

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in \_\_\_\_\_ Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Art and Design** **DATE** May 4, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** \_\_\_\_\_ **Bachelor of Arts & Bachelor of Fine Arts, major in Visual Arts and major in Graphic Design and New Art Media**

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Paul Drechsel Joan Hawthorne

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

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

***Comments:***

Art & Design faculty seem to have done a very thoughtful job of developing well-articulated goals that align with various courses and vary by specific degree and major. The goals seem to be unchanged since the plan was developed in 2005, and it may be prudent to revisit in view of changes that may have taken place (or which may be desirable based on changes in the field and/or findings from previous assessment efforts).

In addition to the program 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 program 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 program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:***

Both undergraduate programs goals have not changed since the assessment review and are aligned with the above noted institutional and essential studies goals.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

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

***Comments:***

Each student learning goal is aligned with an assessment methods goal. For example **Goal 1** Students learn technical skills, with materials, techniques, and equipment specific to the production of their visual art is aligned with **Goal 1**-Students learn technical skills, with materials, techniques, and equipment specific to the production of their visual art.

- Grades

- Oral feedback via formal critiques or individual mentoring
- First hand visual examination of artworks

It should be noted that grades are generally not considered a useful assessment measure since they don't allow faculty to pull out achievement on a specific learning objective and "add up" students across the board to determine how successful the program has been at helping students achieve that outcome. Some of the language in the description of methods seems to be focused on providing useful feedback to individual students. This way of looking at student work products is very important for providing individual students with feedback about their own learning. However, it's less useful as a departmental strategy, where the goal of assessment is to understand the program's success in relation to helping students (across the board) achieve a specific learning outcome.

We also note that methods seem to have been thoughtfully selected but there is no indication of whether any were implemented in 2012-13.

### 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:*

The department spoke of how the results would be used and the process for documentation and decision making. There was no reference to the specifics of the data or results.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:*

No results were reported but a statement was made that “Files with all data and documentation will be maintained in the Art Department office and available for reference.”

### 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:**

No actions were noted, but when results are noted there is a process for documentation and decision making. Results are to be communicated in writing to the Department Chair and the department Curriculum Committee and become part of the agenda for discussion at faculty meetings. Decisions on curricular or program/change will be made by faculty based on the data and summaries of assessment activities and decisions made (if any) will be included in the departmental annual report due. There is no indication in the annual report that these steps actually occurred.

**SUMMARY*****Strengths***

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.  
☒ Student learning goals are well-articulated.  
☒ Assessment methods are clearly described.  
☒ 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.  
☒ No results are reported.  
☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
 (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

**OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The same recommendations can be noted for this assessment review period for the undergraduate programs in Art and Design as the last review in 2008. Goals and assessment methods are very well articulated but there is a need to provide reliable data. The assessment plan are still posted as draft and need to be updated.

Detailed results with references to learning goals would be an important addition to the annual report. Lacking any information about results and loop-closing (and given the long-past date on the assessment plan, which is still labeled as "draft"), it appears that the plan may never have been implemented. If that's the case, faculty in the program would benefit from rethinking the plan in order to develop an updated version that builds on the strengths of the current plan but is more feasible. Assistance is available through UND's assessment consultants (experienced practitioners of assessment from departments and colleges across UND), from members of the Assessment Committee, and/or from Joan Hawthorne. We encourage Art & Design faculty to take advantage of these resources. Another option, used by faculty in a number of programs, is to begin by appointing a faculty member to oversee program assessment, including both refining plans and carrying out assessment activities within the program.

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**

- ☒ Annual report  
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)  
☐ Other (please describe)
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)  
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Paul Drechsel</u>	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	_____
	Department	<u>Aviation</u>	<u>Academic Affairs</u>	_____
	Phone Number	<u>7-4923</u>	<u>7-4684</u>	_____
	e-mail	<u>drechsel@aero.und.edu</u>	<u>joan.hawthorn@und.edu</u>	_____

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

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

*Revision 9/25/13*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013 Annual Reports**  
**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Art and Design **DATE** May 6, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Master of Fine Arts

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Paul Drechsel Joan Hawthorne

**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:***

Learning goals for the Graduate Program well-articulated.

**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:***

The assessment plan is inserted directly into the annual report. Specific assessment methods are referenced in it, and these methods are aligned with the individual student goals. The assessment plan mentions both direct and indirect methods and the assessment report states that both forms of assessment were used. However, no additional information about methods actually used (as opposed to those planned back in 2004-05) is included, which makes it difficult to know what methods, if any, were implemented in 2012-13.

**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:***

A detailed draft assessment plan is outlined. The plan activities are related to the goals of student learning. No results were reported.

**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:**

This unknown since I could not find any results, but a process is in place to use results for decision making.

They include:

- Results will be communicated in writing to the Graduate Program Director and become part of the agenda for discussion at faculty meetings
- Decisions on curricular or program/change will be made by faculty based on the data
- Summaries of assessment activities and decisions made (if any) will be included in the departmental annual report due October 15
- Files with all data and documentation will be maintain in the Art Department office and available for reference.

**SUMMARY**

***Strengths***

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☒ 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.
- ☒ No results are reported.
- ☐ 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 Graduate program has a well-designed draft graduate assessment plan in place with references to student learning goals and educational experiences.

Detailed results with references to learning goals would be an important addition to the annual report. Lacking any information about results and loop-closing (and given the long-past date on the assessment plan, which is still labeled as “draft”), it appears that the plan may never have been implemented. If that’s the case, faculty in the program would benefit from rethinking the plan in order to develop an updated version that builds on the strengths of the current plan but is more feasible. Assistance is available through UND’s assessment consultants (experienced practitioners of assessment from departments and colleges across UND), from members of the Assessment Committee, and/or from Joan Hawthorne. We encourage Art & Design faculty to take advantage of these resources. Another option, used by faculty in a number of programs, is to begin by appointing a faculty member to oversee program assessment, including both refining plans and carrying out assessment activities within the program.

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**

- ☒ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☐ Other (please describe)

- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Paul Drechsel</u>	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>                    </u>
	Department	<u>Aviation</u>	<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>                    </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4923</u>	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>                    </u>
	e-mail	<u>drechsel@aero.und.edu</u>	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>                    </u>

-----

Section 1: \_Y\_\_\_\_\_    Section 2: \_?\_\_\_\_\_    Section 3: \_N\_\_\_\_\_    Section 4: \_N\_\_\_\_\_

Coding Key:

- Y    = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q    = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N    = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA   = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

*Revision 9/25/13*