

Texas A&M International University Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted February 14, 2007

Assessment Period Covered (2006)

Academic Program/AES Unit Department of Fine and Performing Arts/Bachelor of Arts in Art

Person(s) Preparing Review Dr. Richard Wright

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented

FPA faculty members met and recommended that more data is necessary to analyze and use results as very few graduates on this degree last year represented limited data. This degree was approved in fall 2003.

Section I: Planning and Implementation
--

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission

Department of Fine and Performing Arts/Bachelor of Arts in Art.

Department/College/University Goal(s) Supported:

To fulfill the University mission in offering baccalaureate programs in the arts, as well as the commitment to the preparation of students for leadership roles in professions related to the fine and performing arts. (1) The students' knowledge and appreciation of culture, fine arts, social integration, and self-realization.

Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students completing the Bachelor of Arts in Art will attain a basic and satisfactory competence in the history of art, within the broader context of a liberal-arts education.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1

2.12 To provide quality instruction to prepare graduates for leadership roles in their chosen profession. Furthermore, to fulfill the University mission in offering baccalaureate programs in the arts, as well as the commitment to the preparation of students for leadership roles in professions related to the fine and performing arts. (1) The student's knowledge and appreciation of culture, fine arts, social integration, and self-realization.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

(1) Portfolio of writing assignments; (2) Locally generated survey.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

1) Using a rubric developed by the Art faculty and derived in part from principles spelled out in the Handbook of the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) for liberal-arts majors in Art, portfolios of art history exams and essays from students taking ARTS 3353 will be assessed by a panel of three judges. (ARTS 3353 is the closest thing to a summative art-history course "experience" for our majors. It has lower-level art-history prerequisites and recommended prior coursework in other art-history classes, is required for graduation, is now offered every spring, and is writing-oriented.) Only two of the judges shall be fulltime faculty members in Art. The outcome will be achieved if 60% of the portfolios receive scores at the "satisfactory" (three points) or "excellent" level (four points) on a four-point holistic scale.

2) 60% of all students anonymously completing the Cumulative Art History Knowledge Survey administered by a fellow student during the time block allotted for end-of-term Student Evaluations in ARTS 3353 will agree with the statement, "My competence in the techniques, concepts, and media I am studying in other art classes has been strongly enhanced by the historical and critical perspectives I have gained in the courses I have taken at TAMIU in art history."

Outcome 2

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students completing the Bachelor of Arts in Art will attain basic technical proficiency in at least two media.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2

2.12 To provide quality instruction to prepare graduates for leadership roles in their chosen profession. Furthermore, to fulfill the University mission in offering baccalaureate programs in the arts, as well as the commitment to the preparation of students for leadership roles in professions related to the fine and performing arts. (1) The student's knowledge and appreciation of culture, fine arts, social integration, and self-realization

Identify methods of assessment to be used

(1) Local tests; (2) Alumni survey.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

1) 50% of students in 2000-level classes (including majors, possible majors, and non-majors) will attain basic proficiency in the following learning outcomes: (i) understanding of the materials employed to make art in the assigned medium, (ii) the technical aspects of execution in the medium taught, and in (iii) aspects of artistic composition that are specific to the medium taught. Quizzes, tests, reports, and other assignments will be given at various points during the term. Such assignments usually focus on aspects of these three outcomes. In part, these assignments will draw on competency-based expectations for liberal-arts majors in Art that are related to the three outcomes specified in this paragraph, and derived from the most recent edition available of the Handbook of the National Association of School of Art and Design (NASAD).

2) 50% of responding alumni who hold this degree, surveyed two years after graduation, will provide generally positive responses to questions concerning the general relevance of problem-solving skills and learning strategies, developed initially in their attempts to master medium-related technical standards at the ARTS 2000 level, to the mastery of new technical tasks in post-college occupational life.

Outcome 3

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students completing the Bachelor of Arts in Art will be prepared to continue producing their work for personal self-realization and growth after graduation, and/or to display and exhibit their work in a professionally coherent way to public audiences.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3

2.12 To provide quality instruction to prepare graduates for leadership roles in their chosen profession. Furthermore, to fulfill the University mission in offering baccalaureate programs in the arts, as well as the commitment to the preparation of students for leadership roles in professions related to the fine and performing arts. (1) The student's knowledge and appreciation of culture, fine arts, social integration, and self-realization

Identify methods of assessment to be used

(1) Judging of artist statements; (2) Alumni survey.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

- 1) Each student displaying art in the annual Senior Exhibit will prepare an Artist's Statement to accompany their work. Using a rubric developed by the Art faculty and derived in part from principles spelled out in the Handbook of the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) for liberal-arts majors in Art, a three-person panel (only two of which are full-time TAMIU faculty members in studio art) will evaluate each student statement according to a rubric-based, holistic, four-point scale. The outcome will be achieved if 70% of the statements receive scores that are equivalent to at least a 70% grade on the four-point scale (i.e., 70% of 4=2.8, so the holistic score must average out to 2.8 or better).

- 2) At least 50% of responding alumni who hold this degree, surveyed two years after graduation, will provide generally positive responses to questions concerning their ongoing creative self-fulfillment and development.

Section II: Analysis of Results

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?

Outcome 1

Spring and Fall 2006

Outcome 2

Spring and Fall 2006

Outcome 3

Spring and Fall 2006

What were the results attained (raw data)?

Outcome 1

[**NOTE: All collected data reported here is combined for both the BA in Art and the BA in Art with All-Level Certification due to the relatively small sample.**] Criterion 1: 52.6% (10 of 19) scored at 2.67 or higher; 42.1% (8 of 19) scored at 3 or higher. Goal was 60% at 3 or higher. DID NOT MEET GOAL. Criterion 2: 10 of 14 responding (71.4%) responded either "agree strongly" or "agree." MET GOAL, which was 60% in agreement.

Outcome 2

Criterion 1: For CY 2006, 67.1% of students (63 of 85) averaged a grade of 70 or above. Goal was 50%. MET GOAL. Criterion 2: can't be administered yet--too few graduates; program began in 2003.

Outcome 3

Criterion 1: 55.6% (5 of 9) earned an average score of 2.8 or better. Goal was 70% meeting this score. DID NOT MEET GOAL. Criterion 2: can't be administered yet--too few graduates; program began in 2003.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?

Outcome 1

Richard Wright, Janet Krueger, Reuben Njaa

Outcome 2

Alma Haertlein, Janet Krueger, Reuben Njaa, Alan Holmgreen; computations by Richard Wright

Outcome 3

Richard Wright, Janet Krueger, Reuben Njaa

When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to assessment@tamiu.edu (Please use Minutes Template located on the [Project INTEGRATE](#) web page.)

Via email, Feb. 12, 2007. A full real-time meeting was not held since the data for some criteria is still nonexistent, and this is only the first year data has been analyzed.

NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?

Outcome 1

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: One criteria met; one not. The writing-based criteria were where we fell short this year. (NOTE: Some of what follows will also apply to Outcome 3.) It occurs to me that we have only a "50% passing" threshold for things like in-class quiz-grade averages, but we placed the passing threshold for the more complex, upper-level writing-based assignments (exams, statements) at 60% and 70%. This is probably unrealistic and not completely logical (to increase the expected percentage of those "passing" as the complexity of the assignments increase)--the direction of the scaling should probably be reversed and made a bit more modest, especially since the best art students in Laredo schools and LCC are not matriculating at TAMIU at the current time--we teach a lot of kids right from the basics of Square One, with little or no previous background in things like making and discussing art. In short, simpler assignments should have higher thresholds for passing than relatively more complex assignments, not vice-versa. Also, writing skills for many college students in Laredo still need significant work as a Laredo Morning Times article reports this week. We need to work harder at this.

At the same time, the data was not as complete as it could have been due to lackadaisical record keeping on my part. No portfolio contained more than two items, and some only contained one exam. More confidence in drawing conclusions from data will be attained if the portfolios are more complete (and thus more representative). Finally: another reason the success-rate scaling should probably be made more modest is that all writing in ARTS 3353 is done in class, as a one-shot draft. (Research papers are not assigned because a large majority of the students in ARTS 3353 are not Art History minors; there is no major in Art History at TAMIU.) A lot of the writing by the better students can thus be seen as more impressive in this light--many of the students have solid writing abilities by the end of their Art degree.

Outcome 2

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Met..but one criterion has yet to be implemented due to lack of graduates so far. Acceptable success rates should probably be heightened for Criterion 1 of this outcome because the items graded here are more often quiz- or short-answer-like in nature and not as

complex as in longer essay writing (see discussion for Outcome 1). The projected threshold for success was fairly easily met and thus will be raised.

Outcome 3

Met **Not Met**

Provide narrative: Not met..although one criterion cannot be implemented yet, so negative conclusion here must remain for now a bit qualified. See discussion about illogical scaling of acceptable success rates in Outcome 1 discussion above. We have also been discussing among ourselves this week (informally in-person and via email exchange) whether or not the NASAD-related rubric we've devised might be too complex for something as straightforward and relatively concise as an Artist's Statement; the analytical worth of the rubric might be more suited to longer essays. We will devise a rubric for use this semester that's better suited to Statements than Essays.

How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?

Too soon to tell. Data amounts are not large in many cases, and some outcome criteria cannot be employed until more graduates are around to be surveyed.

Section III: Programmatic Review

Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II? Yes No

If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:

Funding	Physical	Other
<input type="checkbox"/> New resources required	<input type="checkbox"/> New or reallocated space	<input type="checkbox"/> Primarily faculty/staff time
<input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation of current funds		<input type="checkbox"/> University rule/procedure change only
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:
Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation):
New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below):
Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification):

**** This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president ****

Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?

Yes No

Comments:

Enter text here

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?

Enter text here