

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in \_\_2009-10\_\_ Annual Reports**  
**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Art and Design (MFA) **DATE** March 31, 2011

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Mary Askim-Lovseth, Wayne Swisher

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

- |                                       |              |                |                           |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

*Comments: The Art and Design Department has a well-defined and articulated assessment plan for its Master of Fine Arts Program (it is still posted as "Draft: In Progress Document 03.31.2005" on the University website). The goals and objectives relate to specific student learning outcomes such as, "Objective 2.2—Student will be able to effectively select, organize, and present information orally and in writing [and] Objective 4.1—Through the thesis exhibition student will acquire the professional skills of developing an artist statement, exhibition announcements, organizing an artist's reception, and documentation of their art work through photography, video, or digital technology."*

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- |  |              |                |                           |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

*Comments: Both direct and indirect assessment methods are outlined in the program's assessment plan. The direct assessment activities are tied to student's performances through grades, oral and written presentations, artworks, and oral defense as related to thesis exhibition. A rubric is used to assess learning and performance; it has 11 indicators with five levels of competencies (posted on the University website). Further detailed information is provided in the Annual Report as to what would encompass assessment of artworks. Though grades are noted as an assessment measure, no indication was provided whether these were "course" grades or grades related to assignments that could address specific competencies. Course grades are not good assessment measures as they are difficult to relate directly to a particular student learning objective. The indirect assessment activities are related to peer-reviewed papers and presentations presented by the students outside of the program requirements.*

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |  |                 |                |                           |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>X</u>    | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

*Comments: In the data collection section of the Department's report, the focus is on what type of data is collected, with no reference to the specifics of the data or the results. There was a comment relating to providing "quality educational experiences" but it was a subjective assessment, having no substantive foundation. It is noted that data are under review.*

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

*Comments: The program reports that the faculty have proposed a change in program requirements consisting of formal critiques during the graduate students first year of study, and that this request for change in program requirements is pending approval. However, there are no data presented to indicate why this proposed change is being made and in the Department's comments, if assessment data had any influence on the program change.*

#### SUMMARY

##### *Strengths*

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- X Assessment methods are clearly described.
- X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are reported.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

##### *Areas for Improvement*

- \_\_\_\_\_ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- X No results are reported.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

#### OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

*The Art and Design Department has a well defined assessment plan and appears to be collecting data from multiple sources, including both direct and indirect data. However, the assessment portion of the Annual Report does not provide data that may have been collected. Also, the program reports that the faculty use the data to "continuously monitor this program's goals and objectives, appropriately modifying the curriculum to provide a sound quality education that reflects current development within the discipline." But, the report does not provide any specific data to support that this is happening. It is recommended that in future Annual Reports the Program report the data that have been collected and specifically describe how the data were analyzed and how the results of the analysis were used in making decisions.*

#### MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual report
- \_\_\_\_\_ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth	Wayne Swisher
	Department	Marketing	Graduate School
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-2944
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu">maskim@business.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:wayneswisher@mail.und.edu">wayneswisher@mail.und.edu</a>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: NA Section 4: N

#### Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Art and Design (BA and BFA) **DATE** April 9, 2011

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Mary Askim-Lovseth, Wayne Swisher

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

- |                                       |              |                |                           |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

**Comments:**

*The Art and Design Department offers two undergraduate programs for students—a Bachelor of Arts (BA) and a Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA). The Bachelor of Fine Arts Program is identified by the Department as a professional program. Each program has four student learning goals with subsequent objectives for each goal. Three of the student learning goals are common between the two programs (development of technical skills, oral and written communication skills, and cognitive skills for critical assessment); the fourth goal is differentiated based on the program. The BA Program focuses on students developing “cursory professional skills as artists needed for career advancement.” The BFA Program focuses on students developing “professional skills needed to promote their artwork and advance within their chosen careers.”*

*The assessment plans are still posted as “Draft: In Progress Document 03.31.2005” on the University website. Updating is needed.*

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to departmental goals.

- X   1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)  
  X   2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)  
  X   3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)  
       4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)  
  X   5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)  
       6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)  
       7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)  
       8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

**Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:**

*Student learning goals of both undergraduate programs are aligned with four of UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals. Communication (Goal 1) is inherent in the Programs’ Goal 2 relating to acquiring oral and written skills. Critical and creative thinking (Goals 2 and 3), and information literacy (Goal 5) are evidenced in the Programs’ Goal 1 where students “identify strengths and weaknesses in technique and take appropriate action to correct weaknesses through research of materials, equipment and/or methods of artistic production;” Goal 5, “develop cognitive skills to critical[sic] assess the conceptual basis for their artwork and ...;” and Goal 4, which focuses on the development of professional skills as artists (e.g., making decisions about display strategies and exhibitions).*

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- Were any specific assessment methods referenced? YES X NO      QUALIFIED Y/N
- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? YES X NO      QUALIFIED Y/N

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? YES X NO      QUALIFIED Y/N

**Comments:**

*Both direct and indirect assessment methods are outlined in the Programs’ assessment plans. Written and oral communication measures were predominately used. These included oral presentations, multiple individual and/or group critiques throughout the semester of the students’ artwork (oral dialogue, but sometimes includes a written component), and written assignments. BFA students also do a visual documentation and oral presentation of their artwork that is in an exhibition.*

*A rubric is used to assess learning and performance; it has 11 indicators with five levels of competencies (posted on the University website). Further detailed information is provided in the Annual Report as to what would encompass assessment of artworks. Though grades are noted as an assessment measure, no indication was provided whether these were “course” grades or grades related to assignments that could address specific competencies. Course grades are not good assessment measures as they are difficult to relate directly to a particular student learning objective.*

*The indirect assessment activities are related to peer-reviewed papers and presentations presented by the students outside of the program requirements. For example, some students do independent studies (requires a written proposal) and/or submit their artwork to professional juried exhibitions that are sponsored by other academic institutions and professional venues to illustrate refined skill development.*

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- Were any assessment results reported? YES      NO X QUALIFIED Y/N
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? YES      NO      QUALIFIED Y/N
  - If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? YES      NO      QUALIFIED Y/N
  - Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES      NO      QUALIFIED Y/N

**Comments:**

*In the data collection section of the Department’s report, the focus is on what type of data is collected, with no reference to the specifics of the data or the results. There was a comment relating to providing “quality educational experiences” but it was a subjective assessment, having no substantive foundation. It is noted that data are under review.*

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals.

Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below. .

- 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

**Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:**

*Since no results were reported, their application to specific goals cannot be assessed.*

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Comments:**

*Commentary in this section was very limited as there were no results reported to influence closing the loop activities. A statement was made that the BA Program was apparently “providing a solid education for students.” The only comment for the BFA Program was the same one referenced in the last assessment review of the Department—requiring Art 494 as of Spring 2008 rather than it being an elective in the Program.*

*A workshop is being planned for Spring 2011 to inform the BA and BFA students of the Programs’ goals.*

#### **SUMMARY**

##### ***Strengths***

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- X Assessment methods are clearly described.
- X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are reported.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

##### ***Areas for Improvement***

- \_\_\_\_\_ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- X No results are reported.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

#### **OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*The same summary and recommendations can be noted for this assessment review period for the undergraduate programs in Art and Design as the last review done in 2006-07. Quoting the January 17, 2008 Assessment Review—*

*Goals and assessment methods for the three undergraduate and graduate programs within the Art Department are clearly articulated. A systematic method for collecting data and reporting the results, rather than a subjective assessment that the Department provides quality educational experiences and student learning goals are met, will provide reliable data and clear direction to the department. Further, focusing on student-learning outcomes and using that as the basis for assessing the quality of the educational experiences will be critical to ensure meaningful closing the loop activities.*

*A rubric entitled “Context and Application” was included at the end of the assessment plan report. As noted it is designed to be applied in all degree programs to assess: performance, historical knowledge and professional practices. While the rubric is generic, there was a caution about applying terms and descriptors evenly since “proficient” in the BA is different from “proficient” in the BFA or MFA. No additional explanations as to what these differences might entail were provided. Neither is it clear when the rubric would be applied nor how it relates to the other assessment methods delineated in the report. This was not referenced in the Annual Report, so it is unknown whether it was used in gathering the assessment data that the faculty are currently reviewing. Finally, the observable indicators were not aligned with learning goals but could be. The language of the goals is apparent in the indicators and the rubric descriptors and so we encourage faculty to add this alignment to the document.*

*The assessment section of the Annual Report seems to be reiterated from one year’s report to the next and basically provides an outline of what is going to be done. There is the note that data are currently under review each time, with no follow-up the next year regarding the findings. The Department needs to be more diligent in documenting the results of the review process*

*so that valid and reliable information can be used to assess if students are achieving the identified student learning goals and what programmatic changes need to be made if students are deficient in any area. If assistance is needed in these areas, the Department is encouraged to contact Joan Hawthorne, Director of Assessment, or the University Assessment Committee members who authored this report.*

## **MATERIALS REVIEWED**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth	Wayne Swisher
	Department	Marketing	Communication Sciences & Disorders
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-2944
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu">maskim@business.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:wayneswisher@mail.und.edu">wayneswisher@mail.und.edu</a>

-----

Section 1: ☒Y\_\_\_    Section 2: ☒Y\_\_\_    Section 3: ☐NA\_\_\_    Section 4: ☐NA\_\_\_

### **Coding Key:**

- Y    = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N    = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA   = no information reported
- ?    = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done