

ART DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT 2007

Compiled by: Howie Smith, Chair

Art Department Assessment Committee

Samantha Baskind

George Mauersberger, Chair

Richard Schneider

ART DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT 2007 - 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 as 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.

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 and outcomes.

Goals

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

We have established several broad principal goals for all our courses and the baccalaureate program. All students are required to take both Studio Art and Art History classes. To clarify, as suggested in the 2006 Assessment Report Review, *these five goals apply to all students pursuing a B.A. degree in Art*. For example, Goal #1 addresses issues that would apply to both Art History courses (“the study...of works of art”) and Studio Art courses (“the...creation of works of art”).

1. To develop a student's perceptual and conceptual abilities through the study and creation of works of art.
2. To encourage the critical understanding of the relationship between art and society.
3. To provide a foundation for professional training.
4. To understand the issues and opportunities raised by the visual arts.
5. To 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 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 Education

Students in Art Education must also complete the Studio Art sequence. Their education component comes primarily 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

During 2004-2005, all aspects of the new assessment process began implementation. 2005-2006 was the second year of implementation, and the first year to include data from exit surveys. 2006-2007 is the second year to include results from the 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. After discussion, faculty agreed that a revised form, distributed to all students in 100 level Art classes, would gather information from a wider cross section of students, including but not limited to Art majors. Distribution of the new survey form began last year and continued this year.

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 mailed or given in person 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.
- Faculty evaluated Merit Scholarship applications.

Art Education

Faculty in Art Education completed rubric forms evaluating student work in the two required Art Education courses, Art 341 and Art 441.

Art History

Art History faculty devised rubrics for evaluating student papers and presentations in 2005. These rubrics are used to evaluate papers in ART 252, 253, 281, and 286, the introductory courses in western and non-western art. We also used the rubrics to evaluate students in seminar courses, all of which are listed as ART 495.

Art History faculty evaluated student work in a minimum of ten percent of introductory and seminar classes in Art History (twenty 200-level papers and eight seminar papers).

Findings

Entrance Surveys

Last year, the committee learned that twice as many students completing entrance surveys entered the program as transfer students, as compared to incoming freshmen. This year, that number increased with 32 new students entering the program as transfer students as compared to 7 entering as incoming freshmen.

Regarding career goals, the two largest numbers of entries were for Graphic Designer and Artist, with 25 listing Artist and 26 listing Graphic Designer. This mirrors last year's findings in which Artist and Graphic Designer were the most popular career goals indicated. Approximately half as many students (13) listed Teacher as the career goal.

In Studio Art, students were asked which studio areas they had the most interest in studying. Drawing (31), Graphic Design (27), and Painting (23) had the largest number of entries. Last year, Photography showed the largest number, but was ranked fourth in popularity this year.

In Art History, students again indicated the greatest degree of interest in studying Contemporary/Modern (31). Renaissance/Baroque (23) was next, followed by Asian (15). These findings are very similar to last year.

In response to why they have chosen to take classes at the Cleveland State University Art Department, the large majority cited Location, followed strongly by Affordability. The next largest percentage cited Faculty. Again, these findings mirror last year's. The survey form is included in the appendix.

Exit Surveys

2006-2007 is the second year that data from exit surveys is available for study. So far this year, we have received back 17 surveys of the 30 that were sent out. Students were asked to rate their experiences in the Art Department using a five point rating system in which 5 is the highest. The survey form is included in the appendix.

Regarding questions on their overall educational experience and intellectual development, the largest percentage rated these at 4, with the next largest percentage rating being 5. Regarding preparation for career goal(s) the largest percentage rated the department at 3, with 5 the next closest percentage. In rating the effectiveness of the specific areas, Teaching and the Art Gallery were rated highest at 3.8 and 3.9, respectively. Facilities and Equipment were again rated lowest at 2.7. Graduating students were also asked how many years it took them to complete their degrees. The average number of years to graduate was 5.04. The majority of students completing surveys said they would recommend the CSU Art Program to others.

Evaluation of Student Work

Studio Art

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

In looking at this year's results, students again received high marks for realistic drawing (5), and lower marks for expressive drawing (3.75). Regarding two-dimensional design elements, students improved in their use of two-dimensional texture (4.5), which was the lowest rated category last year (3.75).

In three-dimensional elements, students were rated highest in their use of form (5), and lowest in their use of space (3.5), which declined from last year's 4.75 rating. Marks in other categories were similar to last year's. The overall quality of this year's exhibition was rated at 4.25, as compared with 3.75 last year. There was a dramatic increase in the number of entries, from 130 last year to 201 this year.

The American Institute of Graphic Artists (AIGA) Student Exhibition - Organized and installed by students in the CSU AIGA Student Chapter, the AIGA Student Exhibition is open to all students in Graphic Design classes, including first year students. Supplemental goals and rubrics were devised by Graphic Design faculty, and the entries were evaluated by three faculty members in Graphic Design on a five point rating scale.. Students were rated at 4 in five categories and received the lowest average score of 3.3 in three categories. These scores were slightly lower than last year's in which students were rated at 5 in a larger number of categories.

Merit Scholarship applications – Students applied for scholarships by submitting six examples of their work on CD. This year, 9 students were chosen to receive scholarships ranging from \$3905 to \$4636. Using a quantitative rating system, applicants' artwork was graded on a scale of 1 to 10 by seven faculties. The highest possible score for each student was 70. The highest recorded score was 51 and the lowest was 26. The same number of students (19) applied as last year, with an increase in the number of incoming freshman applications (7) as compared to last year (3).

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). During two sales in 2006-2007, students sold a total of \$16,043, averaging \$8,021.

Art Education

Rubrics used a five point rating scale. Students in Art 441 were rated at 5 in seven categories and 4 in two categories, including Verbal Skill. Students in Art 341 were rated 5 in all categories with the exception of Verbal Skill, in which they were rated 4.

Art History

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

Review

Studio Art

Annual Student Exhibition – In reviewing the results of the faculty evaluation forms, there were not dramatic differences from last year's results, though the show was rated overall as being higher in quality than last year's (4.25 v. 3.75). The Assessment Committee suggests that some consideration may be given to increasing the expressive drawing component in drawing classes since, for the second year, students were rated low in this category as compared to realistic drawing. Being able to draw both realistically and expressively is one of the desired outcomes for our students. While Art Department enrollment was similar to last year, entries in the student show increased dramatically, a possible result of stronger publicity efforts by the Student Organization for the Fine Arts and their faculty advisor.

The American Institute of Graphic Artists (AIGA) Student Exhibition - A committee of three faculty members in Graphic Design completed rubric forms. With this year's show being rated overall as weaker than last year's, the Assessment Committee agrees that typographic skill should be given greater emphasis in classes and that discussion of a new course devoted exclusively to color theory should be considered.

Merit Scholarship applications – While the number of applications was identical to last year at 19, the number of new freshman applications jumped from 3 to 7, a possible result of the department's efforts to better publicize the program among high schools. A larger mailing of application forms was sent out this year.

Student Ceramics Sale - While a slightly down from previous years in the total amount of work sold, the Student Ceramic Sale continues to offer evidence that students are producing artworks which are at a professional level, based on their acceptance in the marketplace.

Art Education

While the students in Art Education were rated at 5 in most categories in both Art Education classes, for the second year in a row, in both Art 341 and Art 441, students received a lower rating of 4 in Verbal Skill.

Art History

Three seminars are taught per year, only by full-time tenure track faculty (Baskind, Curnow, Donaldson). Some differences were found between the writing skills of the students in the 200-level and 400-level classes, but in the end we believe that an exemplary paper depends on whether the student attends class and follows directions (there were two exemplary seminar papers, three emerging, and the rest were proficient).

For example, students in seminar are required to complete several assignments prior to turning in their final paper. Those students who complete their annotated bibliographies,

paper outlines, and rough drafts tend to write proficient or exemplary papers, in part because we mentor them through the process of writing a research paper.

In sum, we do not see a drastic difference between many 200-level and 400-level papers. Those students who are motivated or who came to CSU with some writing ability do fine. We believe that there needs to be a remedial writing/research course(s) for students.

One area that tends to improve, in writing but also especially verbally, is the students' ability to talk about art – to describe what they see in an articulate way and to begin to analyze what form, shape, color, and subject matter may contribute to meaning. This is encouraging as it suggests students will be able to “participate in and lead critiques of artwork and the aesthetic judgment making process” as described in Outcomes for students taking Art History classes.

Actions

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

Studio Art

- Continue to develop strategies for better publicizing the Merit Scholarship Program. While we had success in increasing the number of high school applicants as a result of mailing application forms to a greater number of high schools, we are considering other ways to increase the overall number of applicants, including, making the application form available for download on the Art Department website.
- Continuing faculty discussions of proposals for professional and advanced degree programs, based on student interest in professional and advanced training.
- Development of a concentration in Digital Photography/Multimedia, based on strong interest in Photography and Graphic Design. A draft of courses that might comprise a multimedia concentration has already been developed for faculty discussion next year.
- Consideration of a revised curriculum that might include a 200 level color theory course and an introductory digital art course.

Art Education

- Conducted a successful search for a full-time Art Education professor, completed her first year here.
- Since students were rated lower in Verbal Skill in both Art Ed courses, faculty may wish to consider adjustments to address this finding. However, since students still received a relatively high mark of 4 on this rubric, major changes to the curriculum do not seem warranted.

Art History

- Recommendation: having a required research course for all undergraduates in CLASS.
- Offer a broader range of art history courses (dependent on hiring new full-time faculty).
- Recommendation of a position in Art History, based on strong interest in

Contemporary/Modern, and Renaissance/Baroque, as indicated on entrance surveys.

General

- Consider what steps the department might take to better respond to the increasing number of transfer students entering our classes, in terms of curriculum, articulation agreements, etc.
- Achieve more prominent external signage for the Art Gallery. This was one of last year's goals that we have been told is being addressed. We hope to have new a new sign identifying the Art Gallery in place by Fall 2007.
- Build administrative support for a new Art Building. We have seen concrete progress in this area, with plans for a new building being developed by the administration, including the commissioning of architect's drawings. Exit surveys again rated "facilities/equipment" as the least effective area in the program. This speaks to the poor state of the Art Building, an aging structure that is clearly not recognized as a magnet-type facility.

ART DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT - 2007 - M.A. IN ART HISTORY

Background

The Art Department offers a very small graduate program in Art History as a specialization for the M.A. in History. (Twenty-four of the thirty-six credit hours required for this degree, including eight hours of thesis, are in Art History.) The small size of the program is due in large part to the limited number of full-time faculty. With only four tenure-track faculty members in Art History it is a challenge to attract new students and offer the variety of courses necessary for a successful graduate program. One new student was admitted this year, and only three other students are taking graduate-level classes. A handful of students are finishing their theses, some of which have been in progress for several years.

It should be noted that the small size of our faculty has a detrimental effect on our undergraduate students as well. At a school as large as CSU, to have an art history faculty where only one full-time professor teaches western art is shameful.

Goals

Goals 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 as 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

Evaluation of Student Work

- Evaluation is based on graduate student performance in seminar presentations and papers, colloquia, and theses. A committee of three Art History professors (our entire art history faculty) constituted the evaluation committee.

Findings

Entrance and Exit Surveys

We only admitted one new student this year so this method of evaluation is not available, nor would it be effective with a one to two person "group" to evaluate.

Evaluation of Student Work

Of current seminar work, one seminar paper/presentation was judged exemplary, one was judged emerging, and another bordered on unacceptable. (Note: we only have three graduate students taking classes at this time.)

One M.A. thesis and three colloquia: the rough draft of the thesis meets the goals elucidated for a proficient to exemplary paper (the final draft has not yet been evaluated). The colloquia were particularly strong; all three students gave effective (exemplary) professional presentations that developed original angles on their material and analyzed the source material critically.

Review

Evaluation of Student Work

This year's findings show improvement in each category. The final draft of this year's lone thesis was judged proficient to exemplary, whereas last year's completed thesis was judged emerging. Both colloquia in 2006 were rated emerging, while all three colloquia in 2007 were rated exemplary. Two seminar works last year were evaluated as emerging. This year one seminar work was rated exemplary and one was rated emerging. A third, however, was borderline unacceptable.

Actions

The actions for the graduate program in Art History mirror those at the undergraduate level.

- Recommendation to add a position in Art History, based on strong interest in Contemporary/Modern, and Renaissance/Baroque. A full-time position is even more important to the graduate program because only full-time faculty members in the Graduate College are able to direct thesis work.
- Offer a broader range of courses. As with the undergraduate program, this is dependent upon hiring additional faculty.

APPENDIX - ART DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT 2007

2007 Entrance Survey Results – Undergraduate Art Major

(52 students completed surveys)

1. Please check your current status:
 - a. Incoming freshman – 7
 - b. Transfer student - 32
 - a. Other - 12

2. Please check highest level of previous art training:
 - a. Elementary school - 0
 - b. Secondary school - 8
 - c. One to three college level art classes - 18
 - d. More than three college level courses - 26

3. What are your career goals? (Check as many as apply)
 - a. Artist - 25
 - b. Art Historian - 4
 - c. Art Teacher - 13
 - b. Graphic designer – 26
 - e. Other (please specify) – 3
(1 – Librarian, 1 – Museum Work, 1 – Fashion Design, 2 – Art Professor)

4. What studio art area do you have the greatest interest in studying? (Check as many as apply)
 - a. Ceramics - 9
 - b. Drawing - 31
 - c. Graphic Design - 27
 - c. Painting – 23
 - d. Photography - 15
4. Printmaking - 5
5. Sculpture - 11
Other (please specify) - 3 – (Illustration – 1, Communication Design, 1-Culinary Arts)

5. What art historical areas do you have the greatest interest in studying? (Check as many as apply)
 - a. Asian – 18
 - b. African/African-American – 15
 - c. Medieval - 15
 - d. Contemporary/Modern – 31
 - a. Decorative Arts – 15
 - b. Renaissance/Baroque – 23
 - c. Architecture – 17
 - d. Other (please specify) – 3 (Ancient Far Eastern – 1, Pre-historic – 1, Latin – 1)

6. Why have you chosen to take classes at the Cleveland State University Art Department?
(Check as many as apply)
 - a. Affordability - 39

- b. Facilities/Equipment - 12
- c. Location - 45
- d. Faculty - 20
- e. Gallery - 10
- Other (please specify) – 2 (Good Reputation – 1, First Time in School – 1)

2007 Exit Survey Results - Undergraduate Art Major

(17 responses)

Please check your major area of study:

- Art Education - 5
- Art History - Asian
 - African/African-American
 - Medieval
 - Contemporary/Modern - 1
 - Decorative Arts -
 - Renaissance/Baroque -
 - Other (please specify) -
- Studio Art - Ceramics - 1
 - Drawing - 4
 - Graphic Design - 2
 - Painting - 3
 - Photography - 2
 - Printmaking -
 - Sculpture - 3

(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 = 4
 - Grade 4 = 7
 - Grade 3 = 1
 - Grade 2 = 3
 - Grade 1 = 0
 - Grade 0 = 1
7. How well do you think your educational experience increased your intellectual development?
 - Grade 5 = 5
 - Grade 4 = 5
 - Grade 3 = 3
 - Grade 2 = 3
 - Grade 1 = 0
 - Grade 0 = 0
8. How well do you think your educational experience prepared you to reach your career goal(s)?
 - Grade 5 = 4
 - Grade 4 = 4
 - Grade 3 = 6
 - 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 = 7	Grade 5 = 5	Grade 5 = 8
Grade 4= 3	Grade 4= 4	Grade 4= 5
Grade 3= 3	Grade 3= 3	Grade 3= 2
Grade 2= 2	Grade 2= 2	Grade 2= 0
Grade 1= 1	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 = 2	Grade 5 = 5
Grade 4= 4	Grade 4= 3	Grade 4= 5
Grade 3= 3	Grade 3= 6	Grade 3= 3
Grade 2= 1	Grade 2= 2	Grade 2= 1
Grade 1= 2	Grade 1= 2	Grade 1= 1
Grade 0= 1	Grade 0= 1	Grade 0= 1

9. How many years did it take for you to complete your degree?
4 years - 4
5 years - 6
6 years - 2
10. 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
11. Based on your experiences here, would you recommend the CSU Art Department to other students seeking art training? Yes - 10 No - 3

2007 Annual Student Show Evaluation Summary

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

1.
 - a. Realistic drawing - 5
 - b. Expressive drawing – 3.75
2. Successful application of the following two-dimensional design elements:
 - a. Color - 4
 - b. Value – 4.5
 - b. Line – 4.25
 - c. Texture – 4.5
 - d. Shape - 3.5
 - e. Composition/Design - 4.5

3. Successful application of the following three-dimensional design elements:
 - a. Color – 4
 - b. Line - 4
 - c. Texture - 4.25
 - d. Form – 5
 - e. Shape - 3.75
 - f. Space – 3.5
 - g. Composition/Design - 4
4. Successful development of concepts and content - 4
5. Technique/Craftsmanship – 4.5
6. Presentation – 4.25
7. Overall quality of work in this year’s student show – 4.25

Graphic Design - Supplemental Student Academic Outcomes:

Assessment Goals for Studio Art Students concentrating in Graphic Design:

We teach students:

1. 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. 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. 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.

Rubrics scores for 2007 AIGA Student Design Exhibition:

Please rate the overall quality of the exhibition in the following categories, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest:

1.
 - a. Clarity of Communication - 3.6
 - b. Appropriateness - 4
2. Successful application of the following design elements:
 - a. Color - 3.6

- b. Typography - 4
 - c. Hierarchy - 4
 - d. Interval Contrast - 3.6
 - e. Shape relationships - 3.3
 - f. Use of Imagery - 4
 - g. Overall Composition/Design – 3.6
4. Successful development of concepts and content. - 4
 5. Technique/Craftsmanship - 3.3
 6. Presentation - 3.3
 7. Overall quality of work in this year's student show. - 3.6

2007 Student Art Exhibition Jurors' Statements

Dana L. Depew, Director, Asterisk Gallery, Tremont, OH.

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.

Charles T. Mayer, Director, Sandusky Cultural Center

I always find it a stimulating experience to jury an exhibit, especially one for young and emerging artists. Someone mentioned to me that one of the considerations in choosing the team of Dana Depew and me for this assignment was the considerable difference in our ages (I am a senior citizen; he is young), which it was thought might provide a strongly divergent aesthetic perspective. In actuality this didn't prove to be the case since we agreed easily on virtually every selection and award. I guess that might demonstrate that quality transcends age.

The exhibit we selected seems to me to be a quite conservative one. I guess I had hoped to be a little more challenged by ideas, but the few possibly 'difficult' works that were entered proved to be incompletely realized and therefore couldn't be adequately assessed. Despite some obvious technical facility, more than a few works didn't make the cut because of banal subject matter; conversely, some ideas weren't presented with

sufficient craft. I found special strengths in the areas of printmaking and drawing, and there are some fine paintings as well.

I especially want to thank the exhibit committee for their extra effort in making my participation possible. Everything conceivable was done to make our work as comfortable and easy as possible.

2007 Merit Scholarship Applications

******NAMES OF THE APPLICANTS PROVIDED HERE HAS BEEN DELETED TO ENSURE STUDENT DATA CONFIDENTIALITY.******

(Four Full-Time faculty voting – 10 point scale)

Name	Score	Award
..... Comments:	42	0
..... Comments:	45	4087
..... Comments:	20	0
..... Comments:	49	4450
..... Comments:	38	0
..... Comments:	50	4543
..... Comments:	51	4636
..... Comments:	37	0
..... Comments:	42	0
..... Comments:	37	0

.....	42	0
Comments:		
.....	44	399
.....	44	3998
Comments:		
.....	37	0
Comments:		
.....	43	3905
Comments:		
.....	48	4361
Comments:		
.....	26	0
Comments:		
.....	51	4636
Comments:		
.....	41	0
Comments:		

2007 Art Education Assessment

Rubrics for evaluation of student work in the Art Education – 2006/2007:

Art 341 - Valuing Processes in Visual Arts - Instructor – Oksun Lee

- Knowledge - 5
- Understanding - 5
- Verbal Skill - 4
- Selection and articulation of lesson topic/objectives – 5
- Planning – 5
- Evaluation – 4
- Research – 5
- Analysis of learning - 5
- Presentation – 5

Art 441 – Art in Social and Vocational Contexts - Instructor – Oksun Lee

- Knowledge - 5
- Understanding - 5

Verbal Skill - 4
Research - 5
Analysis - 5
Presentation - 5

2007 Art History Assessment

Rubrics for Evaluating 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 below a basic level of acceptability in the field of art/architectural history.