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**BFA in Graphic Design 2017-18 AY**

ASSESSMENT REPORT

***What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?***

*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 2018, to evaluate the BFA in GD portfolios for continuation in the program. During this process, the faculty analyzed the student’s work that has been produced in the lower division GD courses and have been submitted as part of the portfolio evaluation. The faculty reviewed 36 student portfolios from all of the areas of emphasis- graphic design, illustration and interactive multimedia. 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.

As a result, the GD faculty determined that:

* 85% 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.
* A few students 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 can be an indicator of future portfolio assessment and graduation rate within the BFA degree.

**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 2018-19 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. The Option will become an elevated degree- BA in Integrated Design. The Interactive emphasis has submitted new course proposals as well revisions to existing courses.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department and Degree: Art and Design - Bachelor of Arts in Interior Design**  **Assessment Coordinator: Silvana Polgar, Assistant Professor of Interior Design**   1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.   SLO 2.3: Demonstrate critical thinking by applying all the phases (specific steps) of the design process and present a design solution. |
| 1. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”   **Interior Design Capstone Course (ID 155):** It offersstudents a platform to work on human and user centered design, respond to social and cultural needs, and increase student awareness and empathy about contemporary social and cultural problems. The course requires students to: engage in the intellectual exploration of a chosen project (and to justify its location), reveal a social and/or cultural problem, and, after a complex critical thinking process, present a design solution. Students connect with the community and integrate classroom instruction with “real life” professional learning experiences. There is an emphasis on analysis, research, critical reflection, evaluation and synthesis. Reading, research, field observations, engagement with the community, reflections, class discussions, pin-ups, critiques, and design proposal presentations increase student awareness, sensitivity and empathy about cultural and social issues, and how the social and cultural issues reshape and impact design.    Students work on all phases of the design process: research and analysis, conceptual drawings, development of the project, final drawings, and a design solution presented on two (36”x 48”) boards. On the two boards, students must include specific elements and aspects of the design process, including: statement of the project, conceptual drawings, site plan, floor plans, interior and exterior elevations, rendered perspective drawings of selected interior spaces and exterior of the building, materials, colors schemes, furniture, and light fixtures. The boards are graphic narratives of the design solutions.    Students should demonstrate, during all phases of the design process, an intellectual and design maturity, expressed through their thought process, critical thinking, and substantial problem solving. Students are required to exhibit their presentation boards at the Conley Art Gallery at California State University Fresno. During the exhibit, students stand by their boards and give key points presentations to professionals, people from the interior design industry, community college and high school faculty and students, and local organizations.  **Grading Rubric:** Projects are graded on the grading rubric criteria.  The following are two specific criteria from the grading rubric related to SLO 2.3.:   1. Completion of the project and completion of each phase of the design process (points 0-10) 2. Good analysis, research, and references that support the project (points 0-10) |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   Projects varied in depth of application of the steps of the design process, creativity, and quality of the final presentation on the two boards. The majority of the 27 students in the Capstone Course demonstrated high level of proficiency, based on essentials of established criteria. Both boards were evaluated. The following are the data:  Of the 27 students, 70% of the students (19 students) demonstrated an excellent proficiency applied to all the phases of the design process, and creativity. They completed each phase of the design process and the project (presented on two boards). Their work was supported by strong research and project statements. The project drawings, furniture and materials demonstrated excellent critical thinking and a good understanding of the needs of the users of the facility that they designed. The selection of furniture, color schemes, and accessories fostered creativity and were appropriate for the type of facility that they designed. There were no weaknesses in this group of students’ performance related to the outcome.  Of the 27 students, 8% of the students (2 students) demonstrated a good proficiency applied to all phases of the design process, critical thinking, and completion of the project. Their projects were creative, supported by good research, and well presented. Students designed according to the needs of the users of the facility. Their selection of furniture, materials, and color schemes were appropriate.  Of the 27 students, 22% of the students (6 students) demonstrated an average proficiency applied to all phases of the design process and completion of the project. Although students had good research to support their projects, they barely showed a sufficient proficiency during the remaining phases of the design process, showed average critical thinking, and completed the projects to limited extents. They presented a limited selection of furniture, materials and color schemes. Their graphic presentation skills were barely adequate.  Of the 27 students, 0% of the students (0 students) demonstrated poor proficiency (lacking effort, missing phases of the design process, omitting to respond to requirements, applying poor critical thinking and creativity or failing to present boards). |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   Based on data and calculation, the students who were proficient were the majority. As a matter of fact, in the final outcome only 6 students barely met the minimum requirements, therefore no changes or actions need to be made. ID 155 is a Capstone Course and we expect students to already be familiar with the research methods, all the aspects of the design process, sophisticated thought process, and complex critical thinking. Consequently, students were able to apply independent research and execute every phase of the design process and, at the end of the semester, to present creative and mature design solutions. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2018-2019 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.    * 1. PLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the elements and principles of design and their application within historical and cultural contexts   SLO 1: Apply the elements and principles of design and vocabulary  Direct Measures:   1. Case study 2. Design Project 3. Presentation board   Indirect Measure:   1. Student survey   Evaluation Method: Rubric |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”   Progress has been made to the majority of the items listed:  **1**. Support the local chapter of ASID, and its activities.  The following actions were taken: The President-Elect of the Northern and Central CA Region visited the students and gave a talk on the industry and the profession. A reception was held for her after. All local ASID members and Industry Partners were invited. Forty-seven attended.  The Fresno State student chapter was reactivated with ASI and ASID. Nine of our students attended the annual National Conference, SCALE in LA for three days. One of our students was chosen as the Student Representative for the North Central CA Region. The student was sent to Washington DC to the national professional ASID Conference.  2. Pursue the establishment of local student chapters of other design organizations such as NKBA and IIDA. No progress.    3. Upgrade lighting lab with new measurement systems, color filters, lighting simulation software (and computers),etc. No progress.    3. Place an increased emphasis on environmental codes and standards such as LEED.    4. Place an increased emphasis on embracing new technologies.  5. Maintain and expand the existing culture of assessment in the program.  6. Reestablish the graduate program. No Progress.  7. Build meaningful and lasting relationship with the Dean.  8. Launch a search for an additional full-time faculty member. No progress.    9. Develop a long-term maintenance/upgrade plan of technology assets and facilities, including additional computing facilities – dedicated or shared on campus. No progress.    10. Provide excellent education in design: (a) as a fine art closely allied with architecture and other art and design disciplines; (b) as a cultural activity grounded in the arts and humanities; (c) as a globally oriented, and socially and environmentally engaged practice that has a social responsibility.    11. Provide an education rich in creative and critical inquiry, while preparing students, both intellectually and professionally, for service to the interior design (and related design) professions, as well as to the community (local, regional and global).    12. Provide an education encompassing a broad spectrum of design experiences and problem-solving situations from multi and trans-disciplinary activities achieved by collaboration with the students of other departments (e.g., Sociology, Psychology) and with exposure to a multiplicity of practices, including art and engineering.    13. Commit to the fulfillment of cultural promise and social responsibility.    14. Continue to improve multidisciplinary approach and its offerings in history, theory and criticism in foundational and advanced theory/history courses to allow for mastery of critical and conceptual development in design studios and other courses. No Progress.    15. Continue to encourage creativity and innovation through the integration of the theory, art, technology, and science of the built environment.    16. Continue focus on values of stewardship and social responsibility. The program will continue to seek opportunities to engage students in projects that affect the quality of life and economic development of Fresno.    17. Maintain its emphasis on environmental issues and expand on existing opportunities in the curriculum to promote interdisciplinary collaborations and ethos of service. With guidance from our Advisory Council, the program will continue to nurture the synergy between design education and practice, the program and its professional partners, as a successful formula for an integrative, holistic design experience. No progress.    18. Continue to maintain current facilities and resource room, with update materials, catalogues, samples, and technology.    19. Continue to recruit and support the existing pool of part-time faculty to complement the full-time faculty (in progress).    20. Emphasize a holistic approach to the study of visual arts in its courses (in progress).    21. Expand on service-learning and community engagement opportunities in the curriculum involving local (and national/international) partners.    22. Continue to seek opportunities to engage practicing professionals and community members in the educational process.    23. Expand partnerships with institutional partners in the region’s community colleges (in progress).    24. Explore ways in which to play a greater leadership role in the advocacy and understanding of art/design in our community.    25. Continue to assess the outcomes of the internship experience and continue to expand the program's professional connections regionally, nationally and internationally.  **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions. |

**BA in Art Studio Assessment Report AY 2017-18**

Please either download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section or cut and paste all six questions into a word document and provide a response for each one. E-mail your assessment report(s) to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine ([mjordine@csufresno.edu](mailto:mjordine@csufresno.edu)). Please complete a separate report for each B.A/B.S. and M.A/M.S. program offered by the department.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department and Degree: Art and Design, BA in Art (Studio)**  **Assessment Coordinator: Stephanie Ryan**   1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.   **SLO: B.2.** Apply aesthetic principles of art and design to the final art product.  **SLO: D.3.** Compose compelling and thought-provoking content in created artistic work. |
| 1. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”   The Studio Art Faculty used randomly selected student work gathered from Final Project Assignments that were given to students in Advanced-Level courses from the majority of Studio Art areas. A few studio areas were not able to participate in last year’s assessment because the area either did not have F-T/T-T faculty, or the faculty member was on leave (Printmaking and Animation/New Media respectively).  The art work gathered from these assignments was specific to the medium of each area, and was taken from advanced level courses (or from courses that were the most advanced in that area). The final project of an advanced course is meant to demonstrate the culmination of multiple semesters of previous studio art experience/instruction in that area/medium, developed through a series of courses that are designed work in sequence from beginning to advanced. Prerequisites ensure that students take the courses in order, and advanced courses are designed to be repeated in order to increase mastery of the medium. Students in Advanced Studio Art courses are expected to show an understanding of a range of technical skills, formal aesthetics, and conceptual sophistication pertaining to their area/medium by the time they near graduation. The culminating experience for Studio Art students in the BA in Art program is the *Senior Exhibition*.  The Studio Art Faculty met to discuss the results of the previous year’s assessment report, and began to revise our assessment activities in response to these findings. Specifically, we made sure that multiple, random samples were gathered and evaluated by as many studio art faculty members possible, we aligned our assessment activities with our Student Learning Outcomes, and designed rubrics tailored to each SLO evaluated, and we met several times to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of our program as well as potential for change. These discussions were in alignment with our recent NASAD review also, which contained some similar findings and verified what we learned in our assessment from last year (AY 2017-2018).  During the spring 2018, the Studio Art Faculty met to review 15 randomly selected student works from Final Project assignments, using two different rubrics (see below.) One rubric was designed to measure SLO B.2., aesthetics/formal elements of advanced student art work. We wanted to ascertain if advanced studio student work demonstrates proficiency in terms of skill/formal (aesthetic principles) required at that level. The second rubric was designed to measure SLO D.3., which refers to sophistication of content/meaning in advance student art works. We hope to ascertain if advanced studio student work demonstrates proficiency in terms conceptual sophistication (compelling and thought-provoking work) required at that level. While it is impossible to completely separate form and content in artwork (and in our program we strive to teach students to integrate the two), the faculty determined the assessment of value because for many students, either one or the other is lacking.  The Studio Art Faculty decided to assess SLO B.2. and SLO D.3., straying from the SLOs previously selected in our timetable (which states we will assess SLO A1, D1 and F1.) We made this decision because we are still currently focusing our attention on the work of students nearing graduation, and discussing our program needs with regard to the BA in Art Culminating experience. Thus, we wanted to focus on the SLOs that would provide us with more information on the particular needs of advanced students, rather than those listed in the timetable, which were focused toward beginning and intermediate students.  Our benchmark is to have students score an 9 or higher on both rubrics included below.  The rubric we used in assessing SLO B.2., is:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **B.2. APPLY AESTHETIC PRINCIPLES OF ART AND DESIGN IN THE FINAL PRODUCT** | | | | | | | | BEGINNING | | | | | Student requires extensive support to create art work. Demonstrates lack of technical skill, shows little evidence of the elements & principles of design, and lack of application of artistic process. | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | |  |  | |  | | DEVELOPING | | | | | Student creates work using some skill with basic techniques; demonstrates limited technical skill, limited skill in the application of the elements & principles of design; limited use of artistic process. | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 6 | |  |  | |  | | PROFICIENT | | | | | Students create using a variety of skills & techniques. They apply concepts and processes to solve problems; demonstrates effectiveness in application of technical skills; in the application of the elements and principles of design, and effective use of artistic process. | | | | | | | 7 | 8 | | 9 | |  |  | |  | | ACCOMPLISHED | | | | | Students create using a variety of skills and techniques at an accomplished level. They apply concepts and processes to pose and solve problems. Demonstrates accomplished use of technical skills, application of the elements & principles of design, and use of the artistic process. | | | | | | | 10 | 11 | | 12 | |  |  | |  |   The second rubric we used was to measure the sophistication of content in each work. The Rubric used in assessing SLO D.3. is:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **D.3. COMPOSE COMPELLING AND THORUGHT-PROVOKING CONTENT IN CREATED ARTISTIC WORKS** | | | | | | | | BEGINNING | | | | | Student work shows little or no consideration of meanings/content to create a work; no discernable strategy is evident in work (to communicate meaning, intent, content) and/or little meaning is meant to be conveyed. | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | |  |  | |  | | DEVELOPING | | | | | Student work shows some consideration of meanings/content, however meaning remains incongruent with art work or overly simplistic; occasionally relates aesthetics and design principles to the ideas, but not enough attempts are made to deliver intention. | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 6 | |  |  | |  | | PROFICIENT | | | | | Work exhibits consideration of meanings/content and relates aesthetics and design principles to the ideas. Work demonstrates clear delivery of meanings/content (and purpose); | | | | | | | 7 | 8 | | 9 | |  |  | |  | | ACCOMPLISHED | | | | | Work effectively delivers meanings /content with sophistication; work provokes thoughts, ideas, and makes an impact; aesthetics and formal elements support the ideas seen in the work. | | | | | | | 10 | 11 | | 12 | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   **AVERAGE Student Assessment Results:**  **Average Score of SLO B.2. = 10.03**  **Average Score of SLO D.3. = 10.33**  Student scores surpassed the benchmark of 9, showing an average score of around 10 for each SLO. This means that the student work evaluated is considered ‘accomplished’ according to the rubric, and is within the expected range for advanced students. This was good to find because these scores reflect the effectiveness of advanced courses being designed as repeatable, so that students are given adequate time to develop mastery in their particular studio medium. In SLO B.2., only two students did not meet the benchmark. In SLO D.3., only one student did not meet the benchmark. This shows that the studio art student work overall is of an accomplished level in terms of quality of formal aspects/skill and content/meaning. However, the faculty would prefer higher scores of 11 or 12, since the ‘accomplished’ range goes from 10 – 12, and so discussed ideas about how to raise these scores. The instruction in Advanced studio courses, in all mediums, is a strength, and as mentioned, the repeatable nature of the courses enables students to develop mastery in their medium. However, one major weakness that came to our attention was the lack of a more comprehensive culminating experience for our advanced students which may also serve to raise the quality of student work in terms of form and content. This was not a direct result of the assessment, but came about after multiple discussions about advanced student work in the studio art program.  **STUDENT BY STUDENT ASSESSMENT RESULTS:**  Of the students we assessed for SLO B.2., only one scored below the benchmark of 9. The highest score earned was a 12 and the lowest score earned was a 6.5. The breakdown of scores by student for SLO B.2. is:  Number of students with a score of 12 = 2.  Number of students with a score of 11= 4.  Number of students with a score of 10 = 5.  Number of students with a score of 9 = 2.  Number of students with a score of 8 = 1.  Number of students with a score of 7 = 0.  Number of students with a score of 6.5 = 1.  Of the students we assessed for SLO D.3., only one scored below the benchmark of 9. The highest score earned was an 11 and the lowest score earned was a 6. The breakdown of scores by student for SLO D.3. is:  Number of students with a score of 12 = 0.  Number of students with a score of 11= 11.  Number of students with a score of 10 = 1.  Number of students with a score of 9 = 2.  Number of students with a score of 8 = 0.  Number of students with a score of 7 = 0.  Number of students with a score of 6 = 1. |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   The faculty were not surprised to learn that most students scored above the acceptable standard, because this has been true for many years. However, through our discussions on the experience of advanced studio art students (this assessment activity), we realized that what our program lacks is a comprehensive culminating experience for studio art majors. This realization was not necessarily a direct result of the Assessment activity described above, but certainly led to discussion of this topic.  Currently, as mentioned, the culminating experience is the Senior Exhibition. Participation in the Senior Exhibition is sought out by most seniors (and we offer incentives to participate, like juror’s prizes with monetary awards), but it is not required for graduation and is not supported by directly related coursework or grading. Because of this, some students can ‘slip through the cracks’ since exhibiting is not a requirement and many we think would benefit from direct feedback on the work they choose to exhibit.  Options we have discussed include creating a team-taught (or rotating faculty taught) capstone-type of course for seniors on Professional Practices in Studio Art. This course would be required during the final year of the BA in Art program, and would include preparation and participation in the Senior Show, instruction in professional studio art practices and gallery preparation. This course could include direct feedback to students on their work from studio art faculty and/or professional studio artists from the community, which would create a more comprehensive culminating experience for our students and continue to raise the bar on the quality of the exhibition and individual works of art. For the spring of 2019, we are considering modifying ART 112: Gallery Techniques to use as a test run for this course. A unified approach to the culminating experience will help to create a cohort/community of students from across studio art disciplines, and will better prepare students for careers after graduation.  A Professional Practices course was recommended in our NASAD review, and will align with our future goals of developing a BFA in Studio Art program. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2018-2019 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   During AY 2018-19 the Art and Design faculty will update the BA in Art SOAP and create a new timeline for assessment activities. The Department of Art and Design will assess the first learning outcome(s) selected for the new assessment schedule. We hope to continue our assessment into our development of a more comprehensive culminating experience for senior art majors, as discussed above. |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”   As stated above, these results are in progress. We have had several new hires, which will increase our ability to function smoothly as a department, and to oversee program needs. |

**Assessment Report**

Art History Area

Annual Assessment Report AY 2017/2018

During AY 2017-2018, the Art History area’s primary assessment activity was the development and approval of a new Comprehensive Assessment Plan consistent with the proposed change of Art History from an emphasis within the BA in Art to a major in itself, the BA in Art History. The new major and its Assessment Plan were approved by the Chancellor’s Office at the end of the Spring 2018 semester, and will be implemented beginning this current semester. These new goals and objectives substantially modify, enlarge and replace the previous assessment criteria. The new plan was developed by Dr. Laura Meyer with the input of Dr. Luis Gordo Pelaez and Dr. Keith Jordan of the Art History area in meetings on 1/19 and 1/29/2018, and through email correspondence through February and March. Later, in May consultation occurred with Martin Valencia, Chair of the Department of Art and Design, and Dr. Xuanning Fu, Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Dr. Meyer is now serving as the Assessment Coordinator for the new major. Here is the new plan with a timetable for assessment.

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).