

Herron School of Art and Design

Program Review and Assessment Report, 2012-2013

July 5, 2013

Introduction

The Herron School of Art and Design is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) for the granting of the professional art and design degrees of Bachelor of Fine Arts, Master of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Art Education, Master of Art Education, Master of Arts in Art Therapy, and the Liberal Arts degree Bachelor of Arts in Art History.

Herron is preparing for reaccreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) in Fall 2013. Preparing the self-study serves as a full review of all programs offered by the school and their outcomes. In keeping with the philosophies and published studies by NASAD, Herron's faculty believes that the truest form of outcomes assessment in the art and design fields entails looking directly at the students' work. For this reason, Herron's assessment procedures rely primarily on direct faculty assessment of student art, design, and written work. (For NASAD publications on assessment, including "Assessment on Our Own Terms," "Assessment of Undergraduate Programs in Art and Design," and "Assessment of Graduate Programs in Art and Design," see <http://nasad.arts-accredit.org/index.jsp?page=Assesment and Policy Studies>)

While Herron has defined and published student learning outcomes for each program, we also adhere to NASAD's overall vision for learning in the art and design fields. NASAD defines the Characteristics and Attributes of Individual Achievement as including:

- Basic professional-level knowledge and skills
- Personal vision evident in work
- Conceptual acuity and creative virtuosity at multiple levels of complexity
- Imagination and ability to channel imagination to reach artistic goals
- Technical virtuosity
- Conceptual and technical command of integration and synthesis

NASAD asserts that, while these attributes may be shared by practicing professionals, they are not manifested in the same way, and that their "actual realization is subject to preferences or individual aspirations and standards of quality that are internal to the kind of work being done and to the development of each artist or even each work of art or design." ("Assessment On Our Own

Terms," p. 6) This is crucial to keep in mind when conducting assessment in art and design.

Herron practices individual and program assessment with integrity and depth. However, since the teaching and learning done at Herron is highly individualized, we beg the readers of this report to consider that assessment can be systematic and thorough without being standardized or primarily numerical. As faculty, we constantly engage in assessment processes that mirror the NASAD reviewers': we look at the students' art and design work and find ways to make it better. Sometimes that requires programmatic changes, but always it includes direct and individual coaching.

Overall School PUL Results

Direct assessment results are taken from campus comparison by school charts for 400-level classes declaring a major emphasis, on a 4-point scale, converted to common denominator of 20.

Indirect assessment results are taken from specifically targeted questions on Herron's graduating student survey for students graduating in 2012, on a 5-pt scale, converted to common denominator of 20.

These direct and indirect assessment results are compared below:

2013

PUL	1a	1b	1c	2	3	4	5	6
Direct	17.85	20*	17.25	17.5	17.1	16.55	16.2	17.5
Indirect	16.52	16.4	14.8	18	17.6	17.2	16.52	17.04

*Very small sample set.

2012

PUL	1a	1b	1c	2	3	4	5	6
direct	17.85	20	17.25	17.5	16.9	16.45	16.3	20
indirect	15.92	15.92	15.92	17.52	16.24	16.96	16.12	15.64

Scores are what we expected and indicated that the school's programs are meeting their goals overall. Discrepancies between direct and indirect measures are likely the result of the way the questions asked of the students were phrased. We adjusted several of the questions between 2012 and 2013, and we believe, that the change in the students' self-assessment of PUL 6 "Values and Ethics" is attributable to the altered questions.

While the range of variation is not great overall, PUL 5 does appear as a weak point in both direct and indirect assessments in both of the last two years. We have major curricular changes in development, and will definitely bring this area to the attention of the committees and task forces charged with developing new curricula during the fall 2013 semester.

Actions taken in response:

No curricular actions were taken as a result of this particular assessment. We did revise the questions related to the indirect assessment of PUL 6 "Values and Ethics." This was not merely an attempt to elicit a different numerical response, but rather was a response to the indignation expressed by students regarding that question in their open written responses. Students appeared unruffled by the new version of the question, so we presume we are getting a more accurate response.

The art history program did make substantial adjustments to how information literacy is presented within the curriculum. This was not in response to the Herron PUL results, but to the overall IUPUI results. The differences between the BA in Art History and the BFA programs at Herron make the overall Herron scores too general to be of great value in this area, but the overall IUPUI trend did seem important for the art history program to note.

Group critique is a common feature of training in art and design. Typically, after each assignment or at several points in the semester, students present their work for open critique by their faculty, guest faculty, and their peers. This process gives both students and faculty immediate feedback about process and outcomes (both the artwork created and the students' ability to discuss their own and others' work) from multiple perspectives. It is not uncommon for instructors to adjust their next lessons or assignments based on the results of the critique experience. This process of immediate feedback and quick response by faculty is integral to education in the arts.

Assessment of Program Specific Student Learning Outcomes

I. Bachelor of Arts in Art History (B.A.)

Published Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will be able to describe connections between art and social and cultural contexts across history and throughout the world.
2. Students will be able to evaluate and critique works of art from a range of methodological perspectives.
3. Students will be able to conceive and carry out research involving: formulating a question; gathering information using a variety of tools and techniques; critically evaluating information; making an argument; and defending a conclusion in speech and writing.
4. Students will be able to compare and contrast the underlying value systems that inform the aesthetic decisions of art makers and viewers in different cultures.
5. Students will be able to recognize perspectives from a range of disciplines in the arts and sciences.
6. Students will be able to apply their visual literacy to make informed and ethical judgments in their own lives.
7. Students will be able to interpret works of art using visual analysis, historical research, and defined theoretical perspectives.
8. Students will be able to describe and discuss a substantial body of knowledge about and understanding of their own art historical traditions and the traditions of others.

These outcomes are assessed in several ways:

Student course grades, faculty review of final capstone papers and projects, E-portfolio, discussion throughout the capstone seminar, and written responses by capstone seminar students about the SLOs directly.

The capstone seminar represents a sample group whose learning is assessed directly and indirectly in significant depth. The faculty member teaching this seminar worked closely with the students in a workshop setting, and gained an intimate knowledge of the students' understandings and research processes. These were summarized and reported to the full art history faculty for discussion in the final meeting of the year. The students also generated about a dozen pages of comments on the curriculum which have been shared and discussed with the full art history faculty.

Findings:

Information literacy is emphasized unevenly. Faculty address it individually to different degrees. Some students receive very little training, while others find it over-taught and repetitive, depending on which courses they chose.

Students do not understand what is meant by SLO 6.

Non-western art is insufficiently covered in the curriculum.

Actions taken in response:

A review of the curriculum was undertaken during 2012-2013. While most of the existing curriculum withstood scrutiny, changes were made to the way information literacy is built into the curriculum. The department faculty worked with Librarian Sonja Staum over the course of the year and adopted the library's recommendations for the aspects of information literacy expected at each of the four years of the degree. Whereas previously individual instructors made autonomous decisions about information literacy, they have now agreed to emphasize the topics recommended at each level, to incorporate at least one assignment geared towards those particular skills into each course, and to instruct part-time faculty to do the same.

An art history faculty member has taken on the project of incorporating E-Portfolio earlier in the curriculum, in order that it may represent the growth process as well as the final level of achievement. We also intend to explore its value for advising students and for deepening their engagement with and reflection upon their learning. While it may take some time to implement E-portfolio for these purposes, another faculty member is planning to use paper documents and face-to-face meetings to test the system during the upcoming year.

Greater effort has been taken to ensure student understanding of the program's Student Learning Outcomes. Faculty now discuss them while introducing courses and/or state them on the syllabus along with or as they relate to the PUL information and individual course learning outcomes already present on the syllabus.

A meeting was held for all majors at the start of the spring semester. Drawing students' attention to the program's Learning Outcomes and clarifying their meaning and relevance was a part of the meeting.

Non-western courses continue to be offered to the degree that faculty and enrollment levels allow. Three non-western courses were scheduled for fall 2013, but unfortunately, all three instructors withdrew their services during the final weeks of spring 2013. Finding qualified instructors in these areas remains a challenge. Non-western material will continue to be included in the two semesters of art history survey courses. However, increasingly students take

these courses at Ivy Tech or other colleges. We will urge Ivy Tech to include non-western material, but we cannot enforce that. (This will be an issue for the STAC panel of the Core Transfer Library to discuss when these survey courses come up for currency review.)

II. Bachelor of Art Education (B.A.E.)

Published Student Learning Outcomes:

Upon completion of the Bachelor of Art Education at Herron students will demonstrate the following competencies:

Philosophy

Demonstrate critical reflection on the aesthetic and artistic purposes of art in P-12 learners; articulate and apply personal philosophy in classroom practice.

Communication

Communicate ideas clearly through speech, writing, and visual forms about issues of personal importance and human significance in local and global communities; and apply this to classroom practice.

Content Knowledge - Studio Art

Demonstrate expertise in basic expressive, technical, procedural and organization skills in a wide variety of media and demonstrate mastery in conceptual insights and visual thinking developed through studio experiences; and make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for P-12 learners.

Content Knowledge - Art History and Analysis

Understand the major styles and periods of art history, the analytical methods and theories of criticism; understand development of past and contemporary art forms, including visual culture, and, understand contending philosophies of art and the relationship of all of these to the making of art; and, make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for P-12 learners.

Content Knowledge - Innovation/Ideation

Understand and apply processes of idea generation, imagination, and innovative thinking from a range of disciplines to problems in their artwork and their lives; and develop abilities of creative problem solving and critical inquiry and authentic meaning making in P-12 learners.

Learner Development

Understand the developmental needs and diverse social and cultural constructions of identity in all learners and implement a variety of appropriate visuals, tools, media, technology, and other disciplines to differentiate learning in inclusive, multicultural, and urban classrooms.

Learning Environment

Construct a learning environment that promotes student achievement, utilizes social learning and group dynamics, promotes respect and collaboration among all learners, and incorporates multiple contexts where art exists outside the classroom including museums, galleries, homes, and public sites.

Instructional Strategies

Understand and implement curriculum and a variety of instructional strategies that develop in-depth, complex student skills and knowledge in art content, and integrate art across disciplines.

Assessment strategies.

These learning outcomes are assessed in multiple ways. Students complete supervised student teaching practica, in which faculty observe and mentor their performance in the classroom. Students also compile teaching portfolios that include lesson plans, student assignments, outcomes, and video documentation of performance in the classroom.

Until recently, all students seeking licensure as K-12 teachers in Indiana must pass the Praxis Exam (administered by ETS). Passing the exam or being declared exempt is required prior to being accepted into the major in the junior year.

Students also must pass a sophomore advancement review at Herron.

Findings:

This year, 4 students were exempted from the Praxis exam due to high SAT & ACT scores, 7 passed, and 5 did not pass and must retake it.

Of the 16 students attempting Sophomore Advancement Review, 11 passed. The 5 who did not are the same as those who did not pass the Praxis exam—it was this exam that prevented their passing.

We have almost 100% job placement of our students. We frequently receive requests for teachers that we cannot fulfill because our students already have jobs.

Herron students continue to receive accolades and recognition. In 2012 our student (BAE/MAE) Suzanne Whitton won the coveted Indiana Teacher of the Year – across all disciplines. Herron students continue to win state scholarships for their quality lessons from the Art Education Association of Indiana.

All Herron art education students score well on the Praxis II. Many students continue to exhibit their work locally and/or present their work in peer review state/national venues.

Actions taken in response:

Program is deemed to be operating successfully. No changes appear necessary based on these assessment findings.

Guidance and recommendations continue to be provided to students individually throughout their training.

We need to provide more follow-up with teachers after they graduate and take positions in schools. While we try to keep up with where our graduates take teaching jobs, we do little to maintain contact with them. Research shows the first two years are critical in maintaining quality pedagogical skills and professional development. We offered a free workshop to IPS schools on contemporary artists and practice Fall 2012, and plan to continue our efforts here with additional nights throughout the year featuring a contemporary artist with new studio techniques/processes in an evening session, expanding to other districts as well as IPS. We have put together beginning plans for a certification program to bring teachers back to campus working with them to meet their needs and stay current in professional research and studio methods.

Post-graduation assessment: Student feedback on the quality of the art education preparation program happens end of senior year. We need a five year follow-up with students after graduation to see how they feel about their professional preparation for teaching. We are planning to implement a small “think tank” of past graduates to convene for the purposes of program evaluation and recommendations – every three years.

III. Bachelor of Fine Arts (B.F.A.)

Published Student Learning Outcomes for the B.F.A.:

1. Students will develop a personal aesthetic that will be demonstrated in the characteristics of their artwork, writings, and speech.

2. Students will demonstrate a mastery of visual thinking and the technical demands and craft appropriate to their discipline and artwork.
3. Students will be able to describe historic and contemporary art directions, movements, and theory and place their own artwork in a contemporary context.
4. Students will write and speak effectively about their artwork and ideas.
5. Students will do research and construct their own aesthetic problems utilizing creative process strategies and critical thinking to provide multiple solutions to the problems.
6. Students will exhibit an openness to different or new ideas and a willingness to examine and reconsider familiar ways of thinking.
7. Students will be able to critique their own and others art work in a theoretically and historically informed manner.
8. Students will apply ideas and methods of thinking from a range of disciplines to problems in their artwork and their lives.
9. Students will be able to engage with diverse communities through personal and creative activities.
10. Students will apply their knowledge of art in a professional context, and will utilize the best practices and ethics held by their profession.

Assessment strategies:

Herron's process for assessing student learning is vigorous. Each student is reviewed individually by a panel of faculty midway through their academic studies and as a prerequisite for being accepted into a major. This Sophomore Advancement Review represents a best practice in Fine Arts Assessment and is recognized as excellent by NASAD. At Sophomore Advancement Review, the student submits written responses to two essay questions (which faculty reviewers read in advance), the student presents twelve finished works of art taken from their courses in their first two years of study. These represent work completed in the Foundation Year courses (first year fundamentals such as perspective drawing and color theory) as well as works from second-year courses elected in the area they intend to major in. Faculty view and evaluate the work in terms of form, content, and process, and then interview the student about it in order to evaluate the student's intellectual and critical processes and ability to communicate about the work.

Faculty decisions are either "pass," "probation," or "denied." If a student passes, she or he may advance into 300-level coursework in the major. If a student is put on probation, the terms of the probation are tailored to the individual student. She or he is assigned a faculty mentor and is usually required to take additional coursework in areas that are weak (or to work on those areas in other ways). Often these students are permitted to take 300-level courses in their stronger areas but must demonstrate improvement before being formally accepted into the major. If a student is denied, she or he is assigned a faculty mentor and

recommended to continue coursework at the 200-level and in recommended areas, and then to be reviewed again in 6 or 12 months.

This process not only assesses student learning, but ensures it. This is a process that considers the students' mastery of technical skills and also of their ability to formulate and articulate an individual trajectory for their artistic explorations. The results are also compiled so that they can also serve as evidence to assessing the first and second year curricula. These results are shown below.

Assessment also occurs at other moments such as the juried student show (students submit work and an external juror/s selects pieces to be exhibited), success rates of students who compete for regional or national commissions, and student thesis exhibitions. Results of PUL assessment and written comments on Herron's graduating student survey are also used to evaluate the program. Work in the Fine Arts, and especially in the junior and senior year, is highly individualized, and the emphasis is on the creation of the new rather than the internalization of existing knowledge, assessment must be based on the students' successful use of a creative process and accomplishment of diverging goals. The rigor of fine arts assessment is in its depth and integrity. Assessment of such individualized practice is diminished when expressed in numerical terms. To quote NASAD's policy paper, "Assessment On Our Own Terms," p. 15, "How is it possible to call for a deeply integrated system of standardization so that results can be compared, and at the same time call for innovation and a climate of innovation?"

Findings:

Herron School of Art and Design Average Scores 2013 compared to 2012

Fine Arts Sophomore Advancement Review

GRADES (20% of TOTAL EVALUATION) - consideration of students' studio grades. This is a studio review and the studio GPA is what is reflected in this category. GPA should be reflected in the following point scale. **Current Studio GPA of:**

6pt (2.50–3.00)	8pt (3.01–3.69)	10pt (3.70-4.00)	2012 AVG=3.29	2013
			AVG=3.66	

PRESENTATION (60% of TOTAL REVIEW) - students' work presented at Review and their ability to speak and write about it as directed.

Student work is well crafted, organized	2012 AVG	2013
AVG		

1pt (lowest)	2pt	3pt	4pt	5pt (highest)	3.75	3.69
--------------	-----	-----	-----	---------------	-------------	-------------

Student work is of aesthetic sensibility, conceptual development and creativity

1pt (lowest) 2pt	3pt	4pt	5pt (highest)	3.59	3.53
Student's technical skill is of high quality					
1pt (lowest) 2pt	3pt	4pt	5pt (highest)	3.84	3.56
Student is able to concisely explain their work and why it is successful					
1pt (lowest) 2pt	3pt	4pt	5pt (highest)	3.47	3.52
Student displays critical thinking and understanding					
1pt (lowest) 2pt	3pt	4pt	5pt (highest)	3.42	3.50
Written statement is acceptable in development and format					
1pt (lowest) 2pt	3pt	4pt	5pt (highest)	3.52	3.48
<hr/>					
LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS (20% of TOTAL EVALUATION) - assessment of the students' likelihood of success in their intended majors.					
1pt (lowest)	4pt	6pt	8pt	10pt	
				7.61	8.16
<hr/>					

Questions for faculty reflection (questions are shared at fall faculty meeting):

For two years now we have rated the students' work higher than their ability to think, speak, and write about it. Are we content with this? Should we make any adjustments in the 100- and 200-level classes to address this?

Questions 1 and 3 have been the highest for two years, but they switched positions. How do you define the difference between these?

Actions taken in response:

A formal program review of the Foundations Program was undertaken during this academic year. Substantial curricular changes in response are underway and should be ready for implementation by fall 2014.

More full-time faculty have been scheduled to teach first-year classes, including full-time faculty whose appointments are not specifically in Foundations. This is intended to promote better communication between faculty teaching at the introductory and advanced levels, and to help students build relationships with full-time professors earlier in their college experience. Evidence resulting from this change may be visible at Sophomore Advancement Review in May 2014.

IV. B.F. A. in Visual Communication Design.

Published student learning outcomes for the BFA in VCD:

1. Students will be able to *identify, describe, and summarize* communication problems through user-centered research and analysis.
2. Students will be able to *generate and evaluate* solutions to communication problems by creating alternative solutions, prototyping and conducting user testing.
3. Students will *recognize, describe, and respond* to social, cultural, physical and cognitive issues embedded within audiences and contexts.
4. Students will be able to *demonstrate* an understanding of visual form in response to communication problems through visual organization/composition, information hierarchy, symbolic representation, typography, aesthetics and the construction of meaningful messages.
5. Students will *understand and apply* appropriate tools and technology in the *creation, reproduction and distribution* of visual messages, including but not limited to, drawing, offset printing, photography and time-based media and interactive media.
6. Students will be able to *address and discuss* design from a variety of historical, theoretical, social, cultural, technological and economic perspectives.
7. Students will be able to *discuss and demonstrate* basic business practices, including the ability to organize design projects and work productively as a member of teams.

Assessment strategies:

As in Fine Arts, student learning is evaluated midway through the program at Sophomore Advancement Review and through final senior theses and group projects in the senior professional practice seminar. As in Fine Arts, assessment is intertwined with individual mentoring, so that the assessment processes serve also as teaching opportunities, and simultaneously assess and ensure achievement.

Sophomore Advancement Review in Visual Communication is similar to that in Fine Arts. Students submit written essays and then, before a panel of faculty, present examples of their design work and discuss them in an oral presentation followed by interview format questioning.

In May 2013, each student was reviewed by a panel of three faculty members. This is change from prior years in which students were reviewed by a panel of the full faculty of the department. The review considered the following aspects:

Cumulative GPA
 Studio GPA
 Process: use and understanding
 Process: sketching and prototyping
 Visual Communication Design: elements and principles
 Visual Communication Design: typography
 Visual Communication Design: imagery
 Communication: DEAL response (written reflection)
 Communication: oral response
 Professionalism: preparedness
 Professionalism: tools and craft

Findings:

At Sophomore Advancement Review 2013, 45 students stood for review. Initially 33 were recommended by the faculty for advancement. After discussion with the dean and associate dean, 7 of the 12 who were denied were accepted on a probationary basis with mentoring.

In most cases, the *weakest* area was Visual Communication Design: elements and principles. For this review, this area of evaluation was thusly defined: Work indicates understanding of elements and principles (emphasis, closure, figure/ground, continuance, depth, contrast, repetition, alignment, proximity, etc.). Overall work indicates a developing understanding of synthesis between form and message (gestalt, parts relative to the whole, visual/verbal synthesis).

Actions taken in response:

Beginning in fall 2012, a full-time visiting faculty member with several years' experience with the VC curriculum has been repositioned to teach Foundation courses, so that the first-year experience can better address the concerns of the VC curriculum. We expect to see results of this change in May 2014 when that cohort of students comes up for review.

The sophomore year curriculum was restructured for the 2011-12 year so that students had invested fewer credits in Visual Communication Design prior to sophomore review. This meant that students who were denied advancement into the major saw more of their credits transfer into whatever degree track they chose instead, but it also meant that students who passed did so with a lower level of accomplishment. This result seems to be more fair, but still imperfect. . .

. . .for instance, the weakness identified in May 2013 in elements and principles. The curricular changes implemented in 2011-2012 were made with primary concern for credit distribution. New changes begun in spring 2013 and

continuing into the fall are being made with primary attention to student learning, to maximize student achievement within the allotted number of credits dedicated to the major in the sophomore year.

Work has begun, and still continues, to bring the learning outcomes for each course and the grading standards for sophomore courses more into line with the expectations at review, so that grades in sophomore VC courses will be better indicators of success at the VC sophomore review.

VI. Masters of Art Education (M.A.E.)

Published Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Develop a comprehensive, critical understanding of the field of art education by investigating the ways in which art education has evolved and continues to change in response to cultural, economic, social, political, and technological conditions.
2. Examine and explore critical approaches to new media and directions in contemporary art practices, understanding innovative methodologies of professional artists in order to develop new approaches to elementary and secondary art instruction.
3. Understand the importance and roles of diverse learning environments appreciating both formal and informal art learning sites and studio environments in order to construct learning spaces that promote creative production, social learning and collaboration, as well as incorporate multiple contexts including museums, galleries, homes, and other pertinent public sites.
4. Develop in-depth conceptually based curricula with an understanding of local and global communities, and of the benefits and challenges of promoting democratic values in our culturally diverse society.
5. Demonstrate the ability to cultivate critical and creative thinking skills in others and to assert art's role in fostering multi-cultural, intercultural, and interdisciplinary understandings.
6. Demonstrate breadth of knowledge and skills in art history emphasizing contemporary art forms and visual culture, in analytical methods and theories of criticism, and in contending philosophies of art, and understand the foundational relationship of these components to authentic studio practice; and make these accessible and meaningful to P-12 learners.
7. Develop leadership roles and become an active participant in peer seminars, classroom tutorials, presentations, and reflective processes.
8. Understand, articulate, and continue to nurture the roles of Artist/Teacher/Researcher in their own professional practice and demonstrate increased breadth and depth of competence in studio skills, knowledge, and application.

9. Conduct professional research that demonstrates advanced levels of analysis, insight, design, and methods appropriate for art education settings and audiences. Utilize relevant applications for such research and professional publications.
10. Demonstrate reflective, critical thought, and scholarship as well as a commitment to ongoing professional development, and; contribute to the growth of the profession through disseminating scholarly activity as artist/teacher/researcher at local, state and national professional venues.

Assessment Strategies:

Assessment is highly individual in this program. A yearly meeting is organized for all current graduate students. One purpose of the meeting is to solicit written feedback and discussion concerning the program's class offerings and structure.

Individual annual meetings between the faculty program director and each graduate student are mandatory for reviewing each student's progress and course selections. This ensures that each student selects courses and projects that meet their individual goals and address their areas of weakness, while building on their strengths. Adjustments tend to be made at the level of the individual student rather than at the level of the program.

VII. Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) in Visual Art

(Formerly, MFA in Visual Art and Public Life)

Upon graduation from the Master of Arts in Visual Art degree program, students will:

1. Be able to analyze and explain in writing and speech the meaning and effectiveness of works of art including their formal, thematic, theoretical, social, cultural, cognitive, and technological aspects.
2. Be able to conduct original creative research by controlling the formal, thematic, theoretical, social, cultural, cognitive, and technological aspects of works of visual art the student makes.
3. Be able to conduct original creative research that results in a cohesive group of art works produced at a professional level of quality in terms of formal, technical, and thematic consistency.
4. Have acquired knowledge of the professional factors, including the ethical responsibilities, of developing artworks in university and community-based collaborations.
5. Be able to critically analyze and communicate the analysis of works of visual art as an intellectual and experimental practice that is rooted in a specific time and place.

6. Have acquired knowledge of how to maintain a creative studio practice in a professional context, from making work to its presentation, installation, marketing, and critical analysis.
7. Be able to research, plan, design, fabricate, and complete their own art works (alone and in collaboration with others) utilizing a variety of technical processes in a variety of public and private settings for a variety of aesthetic and intellectual purposes.

Assessment strategies:

Each student pursuing the MFA in Visual Art has an advisory committee of three or four faculty members, who oversee and review their work. Student work, along with the student's ability to explain and critique the work, is assessed three times during the two-year program, after 30 credits, after 45, and after 60 when the thesis is presented. (Students also receive grades for each course.) The teaching and mentoring in this program is highly individualized and students typically work alongside their advisors in the studio with discussion undertaken throughout the process of work, from conception of the project, to research, to methods of fabrication, to final installation.

Principles of Graduate Learning are also assessed at these reviews. Given the level of individualized mentoring provided throughout the program, it is not surprising that scores in this area are consistently excellent.

This was the first year of operation for the MFA programs in Painting & Drawing and Ceramics. It was the second year for the MFA program in Photography & Intermedia. Given the newness of these programs and the as yet small size (e.g. one student in ceramics), more is being learned about the programs through direct observation and conversation than through formal assessment procedures.

Findings:

Students are meeting their own and the program's goals on an appropriate schedule as evidenced by the 30-, 45-, and 60-hour reviews.

At the 30-hour review point, 10/17 were judged to have *excellent* knowledge and skills in the discipline; 6/17 were rated *satisfactory*, and 1/17 was rated *fair*.

By the 60-hour review point, all whose reviews were complete as of June 2013 were rated *excellent* in all four of the PGL. Students whose work was not yet complete or had not reached the level expected by their advisory committees are continuing to work through the summer, so results are not yet available at the time of this report.

Actions taken in response:

The program is judged to be functioning well. No changes are planned based on these assessment findings, though changes are being made to other, non-curricular aspects of the program such as recruiting and the distribution of graduate fellowships.