

Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2007-08

Department/Program: **Art Education**

Degree program(s): **MA Art Education**

Person(s) preparing report: Linney Wix

Date submitted: 11/4/08

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

See attached assessment grid.

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered.

See attached assessment grid.

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

An art education faculty member has entered required NCATA data on a regular basis since 2007. The faculty have not made a practice of accessing and using the numerical data because the results did not seem relevant to student learning. Data have been useful in tracking students preparing for and completing student teaching. Overall, however, data have been entered as required but not used to determine student learning or program success.

4. Describe the departmental process by which faculty reviewed the assessment procedures and results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them.

The CARC develops systems to document assessment to ensure consistency in reporting across the COE. Assessment data are entered into the COEAS by program coordinators. This system generates reports by semester and type of assessment. Program coordinators share these data with their program faculty. Program faculty then discuss the results of the assessments and how they inform faculty about their students' learning. Faculty also examine what the results indicate about the effectiveness of the program overall. Finally the faculty consider whether the assessment method does accurately and effectively evaluate SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. Programs report and discuss results of their assessments at Department Meetings. Department Chairs then share the results of assessment at the College level. The CARC meets regularly to examine college-wide assessment procedures. The chair of CARC and the Associate Dean in charge of assessment meet

with Departments and programs to help evaluate and develop ongoing assessment systems that are manageable, effective, and meaningful.

5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that were implemented in response to the assessment processes and results.

The art education faculty are interested in exploring how an assessment system can be made relevant in the area of Art Education. The faculty decided to go back to their mission statement and identify what is unique about art education. Faculty decided to focus on finding ways to assess student learning in regard to developing diverse aesthetic approaches to instruction and learning in classrooms. The faculty are concerned that evaluating this area will require a system that goes beyond numbers. The faculty are considering innovative ways of collecting “data” that will be useful to the program. For example, an interesting question raised by the faculty relates to how studio art classes relate to actual teaching practice. This may require a more longitudinal and qualitative assessment that may present logistical challenges.

6. **Given the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the next year (2008-09). If significant changes have been made to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy, please clearly describe. (Remember that half of all assessment measures must be direct measures of student learning (see link in #2 above).)**

The art education faculty are discontinuing assessments that did not yield useful data and are exploring ways in which more qualitative and visual methods may be used to collect data in a way which is meaningful to the students and faculty.

NCA Assessment Grid: MA Art Education

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/ Univ. Goal	Assessment/**PIP/ Course if applicable	Direct/ Indirect	Score Range	Pass Score
Prepare arts professionals who understand the visual arts in relation to diverse histories, cultures and aesthetic approaches	Synthesize and apply knowledge of aesthetic approaches as they relate historically and culturally with visual arts	*U, P, I K, S, R	MA exam <i>PIP 4</i>	D	0-2	1
	Students will apply evidence based learning that reflects knowledge of diverse aesthetic approaches in instruction	*U, P, I K, S, R	All MA/License Coursework <i>PIP 2/3</i>	I	0-4.4	3.0

* COE Conceptual Framework for Student Learning Outcomes: U – Understandings, P – Practices, I – Identities

* University of New Mexico Student Learning Goals: K – Knowledge, S – Skills, R – Responsibilities

Each element within the COE conceptual framework (U, P, I) aligns with the corresponding UNM student learning goal (K,S,R)

Three-year Plan – Program will continue to add (or select) a minimum of one *priority* learning goal and two associated student learning objectives each Fall semester that will be assessed in the corresponding academic year. The SLO’s will be assessed for ALL students in the program and data from the assessments entered into the electronic COE Assessment System for both Fall and Spring semesters. Program coordinators will share these data with their program faculty and faculty will discuss the results of the assessments. Finally, the faculty will consider whether the assessment methods have accurately and effectively evaluated the priority SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. An “Annual Program Report” on the findings and discussions of faculty will be submitted by the program to the Department Chair each year.

****PIP (Points in Program)**, – The College of Education, as part of the NCATE accreditation process, developed a “Points in Program - PIP” gateway assessment procedure for tracking students progress through the program. This tracking system has been adopted by all programs across the COE. In this system, student learning objectives are assessed at PIPS 2,3, & 4. The PIP system is described below.

PIP 1 – Admission requirements

PIP 2 – Assessments that occur during program coursework

PIP 3 – Assessments directly related to Field Experiences (student teaching, internships, etc)

PIP 4 – Program Exit assessments (licensure exams, final projects, comprehensive exams, theses/dissertation defenses, etc)

Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning MA Art Education

Report Elements	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Unacceptable 1	Score for each Element
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	3
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	2
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	3
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	3
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	3

<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	3
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	2
<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	3
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	3
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2008-09), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	<i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i>	<i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i>	<i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i>	3