

ART DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT 2006

Compiled by: Howie Smith, Chair

Art Department Assessment Committee

Kathy Curnow

George Mauersberger, Chair

Richard Schneider

Art Department Assessment Report - 2006 - B.A. in Art

Background

In 2002, the Art Department made changes in its curriculum, increasing the number of hours in the B.A. degree from 36 to 48. This change was prompted in part by information gained from formal and informal assessment as well by guidelines established by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design.

In Spring Semester 2003, the Art Department undertook a review of its assessment process. After completion of the review, the department concluded that its assessment process should be revised. The process that had been in place relied only on a pre-test, given to new Art majors, and a post-test, given to graduating Art majors. This instrument provided some useful information, but had limitations, in particular the fact that no actual student work was evaluated. This seemed especially significant for a visual art program.

A new process was implemented in 2004. The revised process utilizes multiple instruments and is intended to provide more practical and useful information related to program goals.

Goals

Goals were originally developed by the Art Department faculty in 1995. The faculty updated these goals in Spring Semester 2003 to better reflect curriculum that had been revised in 2002. We have established several broad principal goals for all our courses and baccalaureate programs:

1. Develop a student's perceptual and conceptual abilities through the study and creation of works of art.
2. Encourage the critical understanding of the relationship between art and society.
3. Provide a foundation for professional training.
4. Understand the issues and opportunities raised by the visual arts.
5. Understand the significance of art relative to human values.

Outcomes

Outcomes were originally developed by Art Department faculty in 1995. The faculty updated these outcomes in Spring Semester 2003 to better reflect curriculum that had been revised in 2002.

Studio Art

Teaches students to:

1. Draw realistically and expressively.
2. Understand the characteristics and practical application of the fundamental elements of two-dimensional and three-dimensional art and design.
3. Develop concepts and content for art works that utilize the fundamental elements of two-dimensional and three-dimensional art and design. Art works should demonstrate level of excellence commensurate with a B.A. program in the field of visual art.

Art Education

Students in Art Education are also Studio Art majors. Their education component comes from the College of Education. In addition to meeting the outcomes described above for Studio Art, Art Education students must also be capable of:

1. Teaching art in a non-traditional setting such as a community center, senior facility, or detention center (ART 441-Art in Social and Vocational Contexts).
2. Teaching art criticism and aesthetics in a K-12 setting (ART 341-Valuing Processes).

Art History

Teaches students to:

1. Participate in and lead critiques of artwork and the aesthetic judgment making process.
2. Differentiate the artistic periods and styles from Prehistoric to late 20th century.
3. "Read" the non-verbal language of visual forms.
4. Develop research and writing skills.

Research Methods

Partial implementation of the revised assessment process took place during 2003-2004, with evaluation of student art exhibitions and Merit Scholarship applications in Studio Art. Evaluation of student papers began in beginning and advanced Art History courses.

During 2004-2005, all aspects of the new assessment process began implementation.

This year, 2005-2006, is the second year of full implementation of the new process, and the first year to include data from exit surveys.

Entrance surveys

Distribution of entrance surveys to Art students began in Spring Semester 2005. The initial plan was to focus only on collecting data from Art majors. The revised plan is to distribute surveys to all students in 100 level Art classes. By doing this, we will gather information from a wider cross section of students, including but not limited to Art majors.

Exit surveys

Distribution of exit surveys to all graduating Art majors began in Spring Semester 2005. Exit surveys focus on rating graduating students' educational experiences including preparation to meet their career goal(s). Surveys are distributed to all graduating art majors.

Evaluation of Student Work

Studio Art

- Studio faculty devised rubrics for evaluating student art exhibitions.
- Studio faculty completed rubric forms evaluating the Annual Student Exhibition.
- External jurors provided evaluations of the Annual Student Exhibition.
- Graphic Design faculty completed rubric forms evaluating AIGA Student Exhibition.
- Supplemental assessment goals were developed for Graphic Design.
- Faculty evaluated Merit Scholarship applications.

Art Education

- Faculty in Art Education agreed to rubrics for ART 341 and ART 441 and completed rubric forms evaluating student work in both of these classes.

Art History

- Art History faculty devised rubrics for evaluating student papers and presentations.
- Art History faculty evaluated student work in a minimum of ten percent of introductory and seminar classes in Art History.

Findings

Entrance Surveys

This year's surveys continue to show a large number of transfer students coming into the program. Whereas last year showed approximately twice the number of transfer students as incoming freshmen, this year's surveys indicate that over four times as many transfers as incoming freshmen are entering the Art program.

Regarding career goals, the largest number of entries was for Art Teacher, with Studio Artist and Graphic Designer being the second most popular. Over twice as many students listed Art Teacher as their career goal this year as compared to last year.

In Studio Art, students were asked which content areas they had the most interest in studying. Results were very similar to last year's in this category, with Photography the most popular, followed by almost as many entries for Drawing, Painting, and Graphic Design.

In Art History, students again indicated the greatest degree of interest in studying Contemporary/Modern. Renaissance was next, followed by Medieval, Asian, and Architecture, all with similar numbers.

In response to why they have chosen to take classes at the Cleveland State University Art Department, the large majority again cited Location, followed strongly by Affordability. The next largest percentages cited Facilities/Equipment and Faculty.

Forty-eight students completed entrance surveys.

Exit Surveys

This year marks the first time we have collected data from exit surveys. The largest percentage of students completing surveys was in Studio Art, followed by Art History and Art Education.

Students were asked to rate their experiences in a variety of categories on a scale of 0 to 5, with 5 being the highest rating.

Regarding questions on the overall educational experience in the Art Department, and intellectual development, the largest percentage rated these at 4; the next largest percentage rated them at 5. Regarding preparation for career goals, the largest percentage by far voted 4. When asked to rate the effectiveness of various areas of the program, Teaching was rated the highest with an average score of 4.45. Facilities/Equipment was rated lowest at 2.5. Other highlights from the exit surveys: the largest number of students completed their degree requirements within five years, an equal number completed their requirements within four or six years; a majority of students stated that they would recommend the CSU Art program to others.

Thirty students completed surveys.

Full results from entrance and exit surveys are included in the appendix.

Evaluation of Student Work

Studio Art

Annual Student Exhibition - Organized by the Student Organization for the Fine Arts, open to all Art students, including first year students. In reviewing the external jurors' statements and the faculty evaluations of artwork from the Annual Student Exhibition, the Assessment Committee agreed that they showed evidence that students were meeting program goals and outcomes. Rating scale was 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest.

In two-dimensional art, students were rated highest in their handling of Value with an average score of 5. Texture, Shape, and Composition/Design were all rated at 4.5, with the lowest score a 4 for Texture.

In three-dimensional art, Space was rated as the strongest three-dimensional design element at 4.75. The lowest score in three-dimensional design was again Color at 3.75. Successful development of concepts and content was rated at 3.5. The Overall Quality of this year's exhibition rated at 4.5, as compared to 3.75 last year.

Seventy students submitted works for judging. In numbers very similar to last year, sixty-six artworks by thirty-eight students were chosen for inclusion from one hundred thirty entries.

The American Institute of Graphic Artists (AIGA) Student Exhibition - Organized and installed by students in the CSU AIGA Student Chapter, open to all students in Graphic Design classes, including first year students. In reviewing the faculty evaluations, the committee agreed they showed evidence students were making progress toward meeting program goals and outcomes. Students received the highest mark in all categories with the exception of Interval Contrast, which was rated at 4.

Merit Scholarship applications - In 2006, sixteen students applied for scholarships by submitting six examples of their work. This was a slight decrease from last year, when nineteen students applied. Twelve students were chosen to receive scholarships ranging from \$1800 to \$4700. Last year, seven students were awarded scholarships. Using a quantitative rating system, applicants' artwork was graded on a scale of 1 to 5 by nine members of the faculty. Highest possible score for each student was 45. Highest score this year was 35.5. The lowest was 12. The average score was 29.5.

Student Ceramics Sale - Twice each school year, students in the Ceramics area, under the guidance of Prof. Richard Schneider, organize a sale of students' ceramic art works. This show is open to all students in Ceramics. The past three Ceramic Sales have each averaged \$10,972 in sales, generating a total of \$32,918 in revenue (divided between students and the Art Department Quasi-Endowment). The total revenue from this year's sale was comparable, with another \$10,000 in student sales. These results from these sales offer compelling evidence that students in the Ceramics area are producing art works which are at a professional level, based on their acceptance in the commercial marketplace.

Art Education

Rubrics used a five point rating scale. Students in Art 441 were rated at 5 in four categories, and at 4 in two categories. Students in Art 341 were rated 5 in six categories and at 4 in the remaining three. These numbers are very comparable to last year.

In reviewing the evaluations of student work the Assessment Committee agreed that they showed evidence that students were making progress toward meeting program goals and outcomes for the two required Art Education classes.

Art History

The committee examined both 200-level short papers and 400-level papers from seminars. Of the 10% examined, most were found to be proficient at their respective levels, while two were exemplary, one emerging, and one unacceptable.

Faculty agreed that art historical skills for all participating students increased dramatically from the 200- to the 400-level and encompassed improved writing, analysis and understanding. Studio students were generally felt to be less developed writers.

Review

Studio Art

Annual Student Exhibition - A committee of four members of the Studio Art faculty completed rubric forms evaluating the show in categories related to program goals/outcomes. Art works for the show were chosen by three jurors from outside the university. Statements submitted by these external jurors can be found in the appendix.

The American Institute of Graphic Artists (AIGA) Student Exhibition - One Graphic Design faculty member completed the rubric form. The second full-time faculty member in Graphic Design was on leave.

Merit Scholarship applications – Applications were evaluated by nine Art Department faculty using a quantitative rating system grading the quality of the applicants' art work on a scale of 0 at the lowest to 5 at the highest.

Art Education

Rubrics were devised in 2003-2004 by the last full-time professor in Art Education. The full-time position in Art Education was vacant during 2004-2005, and was converted to a term position for 2005-06. Evaluations for these courses were completed by the part-time Art Education faculty in 2005, and by the Term Instructor in Art Education in 2006.

Art History

Evaluations in Art History were conducted by a committee of Art History faculty based on rubrics agreed to by all members of the Art History faculty.

Summary

The Art Department Assessment Committee (Curnow, Mauersberger, Schneider), consisting of both Studio and Art History faculty, has reviewed the preliminary findings from 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The full faculty and the Art Department Chair will begin consideration of the recommendations of the Assessment Committee in Fall Semester 2006. As information is gathered about student outcomes utilizing the revised assessment process, the Art Department Assessment Committee will evaluate and compare the data, from year to year, in order to track progress of student learning, and the program.

Actions

Based in part on preliminary findings of entrance surveys and evaluations of student work, the following actions are under consideration:

Studio Art

- Develop strategies for better publicizing the Merit Scholarship Program, particularly among high school students. This was a recommendation last year as well. Because the decrease in applications continued, we need to seek more effective strategies for publicizing the scholarship program.
- Continuing faculty discussions of a proposal for a professional degree program, such as a B.F.A., and/or an M.F.A. program, based on student interest in professional and advanced training.
- Recommendation of a position in Digital Photography/Multimedia, based on strong interest in Photography and Graphic Design.

Art Education

- Conducted a successful search for a full-time Art Education professor who will start in Fall Semester 2006.

Art History

- Continued implementation of the seminar requirement for studio majors was agreed upon. This year, for the first time, the seminar has become a Writing Across the Curriculum class and it was agreed this produced better overall writing.
- The department seeks additional faculty with the anticipated retirement of two of its four members. Because seminars are only taught by full-time faculty, heavy enrollment and small class sizes for this course will produce greater problems without additional personnel.
- Next year 200-level papers should be sought from our part-time art historians as well; we had no mechanism in place to do so this year. The committee feels, however, this year's results are still representative.

General

- Think about ways to attract better students.
- Continue to consider what, if any steps the department might take to better respond to the large number of transfer students entering our classes.
- Continue to try to achieve more prominent external signage for the Art Gallery. The category that was rated second lowest in terms of why entering students chose to take classes here was the Art Gallery. The evident low profile of the award-winning CSU Art Gallery among entering students underscores the need for improved signage.
- Continue to build administrative support for a new or improved Art Building. The category that was cited on entrance surveys as least important in why students chose to take classes here was Facilities/Equipment. This speaks in part to the poor state of the Art Building, an aging structure that is clearly not recognized as a magnet-type facility. We have had some success in this area, with a committee being formed at the administration's behest to consider fund-raising strategies for a new facility.

Art Department Assessment Report - 2006 - M.A. in Art History

Goals/Outcomes

Goals/Outcomes were originally developed by Art Department faculty in 1995, and updated by the faculty in Spring Semester 2003.

By the time MA students begin study at CSU, they should have acquired the same skills of undergraduate majors in Art History (particularly research skills). Additionally, graduate students studying Art History should be able to:

1. Analyze Art Historical source material critically.
2. Develop an original angle on material (and be able to verify that it's original).
3. Be fully flexible in the presentation of material (whether term paper, paragraph summary, website, museum tag, etc.).
4. Develop an understanding of what is yet to be researched.
5. Develop understanding of Art History as a career.

Research Methods

Entrance surveys

Art History faculty agreed that entrance surveys would be administered to all new Art History students. Surveys have been sent to new students, awaiting results/responses.

Exit surveys

Art History faculty agreed that exit surveys would be administered to all graduating Art History students. Exit surveys have been sent to graduating students, one response so far.

Evaluation of Student Work

Art History papers/presentations were evaluated based on rubrics agreed to by Art History faculty.

Findings

Entrance Surveys

Results are pending.

Exit Surveys

One graduating student returned an exit survey.

Evaluation of Student Work

Our evaluation is based on grad student performance in seminar presentations and papers, colloquia, and theses. One student completed her M.A. thesis this year; it was considered to be emerging, as were the two colloquia. Of current seminar work, one paper/presentation was judged exemplary, the other emerging.

Review

A committee of three art history professors constituted the evaluation committee.

Actions

Additional writing assignments in seminars will be required, and further discussion with students of differentiations between undergraduate and graduate level expectations will continue.

Art Department Assessment Report – 2006 - Appendix

2006 ENTRANCE SURVEY RESULTS – Undergraduate Art Major

(48 students completed surveys)

1. Please check your current status:
 - a. Incoming freshman – 8
 - b. Transfer student - 37
 - a. Other - 3

2. Please check highest level of previous art training:
 - a. Elementary school - 1
 - b. Secondary school - 6
 - c. One to three college level art classes - 25
 - d. More than three college level courses - 24

3. What are your career goals? (Check as many as apply)
 - a. Artist - 16
 - b. Art Historian - 7
 - c. Art Teacher - 24
 - b. Graphic designer – 15
 - e. Other (please specify) – 18
(2 – Digital Art/Multimedia, 1 – Museum Work, 2 – Fashion Design)

4. What studio art area do you have the greatest interest in studying? (Check as many as apply)
 - a. Ceramics - 8
 - b. Drawing - 23
 - c. Graphic Design – 21
 - d. Painting – 21
 - e. Photography – 25
 - f. Printmaking – 7
 - g. Sculpture – 15
 - h. Other (please specify) - 2 - Glassblowing

5. What art historical areas do you have the greatest interest in studying? (Check as many as apply)
 - a. Asian – 16
 - b. African/African-American – 11
 - c. Medieval - 18
 - d. Contemporary/Modern – 38
 - e. Decorative Arts – 12
 - f. Renaissance/Baroque – 29
 - g. Architecture – 16
 - h. Other (please specify) – 3

6. Why have you chosen to take classes at the Cleveland State University Art Department?
(Check as many as apply)
 - a. Affordability - 37
 - b. Facilities/Equipment - 12

- c. Location - 41
- d. Faculty - 11
- e. Gallery - 8
- Other (please specify) – 3

2006 EXIT SURVEY RESULTS - Undergraduate Art Major

(30 students completed surveys)

Please check your major area of study:

- Art Education - 2
- Art History - Asian
 - African/African-American
 - Medieval
 - Contemporary/Modern - 2
 - Decorative Arts - 1
 - Renaissance/Baroque - 2
 - Other (please specify) - 5
- Studio Art - Ceramics - 1
 - Drawing -1
 - Graphic Design - 10
 - Painting - 3
 - Photography - 5
 - Printmaking - 1
 - Sculpture - 1

(Please answer questions with 0 representing the lowest rating and 5 representing the highest rating).

6. Please rate your overall educational experience in Cleveland State University Art Department.
 - Grade 5 = 6
 - Grade 4=12
 - Grade 3=4
 - Grade 2=0
 - Grade 1=1
 - Grade 0=0
7. How well do you think your educational experience increased your intellectual development?
 - Grade 5 = 10
 - Grade 4= 12
 - Grade 3= 2
 - Grade 2= 0
 - Grade 1= 1
 - Grade 0= 0
8. How well do you think your educational experience prepared you to reach your career goal(s)?
 - Grade 5 = 3
 - Grade 4= 16
 - Grade 3= 5
 - Grade 2= 2
 - Grade 1= 1 Grade 0= 0

Please rate the effectiveness of the following areas in the CSU Art Department:

Teaching	Curriculum	Gallery
Grade 5 = 10	Grade 5 = 5	Grade 5 = 7
Grade 4= 12	Grade 4= 9	Grade 4= 13
Grade 3= 0	Grade 3= 5	Grade 3= 5
Grade 2= 0	Grade 2= 2	Grade 2= 0
Grade 1= 0	Grade 1= 1	Grade 1= 2
Grade 0= 0	Grade 0= 0	Grade 0= 0
Advising	Facilities/equipment	Office staff
Grade 5 = 5	Grade 5 = 0	Grade 5 = 9
Grade 4= 11	Grade 4= 10	Grade 4= 7
Grade 3= 8	Grade 3= 8	Grade 3= 4
Grade 2= 0	Grade 2= 3	Grade 2= 0
Grade 1= 2	Grade 1= 2	Grade 1= 1
Grade 0= 2	Grade 0= 2	Grade 0= 0

9. Which class(es) did you find most beneficial?
 Classes within major - 21
 Portfolio Review - 2
10. Which class(es) did you find least beneficial?
 Classes outside of major - 8
 General Education Courses - 3
 Art 102 & 103 - 3
 Portfolio Review Classes - 1
11. How many years did it take for you to complete your degree?
 4 years - 3
 5 years - 7
 6 years - 3
12. Do you intend to go to graduate school? If yes, in what field and with what specialization? What schools do you plan to apply to?
 Yes - 6
 No - 5
 Undecided - 7
13. Based on your experiences here, would you recommend the CSU Art Department to other students seeking art training? Yes - 10 No - 3
14. If yes, why?
 Quality of Instruction - 5
 Value for money - 4
 Well-rounded education - 3
15. If no, why not?
 Not an art-focuses school - 1
 Facility is poor quality - 1
 Standards are too low - 1
 Advising causes confusion - 1

Additional comments

.....Art 445 should be optional. Not everyone plans on being a web designer.

.....I enjoyed my time at CSU. My money was well-spent for what I got out of it.

.....Since I am an Art History major, three required studio classes is asking too much. More Art History classes would be better.

.....CSU is more affordable than CIA and the instructors are more down to earth.

.....I feel I received a good background and education here.

.....one really can't beat the quality of education at CSU. But when it comes to the facility, you get what you pay for.

....the CSU gallery has continued to uphold prominent respect among the art community.....

....I wish the University advisors and Art advisors would work together better. Because of their miscommunication I had to take an extra course after I was told I was on track.

ANNUAL STUDENT SHOW EVALUATION SUMMARY - 2006

Four Studio Art faculty completed rubric evaluation forms (5=highest;1=lowest).
Average of these scores listed below:

1.
 - a. Realistic drawing - 4.75
 - b. Expressive drawing - 4

2. Successful application of the following two-dimensional design elements:
 - a. Color - 4
 - b. Value - 5
 - b. Line - 4.25
 - c. Texture - 4.5
 - d. Shape - 4.5
 - e. Composition/Design - 4.25

3. Successful application of the following three-dimensional design elements:
 - a. Color - 3.75
 - b. Line - 4.5
 - c. Texture - 4.25
 - d. Form - 4.5
 - e. Space - 4.75
 - f. Composition/Design - 4.25

4. Successful development of concepts and content - 4.25

5. Technique/Craftsmanship - 4
6. Presentation - 4
7. Overall quality of work in this year's student show – 4.5

2006 STUDENT ART SHOW - JURORS' STATEMENTS

Reid Wood

Not all jurors work in the same way when jurying a show, so perhaps some comments about my methods would be in order. My first pass through the work was to see what pieces struck me immediately as ones that had to be included. These artworks had that combination of concept and process that resonated with me initially and continued to do so with every viewing. On the second pass I looked more carefully at each work and began making a list of yes, no, or maybe. During a third view I asked myself "is this work still as strong as it first appeared?" or "is there a reason to include this work that I eliminated previously. With my choices in hand I then joined the other two jurors, and we all discussed each work for inclusion or not. Often we had similar feelings about a piece, but sometimes we differed, and so more discussion followed. The resulting exhibition reflects not only our choices, but the breadth and depth of artwork at Cleveland State; I hope you will be engaged, moved and challenged by it.

Kim Schoel

It is most intriguing to observe the diverse ways in which students translate their ideas into 2-D and 3-D forms. Apart from the craftsmanship, choice and use of materials, I look for a spirit of curiosity, imagination, experimentation, and risk-taking. The student exhibit would have seemed more complete with a stronger representation of multimedia, digital and conceptual works. On the other hand, in an age that tends to emphasize technology, it is refreshing to see such wonderful examples in the more traditional fields of drawing, painting, printmaking, photography and sculpture.

Barbara Chira

First of all, I wish to thank all the students who entered for having the courage, and working hard, in order to do so. Whether or not your work was ultimately included in the show, you are to be commended for entering. Each and every one of your entries had merit, and contributed to the positive energy of the whole. Non- inclusion is never a judgment about the worth of your ideas or the form in which you work. So please keep working.

When I first entered the gallery space on jurying day, the work as a whole created an overall atmosphere of both aliveness and caring. That sense of aliveness seemed to come from an energy still resonating from the pieces themselves, a living record or residue of

the student artists' ideas, working processes, and perhaps even hopefulness about this exhibition opportunity. By caring, I probably mean respect for what one does, and for the realm of art in general. One way that caring shows itself is through craftsmanship.

Looking at each individual piece of art followed that first impression. Looking at a piece of art takes time. You cannot just glance at it; you must devote time to experiencing it. Just as a piece of music or a film occurs over time, so should our interaction with visual art. Be assured that each juror spent an open-ended (and open-minded) amount of time with each piece of artwork, and visited all of the artwork several times.

As I spent this quality time with each artwork, I was beginning to answer the general question, "How strong does this work compel me?" This is followed by a much more thorough analysis of my reaction to that work, but initial impressions most often hold true. For example, while each of the three jurors independently reviewed all of the work at least 3 times, when we regrouped and walked through the work together, we found that we had near complete agreement across each of our preliminary lists of strongest works. This is a good sign.

To explain a little about that "much more thorough analysis of my reaction to each work," there is probably an umbrella under which that analysis takes place – something like art for me being the skillful use of both intuition and intellect whose aesthetic result communicates some life force or even sense of sacredness. Do not confuse the use of the word sacredness. Here I mean evidence of the student's development of clear perception and pure expression, revealing or awakening a sense of truth.

Most of the time this traditionally implies idea or concept married to skillful technique. That is, a work that strongly compels the viewer to look at it, is also likely to have not only a fresh and honest artistic vision, but a college-appropriate level of masterfulness of manifesting that vision in form, media, genre, structure, and craft. (As a footnote, I wanted to emphasize, among so many other formal decisions, that in terms of scale, bigger is not at all necessarily better. As artists, we should continuously ask ourselves about scale in our work. What does it mean?)

There are also times when the vision or mark is so fresh or honest, that a work can be compellingly strong, despite technical skill level.

If number of awards reflects strength in the different categories, then perhaps there was a slightly stronger showing in both drawing and printmaking. Personally, I thought the number and/or quality of photo, printmaking and sculpture entries reflected a good deal of serious commitment and scholarship.

Every student entered works that selflessly invited us into their intimate worlds, and we thank you for that. The strongest works - those exhibited here - invite us time and time again. Congratulations, student artists! And congratulations SOFA for facilitating a superb show!

Graphic Design Supplemental Student Academic Achievements/Goals/Outcomes

Students:

1. Develop the ability to create and develop visual form in response to design problems, including an understanding of principles of visual organization/composition and application.
2. Develop the ability to describe and respond to clients and contexts that design solutions must address, including recognition of the physical, cognitive, cultural, and social human factors that shape design decisions.
3. Develop the ability to solve design problems, including the skills of problem identification, research, and information gathering, analysis, generation of alternative solutions, proto-typing and user testing, and evaluation of outcomes.

2006 AIGA STUDENT SHOW EVALUATION SUMMARY

One graphic design faculty evaluated the overall quality of the exhibition in the following categories, with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest:

1. a. Clarity of Communication 5
b. Appropriateness 5
2. Successful development of concepts and content.
 - a. Color 5
 - b. Typography 5
 - c. Hierarchy 5
 - d. Interval Contrast 4
 - e. Shape relationships 5
 - f. Use of Imagery 5
 - g. Overall Composition/Design 5
4. Successful development of concepts and content 5
5. Technique/Craftsmanship 5
6. Presentation 5
7. Overall quality of work in this year's student show. 5
8. Additional comments:

2006 MERIT SCHOLARSHIP REVIEW SCORES

(9 faculty voting – 5 point scale)

(Name – Score - Concentration(s) –Award)

High School

Thomas Koch - 31.5 - drawing, painting, sculpture - \$2900

Erica Williams - 21 - drawing, painting - \$0

Heidi Papczun - 35.5 - drawing, painting, ceramics - \$4700

Freshmen

Anna Tararova - 35.5 - drawing, painting, photography - \$4700

Juniors

Dan Corrigan - 35.5 – painting - \$4700

Joe Filak - 29 - sculpture - \$1800

Crystal Gioitta - 29 - graphic design - \$1800

Kathreen Hale - 30.5 – painting - 2500

DeAnna Domino – 12 - \$0

Nikki Mochado - 24 - graphic design - \$0

Kevin Schroeder - 34.5 - drawing, graphic design - \$4000

Matt Sullivan - 30.5 sculpture - \$1250 (fall semester only)

Seniors

Carlos Alvarez - 36.5 - painting, sculpture - \$2500 (fall semester only)

Cory Norris - 23 – painting - \$0

Bianca Roberts - 35.5 – sculpture - \$4700

Matt Russo - 29 - painting, drawing, graphic design - \$1800

2006 ART EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

Rubric scores for evaluation of student work in the Art Education:

Art 341 - Valuing Processes in Visual Arts

Knowledge - A

Understanding - A

Verbal Skill - B

Selection and articulation of lesson topic/objectives – A

Planning – A

Evaluation – B

Research – A

Analysis – B

Presentation – A

Art 441 – Art in Social and Vocational Contexts

Knowledge - A
Understanding - A
Verbal Skill - B
Research - B
Analysis - A
Presentation – A

2006 EXIT SURVEY SUMMARY – Graduate Art Major

(one student responding)

Do NOT fill out your name.

Please check your major area of study:

- Art Education - Secondary ___
- Art Education - Elementary ___
- Art History - American/Modern ___
- Art History - African/African-American ___
- Art History - Medieval ___
- Art History - Asian X
- Art History - other ___
- Art History - Architectural History
- Art History - Renaissance/Baroque

(Please answer questions 1 through 3 numerically, with 0 representing the lowest rating and 5 representing the highest rating).

16. Please rate your overall educational experience in Cleveland State University Art Department. _4_

17. How well do you think your educational experience increased your intellectual development? _5_

18. How well do you think your educational experience prepared you to reach your career goal(s)? _4_

19. Please rate the effectiveness of the following areas in the CSU Art Department:

- 3. Teaching _5_
- 4. Curriculum _5_
- 5. Advising _3_
- 6. Facilities/equipment _3_
- 7. Gallery _5_
- 8. Office staff _5_

20. Which class(es) did you find most beneficial? All of Donaldson's

21. Which class(es) did you find least beneficial? HIS 601 and HIS Seminar

22. How many years did it take for you to complete your degree? 2

23. Based on your experiences here, would you recommend the CSU Art Department to other students seeking education in art? Yes No

24. If you answered "yes" to question # 8, why?

I'm impressed with the faculty and their dedication to CSU and the students. There were some grad course offerings but there could be more variety. Although building is old it is still functional and comfortable (much like Art building at OSU) could be revamped. I enjoyed my experience a great deal and would recommend the Art Department to others but maybe not for some of the other areas of study. Although most people didn't know what was going on they were always willing to try to help (advising).

25. If you answered "no" to question # 8, why?

26. Additional comments:

2006 ART HISTORY ASSESSMENT

Rubrics for Evaluating Graduate Art History Papers:

Exemplary: Papers that demonstrate the ability to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts. Their analysis of causation and influences is fairly thorough. They demonstrate an understanding of content and context. They understand the visual aspects of works of art/architecture. They evidence research skills to find and evaluate the usefulness of source material and its appropriate applicability to the problem.

Proficient: Papers that show some ability demonstrate to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts relative to art/architectural history. They can apply concepts of chronology and causation. They draw from different perspectives, including formal ones, to examine issues. They are able to find and organize source material and apply it to a task.

Emerging: Papers demonstrate ability to explain issues of art/architectural historical content. They have a sense of historical sequence and understand that events in art/architectural history do not exist independently of each other. They can find and paraphrase source material and apply it to a problem.

Unacceptable: Papers do not demonstrate the ability to explain issues and concepts. Their explanations may be incomplete. They lack visual understanding of art/architecture. They view problems from a limited number of perspectives. Papers are below a basic level of acceptability in the field of art/architectural history.