

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: Art (MA) and Fine Art (MFA)

Contact Name and Email: William V. Ganis william.ganis@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>Outcome 4.1</p>	<p>Assessment of readiness to exhibit</p>	<p>student proceeds through program</p>	<p>Students allowed to exhibit</p> <p>Given recent experiences with students creating subpar work, having work approved by their committees though it was never physically executed, or students adding "extra" work not approved by their committees, there is much to improve in terms of expectations and standards. This measure is problematic insofar as it is self-fulfilling but really measures nothing.</p>	<p>Student's Advisory Committee</p>

<p>All Outcomes</p>	<p>Focus Group, with general questions about the program and curriculum. For this trial, the focus group invited all graduate students and was conducted in the ARTP 609 course, since the course is required of all students in the MA and MFA programs.</p>	<p>It's all too easy to say that defined "outcomes" are met— especially if some are met through painful or inefficient means. It's likely time to reexamine the insular learning outcomes themselves and think about them perhaps more holistically or with greater goals, such as work</p>	<p>The students had much to say about the difficulty scheduling and the value (good and bad) of committee meetings—the experiences are very uneven).</p> <p>Student lament the lack of a community of students across several disciplines.</p>	<p>Thomas Steiger, Professor of Sociology conducted focus group in the ARTP 609 course, since the course is required in the MA and MFA programs.</p> <p>Jodi Lynn McCoy, Gallery Assistant, recorded the focus group discussions.</p>
		<p>preparedness or professional placement.</p>	<p>The information in the handbooks is dense and inaccessible—students need the information summarized.</p> <p>Students largely value the independence—they set challenges/goals for themselves and are encouraged by instructors.</p> <p>Students for their teaching experiences to be uneven and that they need more guidance.</p>	<p>William Ganis, Department Chairperson, analyzed and parsed the results and delivered them to the faculty members/areas discussed by the students in the focus group.</p>

Most Outcomes: 1.1 2.1 2.3 3.1 4.3	Graduate Survey	75% score "Agree" or above 75% score "Agree" or above 90% score "Agree" or above 90% score "Agree" or above 90% score "Agree" or above	Though there was a successful effort to re-create the survey in Qualtrics, the survey itself was a failure as no students responded to the survey.	The assessment committee created the new survey, however, with no survey results we know that we need to designate ownership, perhaps to the Graduate Coordinator, to ensure that students take the survey. We could easily integrate the student survey into our graduating "checklist" activities and even have our administrators remind students to complete the survey.
--	------------------------	--	--	--

Summary

1) discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself. The results of the focus group fit a context of problems we've experienced with our graduate programs, especially those surrounding our graduate-program handbooks and our committee processes.

Specifically, students have reported that:

- a. the handbooks are confusing and important information is sometimes not obvious—we
- b. they desire more instruction about requirements and would like us to draw their attention to processes.
- c. being a graduate student in our programs can seem isolating and some would like to see more "community" opportunities.
- d. they would like more specific preparation for the professional world.
- e. they need more preparation to teach undergraduate courses assigned for their TA-ships.

Given recent experiences with students creating subpar work or having work approved by their committees though it was never physically executed, there is much to improve in terms of expectations and standards. This and other "passed by the committee" measures are problematic insofar as they are self-fulfilling but really don't measure anything.

2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary. This past year, the MFA and MA handbooks were completely reworked by the department's Graduate Committee and approved by all of the faculty. Graduate students will receive these new documents in the Fall of 2017.

The MA and MFA curricula are being rewritten for clarity and simplicity, in short, many specific courses are being replaced by single course numbers that may be repeated for credit. This change reflects structures at peer institutions as well as each graduate student's unique study.

We will establish protocols and "ownership" for administering the survey.

We have efforts underway to improve professional opportunities for graduate students—

3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

We expect to focus on improvement of the above issues and measure these improvements. We expect to look to professional organizations, accreditation and peer institutions for standards and comparables germane to our graduate programs and especially competencies we'd expect graduate students to master. Our outcomes must become more meaningful and less self-fulfilling and insular.

As above, we must establish protocols and "ownership" for administering the survey.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: Art (MA) and Fine Art (MFA) Date:

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to

				<p>master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess</p>

				<p>student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<p>results.</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

Thanks for submitting your 2017 Student Learning Report!

As was the case with the undergraduate report, this one also needs additional detail (list the outcomes, describe the assessment measures to demonstrate their alignment with the outcomes, provide specifics about the results and what they mean, etc.) and some direct assessment. At this point, there is no evidence of what graduate students know and can do or of whether or not they are successful. I appreciate your revising the student handbook, and I hope that once the curriculum is revised, you will begin assessing students' knowledge and skills. You also need to consider separating results for the MA and the MFA.