Art and Design Department
ASSESSMENT REPORTS 2016-17 AY
_____

BFA in Graphic Design 2016-17 AY
ASSESSMENT REPORT

What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?
In actuality, the GD faculty review all the goals and outcomes listed in the attached chart but we will report on the following.

GD Learning Outcomes (GDLO)
Students should be able to:

GDO1.1   Produce graphic design works that identify, define and apply traditional and contemporary principles of art and graphic design.

GDO2.2   Produce graphic design works that identify, evaluate and apply creative processes in graphic design.

What instruments did you use to assess them? What did you discover from these data?

The GD area faculty met during the Spring 2017, Graphic Design Senior Exhibit to evaluate and analyze the students' culminating experience and portfolios. This particular year, the faculty evaluated students from all of the areas of emphasis- graphic design, illustration and interactive multimedia a total of thirty-four students that were evaluated. Prior to evaluating portfolios, the faculty established the competency factor. The competency was based on students' prior coursework and grades. A rubric based on the above learning outcomes was used for the portfolio assessment. The rubric is given a rating of 1 through 4, with 4 being the highest score.

For the 2017 Graphic Design Senior Exhibit, thirty-four seniors participated. All students were evaluated.

As a result, the GD faculty determined that:

- 99% of our GD students have scores of 3 and 4 on the rubric, specifically those who were determined to be high competency prior to assessment.
- NO student scored on the 2 to 3 rating on the assessment. Some student's cells indicate NE indicating NO EVIDENCE. This is due that some student's portfolio were only presented as "hard copy" and not digital.
- The findings demonstrate that students' prior coursework and grades are a possible indicator of future portfolio assessment.

- For the most part, the culminating experience reflected the students' creativity and execution of projects at a professional level. This could be attributed to the inclusion of the portfolio and exhibit course-GD180.

What changes did you make as a result of the findings?

The faculty will continue to review grade patterns of GD students and progression through the BFA program, and will assist low competency students with their course and project development.

The GD faculty, specifically in the Interactive Multimedia track (IM), will continue to develop new introductory courses and two advanced courses for this emphasis. The introductory will assist students develop an overall but basic understanding of the field of Interactive Multimedia. The advanced courses will assist the students with their professional-based projects and portfolio that is directed towards their field of study. These changes will also provide needed curricular changes in the IM area that is focused and with clear directions to the culminating experience and portfolio.

Secondly, due to the lack of web design from the GD track, we will be considering adding two courses based on web design and user interaction. These courses will need to replace other required GD courses.

The GD faculty is considering a new structure for the established roadmaps to assist with graduation patterns.

What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-18 academic year? *Briefly list the outcomes to be assessed and how you will measure them. This should align with the activities provided in your SOAP.*

The GD area faculty will meet during the Graphic Design Senior Exhibit to evaluate and analyze the students' culminating experience and portfolios. A rubric based on the following goals and learning outcomes will be used for the assessment. The GD faculty will be considering the following learning outcomes.

GD Learning Outcomes (GDLO)
Students should be able to:

GDO1.1   Produce graphic design works that identify, define and apply traditional and contemporary principles of art and graphic design.
GDO2.2   Produce graphic design works that identify, evaluate and apply creative processes in graphic design.
GDO4.1   Identify, define and apply technological methods or processes in graphic design including typography, illustration or interactive multimedia design.

What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?

Since the last program review under the BFA in Graphic Design and BA in Art with GD Option, the GD area faculty has had discussions with Dr. Fu, Dean of Undergraduate Education, regarding changes to the BA in Art with GD Option as well restructuring the roadmaps for better student graduation rates.

Assessment Report
Painting & Drawing Area
Annual Assessment Report AY 2016/2017

1. What Learning Outcomes did you assess?

1) Assess Learning Outcome B1.
   Identify aesthetic principles of art and design in verbal or written form.

2) Assess Learning Outcome D3.
   Compose compelling and thought-provoking content in created artistic works.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

Learning Outcomes B1 & D3:
   In order to assess the above Program Learning Outcomes, Painting/Drawing FT-TT Faculty collected and reviewed written samples of student work from a research assignment given mid-semester in *Art 120: Drawing* (for LO B1) and student artistic works from an assignment at the end of the semester in *Art 120: Drawing* and *Art 141: Intermediate Painting* (for LO D3). All were assessed according to the scoring rubric below.

   A 12-point rubric was used for each learning objective, with accomplishment levels noted at the top and the presumed corresponding level of study listed below.

Beginning			Developing			Accomplished			Exemplary		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Freshman			Sophomore			Junior			Senior		

   The standards for student performance at the intermediate level should fall within the 5–8 point range, indicating sophomore/junior level performance. The student performance at the advanced class level should fall within the 10—12 point range, which denotes a senior level of performance.

3. What did you discover from these data?

The averaged results of the assessments for each class are:

B1

Area	Class	Average
Drawing	ART 120	6.76

D3		
Area	Class	Average
Drawing	ART 120	6.5
Inter. Painting	ART 140	4

Learning Outcomes B1 Results:
With regard to writing, students in Art 120 scored at the high end of the "developing" area of the rubric, which is a bit lower than they are expected to score for an advanced drawing course. The faculty in Painting/Drawing believe this is due to the fact that students in Art 120 have only completed one semester of drawing before they can enroll in Art 120 and need further coursework in order to develop the exposure to traditional/contemporary art context and sophistication needed to engage with the content of an advanced course in drawing.

Learning Outcomes D3 Results:
Students in Art 120 and Art 140 scored at the low end of the "Developing" section of the rubric on average. The Painting/Drawing faculty interpret this to mean that students in drawing are in need of an additional drawing course, between the Beginning and Advanced levels. We are considering creating a three-tiered drawing curriculum, which we hope will benefit both drawing and painting, since drawing is the foundation of successful painting. This system will include Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced drawing, and will require Intermediate Drawing as a prerequisite for Advanced Drawing and for Advanced Painting. This type of system is common in most university and college studio art BA and BFA programs across the country. Our program offers only 2 courses in drawing currently—a Beginning and an "Advanced" drawing course, which from assessment seems to indicate that the students are not actually at the advanced level when they take Art 120Advanced Drawing. Rather, they score at the intermediate level in terms of written expression as well as art production.

4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?
1) Proposal of Art 123: Expanded Studies in Drawing during the Fall 2017 semester.
2) Revision of Art 120: Drawing, to cover more Intermediate level techniques, concepts, written assignments and studio practice.
3) Submission for request of a tenure-line Painting/Drawing in 2017. In the last assessment report submitted by the department (when the Drawing/Painting faculty were both on sabbatical), it was stated that the Painting/Drawing Area has ". . .multiple tenure-line faculty, adequate facilities, and a solid curricular structure." This statement is inaccurate. Like the other studio areas, the Drawing Area has only one FT-TT faculty member, and the Painting Area also has only one FT-TT faculty member, which is problematic since the Painting and Drawing Areas each have the highest number of enrolled students of any studio area. The facilities also are in need of upgrades. The Painting/Drawing Area faculty have as a result requested curtains and lights again in 2017, as they have in previous years since about 2002. And as mentioned, the faculty will address the

curricular needs by proposing Art 123: Expanded Studies in Drawing, and by revising the content of Art 120 so that it serves as more of an intermediate course in drawing.

Laura Meyer, MA in Art Program Coordinator
Department of Art and Design
College of Arts and Humanities
August 29, 2017

2016-17 ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES REPORT: MA in Art

1. **Focus of Assessment Activities:**
   During AY 2016-17 the MA in Art degree program (along with other degree programs offered by the Department of Art and Design) underwent broad self-assessment and outside assessment in the process of applying for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD).

2. **Instruments/Method of Assessment:**
   In preparation for a multi-day visit by NASAD staff members during May 2016, the MA in Art faculty prepared a comprehensive report on the MA in Art program, including faculty education and achievements, program requirements and course syllabi, images of student artwork completed in graduate studio art classes during the past six years, a complete listing of Project Reports (from studio art majors) and MA Theses (from art history majors) completed over the past six years, an assessment of classroom facilities and their current safety/ventilation equipment and needs, an assessment of off-campus graduate studio spaces and gallery space, as well as on-campus gallery spaces and opportunities for exhibiting artwork. The report also documented visiting artist programs and opportunities for graduate students to participate in internships with visiting artists and with local art institutions such as the Fresno Art Museum and Arte Americas. Additionally, the report documented the activities and employment of recent MA in Art program graduates, including art exhibitions, publications, and employment as instructors at the college and high school level. A copy of the self-study submitted to NASAD and links to online images of artwork, etc. may be provided upon request.

   In May 2016 two NASAD representatives spent several days touring the facilities, visiting classes, and meeting with students, faculty, and administrators. At the end of their visit they reported their findings verbally in a meeting with department faculty and the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities.

3. **Findings of Assessment/ What did you discover from these data?:**
   The response of the visiting NASAD reviewers was very positive. The review team praised, in particular, the faculty's commitment to student success and their dedication to mentoring MA in Art students outside the classroom.

   The NASAD review team will take their findings to the larger NASAD body in October 2017. We are hopeful that the MA in Art program will, for the first time, gain accreditation by NASAD. NASAD accreditation upholds the highest standards in the field, and will enhance our ability to recruit highly-qualified students.

The most significant recommendation NASAD reviewers made during their visit to Fresno State was to consider developing an MFA in Art program. Since the MFA (not the MA) is now considered the terminal degree in studio art, most universities and colleges require the MFA from candidates for tenure-track teaching positions. The MA in Art degree is now of limited use to students aiming to teach at the college or university level.

This recommendation corroborates feedback from recent graduates of the MA in Art program, as well as potential applicants to the program, who time and again express the desire for an MFA program in the Central Valley.

4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?:
As a result of these findings the MA in Art faculty are beginning to conduct research into the demand for and feasibility of implementing an MFA in Art degree program.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-18 academic year?
During AY 2017-18 we plan to update and send out an alumni survey that includes questions about the potential demand for an MFA program. We also plan to conduct research on MFA programs offered by comparable institutions and determine what additional resources would be needed to implement such a program at Fresno State.

6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?
New writing requirements have been incorporated into ART 240 (Seminar in Studio Art) and ART 230 (Seminar in Art Theory) in order to better familiarize students with the standards of academic writing required for the MA in Art Project Report (for studio art majors) and the MA Thesis (for art history majors).