..."

1- Attached are copies of our undergraduate outcomes assessment plan

2- During the period of time when the student puts up the required B.F.A. exhibition, an outcomes assessment questionnaire is circulated amongst the faculty in the student's area of concentration and the Art History faculty (a copy of the questionnaire is attached) to ascertain that students have fulfilled the expectations of the program. Comments about the student's development are provided by the major professor in the appropriate section of the questionnaire. The student average grade point in Art History is tallied and measured against the average which is 2.13 for 16 students for the 1999-2000 year and measured against our goal of 80% of B.A./B.F.A. students achieving above 2.5. This was not achieved in the last group with only 69% earning 2.5 or better though 87.5% attained 2.00 or better. These are collected by the Department Head in order to analyze the results. The major professor and the B.F.A. committee helps the student put together the undergraduate B.F.A. exhibition.

3-

a) The level of our students graduating with a B.F.A. is meeting the expectations that we have set forth. The underlying goals for studio based students remain: 1- to emerge from the program both visually and critically literate. This is determined by the research papers done in art history classes as well as verbal performance during the numerous critiques in classes where students must demonstrate familiarity with concepts of art theory 2- to be knowledgeable of the history and development of the various disciplines and movements, this is also accomplished by both art history classes and studio lectures and critiques. 3- to be able to write an articulate ten page (minimum) paper in a specific (upper level) Art History subject, using primary sources, 4- to be skilled in the chosen area of emphasis regarding the technical demands of the discipline determined by the faculty in the area. 5- to develop a serious and professional attitude towards the field as a whole, and 6- to have the ability to compete nationally for admission in (and be adequately prepared for) graduate programs of note and rigor, such as: Chicago Art Institute, Yale and Iowa State.

In order to apply our outcomes assessment program we have already changed our program to be more "measurable". A more formal and required B.F.A. exhibition has been instituted, and a specific length writing requirement has been included in art history. Our program is very successful in its aims. Participation in the student exhibitions is high. The "exit" B.F.A. exhibitions (held with the M.F.A.) are well attended. It is difficult to be quantitative in the visual arts as there are no "standardized tests."

b) The Department of Art will have recently had a retreat. We discussed Outcomes assessment for several hours. The faculty evaluated both the undergraduate and graduate programs. We used the Outcomes Assessment information as part of the basis for these discussions. We also discussed changing the program to try to reflect better outcomes results. This was rejected since we generally feel that the program is in an excellent position. Almost everything that was discussed vis-a-vis change, required significant amounts of money to be added to our budget. Presently

Page 3

November 18, 2000

there are no plans to change our program other than by natural growth.

4- No changes are anticipated in our program from the past year's assessment information. Further study must go into the goal of 2.5 gpa for art history courses. However we do recognize the need for closer and more systematic advising of students and will develop a departmental advising day where all faculty will advise all students.

5- We have discussed O.A. in some detail in our August retreat and will continue to do so at future faculty meetings. We will add an agenda item where we discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the BFA exhibition at the last faculty meeting of the semester we will also talk about the recent decline in the Art History GPA. This discussion will be summarized and added to the evaluation process of our program.

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF ART

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (page 1 of 3)

Semester _____ Year _____

Art Department Faculty:

Please confirm with your signatures that the following student has completed the specified departmental outcomes assessment requirements for the appropriate degree in Studio or Art History. Please circulate this checklist to the next appropriate faculty member. When all signatures are obtained, return the checklist to the Art Office. Unconfirmed assessment areas will be reported as incomplete.

Student: _____

Degree _____

Major Area: _____

Major Professor(s): _____

(Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree Only)

Major Studio Professor:

Working with the major professor, this student successfully participated in the Bachelor of Fine Arts Thesis Exhibition:

Yes _____ No _____ Signature _____

Comments: _____

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (page 2 of 3)

Student: _____

(All Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts Degrees)

Art History Professor:

This student has successfully completed an upper division level research paper of at least 10 pages in length, utilizing primary sources:

Yes _____ No _____ Signature _____

(Bachelor of Arts Degree in Art History Only)

Art History Professor:

As an Art History major, this student has successfully completed an article-length research paper, on an appropriate subject, based upon primary sources and including a bibliography:

Yes _____ No _____ Signature _____

Comments:

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (page 3 of 3)

Student: _____

(All Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts Degrees)

Art Department Office:

This student has a combined average grade point in all Art History and seminar courses of: _____

Signature: _____

UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Following are the four learning outcomes and related assessment measures conceived by the Department of Art and based on the program's goal:

Department Mission Statement: The Department of Art provides a rigorous program for the enrichment, application, development, and appreciation of the visual arts. Studio students are expected to develop an individual aesthetic by experimenting with and expressing visual concepts in an articulate manner. Art History students will acquire a comprehensive understanding of the aesthetic and cultural issues addressed within the History of Art. They will demonstrate an ability to conduct and present independent research coherently.

1. Students completing a B.A. or B.F.A. in Studio Art should demonstrate a familiarity with the major periods and movements in Art History and an understanding of historical methodology.

*Assessments:

- a. For 80% of all graduating B.A. and B.F.A.'s, the combined average grade of Art History and seminar courses will be 2.5.
 - b. All students in upper division Art History courses will be required to successfully complete a research paper of a minimum of ten pages, utilizing primary sources.
2. Students completing a B.A. in Art History will demonstrate an understanding of cultural diversity and historiography specifically demonstrating art historical reasoning and scholarly research methodology.

*Assessment:

- a. As part of the required course work, all students will successfully complete a twenty-five page research paper on an appropriate subject, based upon primary sources and including a bibliography.
3. Upon completion of the B.A. or B.F.A. in Studio Art, the student will be able to advantageously compete with students from similar institutions in getting accepted into graduate programs in Art.

*Assessment:

- a. Art Department faculty will document the ratio of NMSU art majors applying for graduate study to those students accepted into graduate programs.
4. Working with their major professor, B.F.A. students will be required to have a public exhibition of their studio work, during their graduating semester.

*Assessments:

- a. The student's major professor will critique the exhibition, based on standards that have been previously established.
- b. The B.F.A. exhibition should demonstrate competency in the methods, materials, and processes of the foundation program, as well as the student's major area of emphasis.

****Final Assessment:**

A list of graduating B.A. and B.F.A. students will be distributed to all faculty together with a checklist of the above assessment requirements. The appropriate faculty will confirm the students completion of assessment requirements by checking off those items.

Outcomes Assessment Plan

Department of Art - New Mexico State University

Graduate Program

The Art Department utilizes a variety of methods to generate outcomes assessment data in order to track the achievement of students as they advance through the graduate program. The information derived from both the individual and cumulative analysis of the evaluations is used to inform adjustments in Art Department curriculum and teaching.

The faculty of the Art Department has identified the following points in the graduate Masters of Fine Arts (MFA) degree program at which students may be evaluated.

Graduate Masters of Fine Arts (MFA) Program Student Evaluations:

There are four measurable instruments in the progress of a student achieving their MFA degree that are utilized for the purposes of outcomes assessment – three semester reviews, and the MFA capstone exhibition.

Graduate students currently must participate in all-faculty semester progress reviews during their first three semesters in the MFA program. In the fourth semester of the MFA program students assemble a graduate committee consisting of three Art Department faculty members (major area advisor and two selected by the student) and one faculty member from outside the department. The assembled committee then monitors and guides the progress of the student for the remaining three semesters of the MFA program that culminates in a thesis exhibition and oral defense of the thesis.

The Art Department has identified the three semester reviews and the MFA capstone exhibition as appropriate points at which to evaluate student progress and program effectiveness.

I: Semester Review

The three semester reviews are the mechanism for measuring applied performance while the student is progressing through the MFA program. Graduate students are individually evaluated by each member of the faculty at the end of each semester review utilizing the “*Semester Review – Individual Evaluation Form*” (Attachment I) The following four criteria will be judged: Craft, Content, Creativity, and Critical Analysis. Definitions of these terms will follow at the end of this section. The results of the individual semester review evaluations will be collated in the form titled *Semester Review - Cumulative Evaluation*” (Attachment J) and the resulting data will be used by the faculty in outcomes assessment of the graduate studio art program.

II. MFA Capstone Exhibition

Graduate students must complete a MFA thesis exhibition under the guidance of their major professor. A student's major professor is determined by the student's area of concentration (e.g. metals, painting, etc.)

The MFA thesis exhibition serves as the instrument for the measuring of applied performance in the student's capstone experience. The exhibitions are installed at the University Art Gallery for a period of approximately two weeks at the end of their final semester.

The MFA exhibitions are evaluated by the full faculty of the Department of Art utilizing the final section of the "MFA Capstone Exhibition – *Individual Evaluation Form*." (Attachment K) The following four criteria will be judged: Craft, Content, Creativity, and Critical Analysis. Definitions of these terms will follow at the end of this section. The results of the thesis exhibition evaluations will be collated in the form titled "*MFA Capstone Exhibition - Cumulative Evaluation*" (Attachment L) and the resulting data is used by the faculty in outcomes assessment of the graduate studio art program.

III. Evaluative Criteria:

The Art Department has formulated and defined the following evaluative criteria for the measurement of applied performance. Criteria are derived from widely accepted publications on art criticism and theory, and conform to general use definitions.

Craft: A demonstrated aptitude in use of tools and execution of techniques.

Content: A demonstrated aptitude in formulating/conveying expression, essential meaning, significance or aesthetic value. Content refers to the sensory, subjective, psychological or emotional properties we feel in a work of art -- this is in opposition to our perception of an artwork's descriptive aspects alone.

Creativity: The demonstrated integration of the aforementioned components of craft and creativity.

Critical Analysis: The demonstrated ability to engage the content, meaning, and aesthetic value of works of art through oral and written modes from an informed point of view. Critical Analysis implies informed discourse as opposed to mere discussion.

Outcomes Assessment Report
Department of Art – New Mexico State University
Graduate Program
2003

I. Semester Review

Twelve faculty members review the work of all first through third semester MFA candidates. The reviews are generally held on two consecutive Fridays in the last month of the semester and last approximately 7 hours each day. Each student installs their work in one of two areas in the department, and the review process consists of an introduction by the thesis advisor followed by the presentation of work by each MFA candidate.

The MFA Capstone Exhibition is also reviewed by the full faculty, however, as the forum for that discussion does not include the background of an in-person critique the category of critical analysis has been removed. In addition, the MFA exhibition occurs in the spring only, thus there is only one set of data annually for that event.

At the end of each semester faculty gather for a meeting dedicated to the discussion of student progress and the state of the program as it is reflected in cumulative scores generated through Outcomes Assessment. Curricular changes are developed as needed.

Cumulative numerical scores are based on criteria outlined in the attached Outcomes Assessment plan.

Spring 2002

The cumulative scores in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.56
Content	2.26
Creativity	2.08
Critical Analysis	1.95

With a overall composite score of 2.21

Fall 2002

The cumulative score in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.37
Content	2.28
Creativity	2.14
Critical Analysis	1.97

With a overall composite score of 2.20

Spring 2001

The cumulative score in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.28
Content	2.07
Creativity	2.13
Critical Analysis	1.88

With a overall composite score of 2.09

II. MFA Capstone Exhibition

Spring 2002

The cumulative score in the four evaluative categories are as follows:

Craft:	2.30
Content	1.80
Creativity	2.15

With a overall composite score of 2.42

III. Conclusions

Based on analysis of both semester review and capstone exhibition data the art faculty determined that it was necessary to place increased emphasis on the critical abilities and capacity for intellectualization of MFA candidates. Students were consistently producing technically sound and visually innovative work, however, their ability to discuss intent and direction was found to be lacking. As a result, we have made it a requirement for students to begin producing thesis statements during their first semester, and these statements are used as a basis for discussion in semester reviews. The faculty has developed guidelines for these statements. (Attachment M).

Outcomes Assessment Committee
NMSU Department of Art

Julia Barello, Chair
David Taylor

6 January 2003

ATTACHMENTS

BFA

Studio Foundations Course – Individual Undergrad Evaluation Form (Attachment A)
Studio Foundations Course - Cumulative Evaluation – (Attachment B)

BFA Capstone Exhibition – Individual Undergrad Evaluation Form (Attachment C)
BFA Capstone Exhibition -Cumulative Evaluation (Attachment D)

BA Art History

Junior Year Review – Individual Undergrad Evaluation Form (Attachment E)
Junior Year Review - Cumulative Evaluation (Attachment F)

Capstone Experience Review - Individual Undergrad Evaluation Form (Attachment G)
Capstone Experience Review - Cumulative Evaluation – (Attachment H)

MFA

Semester Review - Individual Graduate Evaluation Form (Attachment I)
Semester Review - Cumulative Evaluation – (Attachment J)

MFA Capstone Exhibition – Individual Graduate Evaluation Form (Attachment K)
MFA Capstone Exhibition – Cumulative Evaluation (Attachment L)

Guidelines for Artist statement Preparation – (Attachment M)

January 2003

Studio Foundation Course Individual Undergraduate Evaluation

Attachment "A"

Student Name _____

DATE: _____

Studio Foundation Course	3 Superior	2 Adequate	1 Insufficient
Craft			
Content			
Creativity			

Comments:

EVALUATOR _____

STUDIO FOUNDATION COURSE - CUMULATIVE EVALUATION
Integrated Measure of Applied Performance

Attachment "B"

3= SUPERIOR
2= ACCEPTABLE
1= INSUFFICIENT

NAME:	MAJOR AREA	SCORE 1-3 CRAFT	SCORE 1-3 CONTENT	SCORE 1-3 CREATIVITY	COMPOSITE SCORE
COLUMN AVERAGES					

BFA Capstone Exhibition - Individual Undergraduate Evaluation

Attachment "C"

Student Name _____

DATE: _____

BFA Capstone	3 Superior	2 Adequate	1 Insufficient
Craft			
Content			
Creativity			
Comments:			

EVALUATOR _____

BFA Capstone Exhibition - CUMULATIVE EVALUATION
Integrated Measure of Applied Performance

Attachment "D"

3= SUPERIOR

2= ACCEPTABLE

1= INSUFFICIENT

NAME:	MAJOR AREA	SCORE 1-3 CRAFT	SCORE 1-3 CONTENT	SCORE 1-3 CREATIVITY	COMPOSITE SCORE
COLUMN AVERAGES					

Junior Year Review BA/AH Individual Undergraduate Evaluation

Attachment "E"

Student Name _____

DATE: _____

Junior Yr. Review	3 Superior	2 Adequate	1 Insufficient
Creativity			
Org. Ideas			
Presentation			
Critical Analysis			

Comments:

EVALUATOR _____

Junior Year Review - CUMULATIVE EVALUATION
Integrated Measure of Applied Performance

Attachment "F"

3= SUPERIOR

2= ACCEPTABLE

1= INSUFFICIENT

NAME:	MAJOR AREA	SCORE 1-3 Creativity	SCORE 1-3 Org. Ideas	SCORE 1-3 Presentation	SCORE 1-3 Critical Analysis	COMPOSITE SCORE
COLUMN AVERAGES						

Capstone Experience Review BA/AH Individual Undergraduate Evaluation
Attachment "G"

Student Name _____

DATE: _____

Capstone	3 Superior	2 Adequate	1 Insufficient
Creativity			
Org. Ideas			
Presentation			
Critical Analysis			
Comments:			

EVALUATOR _____

Capstone Experience Review - CUMULATIVE EVALUATION
Integrated Measure of Applied Performance

Attachment "H"

3= SUPERIOR

2= ACCEPTABLE

1= INSUFFICIENT

NAME:	MAJOR AREA	SCORE 1-3 Creativity	SCORE 1-3 Org. Ideas	SCORE 1-3 Presentation	SCORE 1-3 Critical Analysis	COMPOSITE SCORE
COLUMN AVERAGES						

Semester Review - Individual Graduate Evaluation Form

"Attachment F"

NAME _____

DATE _____

SEMESTER IN PROGRAM _____

	3 Excellent	2 Acceptable	1 Insufficient
Craft			
Creativity			
Concept			
Critical			

Evaluator _____

Comments:

SEMESTER REVIEW - CUMULATIVE EVALUATION
Integrated Measure of Applied Performance

Attachment "J"

3= SUPERIOR

2= ACCEPTABLE

1= INSUFFICIENT

NAME:	MAJOR AREA	SCORE 1-3 CRAFT	SCORE 1-3 CONTENT	SCORE 1-3 CREATIVITY	SCORE 1-3 Critical Analysis	COMPOSITE SCORE
COLUMN AVERAGES						

MFA Capstone Exhibition - Individual Graduate Evaluation Form

“Attachment K”

NAME _____

DATE _____

SEMESTER IN PROGRAM _____

	3 Excellent	2 Acceptable	1 Insufficient
Craft			
Creativity			
Concept			

Evaluator _____

Comments:

MFA Capstone Exhibition - CUMULATIVE EVALUATION
Integrated Measure of Applied Performance

Attachment "L"

3= SUPERIOR
2= ACCEPTABLE
1= INSUFFICIENT

NAME:	MAJOR AREA	SCORE 1-3 CRAFT	SCORE 1-3 CONTENT	SCORE 1-3 CREATIVITY	COMPOSITE SCORE
COLUMN AVERAGES					

Procedure for Semester Reviews

1. Each semester, for the first three semesters, you will have a full faculty review. This will take place near the end of each semester. Reviews are scheduled with students from respective semesters together. All reviews occur on the same day, unless because of the number of students, it is necessary to set aside two days.
2. Those present at the reviews are faculty and graduate students.
3. The reviews are 30 minutes in length for first semester students and 40 minutes in length for second and third semester students. There is a ten-minute break between reviews.
4. Your major advisor will introduce you at the beginning of the review. His or her input during review will be minimal because this is an opportunity for you to get feedback from other faculty members. However, your advisor will speak to you as soon as possible after the review to give you feedback on the discussion and faculty comments, as well as to answer any questions you may have.
5. One purpose of these reviews is to give you the opportunity to hear what faculty members outside of your area have to say about your work. Reviews also provide an opportunity for you to get to know faculty members so that you can make informed choices for your thesis committee.
6. Another purpose of the reviews is to help you learn the critical analysis skills necessary to your development as a professional artist. Because of this the reviews are structured in such a way as to promote meaningful discussion of your work and its development. The review is in the form of questions and answers.
7. You should approach each successive review with different expectations. Generally speaking, the first review will consist of a dialogue concerning your goals and expectations in regard to the work you've presented. You should also be prepared to discuss what you've learned and evaluate the results of your efforts. You may also want to mention influences of any kind of the work. At this point it is important to show that you have been working as reflected in the amount of work shown. In the second review you should be even more goal oriented and clear about what motivates the work and how you evaluate the results. The work at this point should reveal a consistency in appearance that illustrates your understanding of these goals and motivations. In the third semester you should be establishing your territory, so to speak. You should be able to explain your ideas, motivations, and goals clearly. Your answer to questions should be thoughtful and show that you are aware of your intentions and whether or not you have successfully fulfilled them. This is your last review before your advancement to candidacy for the MFA.
8. In all cases the work should be presented in a professional manner. (Two-dimensional pieces don't need to be framed).
9. It is advisable to encourage your peers to take notes because later you will benefit from getting their feedback on what they heard as compared to what you heard.
10. You are required to write a statement to be distributed to the faculty at the beginning of your review. These statements vary, depending on your placement