### PART ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expand and enhance the level of research/creative skills in graduate student’s selected media.</td>
<td>Fall Semester Review; graduate exhibition portfolio; Alumni survey of MA grads.</td>
<td>A portfolio of quality graduate level artworks that could be used in seeking exhibitions/grants in professional venues or admission to Master of Fine Arts degree programs including assistantships/fellowships/grants. Alumni survey question #2 item a: Overall quality of Art Department, and item b: Quality of your specific focus of studies in the Art Department, question #6 Quality of instruction in Major studio area, Minor studio area (with rating of 1=Low Quality to 5=High Quality).</td>
<td>Fall review: 9 out of 9 met expectation. Graduate exhibit/portfolio: 9 out of 9 met expectation. Alumni survey (2001 to 2006 grads) indicated results for Q#2 of 4.5 in overall quality of Art Department and 4.29 in quality of specific focus of studies, Q#6 of 4.67 in quality of instruction Major studio area, 5.0 in Minor studio area.</td>
<td>Masters Committee provides results of Fall review and Graduate Exhibit/portfolio to Graduate Coordinator. Results shared with departmental Graduate Committee. Results of MA in Art alumni survey shared with Graduate Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expand and enhance ability to form and defend judgements of quality and effectiveness of creative work.</td>
<td>Fall semester review; oral comprehensive examination of ideas, techniques, and formal solutions involved in the art works displayed for graduate exhibition; Alumni survey of MA grads.</td>
<td>Successfully complete fall review; pass oral examination for MA degree program. Alumni survey question #6 Quality of (a) instruction in Critical Analysis and (b) Art/Design History (with rating of 1=Low Quality to 5=High Quality).</td>
<td>Fall review: 9 out of 9 met expectation. Oral comprehensive exam for MA: 9 out of 9 met expectation. Alumni survey (2001 to 2006 grads) indicated results for Q#6 of 4.0 in quality of instruction of Critical Analysis and 4.0 in Art/Design History</td>
<td>Masters Committee provides results of Fall review and oral examination to Graduate Coordinator. Results shared with departmental Graduate Committee. Results of MA in Art alumni survey shared with Graduate Faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Provide additional education to enhance the professional development of art educators including creative and teaching skills.

| Graduate exhibition portfolios; MA in Art with Option in Art Education oral comprehensive examination of research paper; student and supervisor evaluations of GA teaching; COEPS Advanced Candidate Assessment of MA in Art with option in Art Ed graduate students at entry, mid-point, and completion of program; Alumni survey of MA grads. | A portfolio of quality graduate level artworks; pass oral examination for MA in Art with Option in Art Ed degree program; on student evaluation of GA teaching a average mean score between 1.0 and 2.0 to exceed expectation, between 2.0 and 3.0 to met expectation, and between 5.0 and 3.0 is below expectations; from COEPS Advanced Candidate Assessment an overall rating of Proficient or Developing or Unacceptable; Alumni survey question #10: What were influence of opportunities on personal career development (with rating of 1=No Influence to 5=Tremendous Influence), and question #17: Rate assistantship according to (a) Contribution to personal and career development and (b) Preparation for subsequent professional responsibilities(with rating of 1=Terrible to 5=Excellent). | Graduate exhibit/portfolio: 9 out of 9 met expectation. Oral comprehensive exam for MA in Art Ed: No oral exams given AY07. Student evaluation of GA teaching: 4 exceeded expectations, 1 met expectations; COEPS Advanced Candidate Assessment: 2 graduate students in MA in Art with option in Art Education assessed at mid-point in program were rated as Proficient; Alumni survey (2001 to 2006 grads) indicated results for Q#10 of 4.57 in Independent studio work, 2.8 in collaborative projects, 4.5 in Participation in exhibitions, and for Q#17 (a) 4.5 in Contribution and (b) 4.25 in Preparation. | Masters Committee provides results of Fall review and oral examination to Graduate Coordinator. TA supervisor provides teaching evaluations to Graduate Coordinator and Student evaluations are tabulated by Art Office. Results shared with departmental Graduate Committee; results of COEPS Advanced Candidate Assessment shared with graduate faculty in Art Education; results of MA in Art alumni survey shared with Graduate Faculty. |

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

**PART TWO**

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

For AY2007-2008, as in previous years, the faculty of the various studio areas of the department engage in refinements of the curriculum based on the needs of the individual graduate student; this is usually a mutually agreed upon program of study that will facilitate the graduate student in meeting his/her education goals. At the fall review the graduate student’s masters committee reviews his/her progress and recommends or
suggests a direction of study based on the artwork presented (portfolio review). This arrangement has proved to be very effective in allowing the graduate student to realize and develop the potential of his/her creative work for the Graduate Exhibition in the Spring Semester. During the Spring semester the graduate student’s masters committee will meet with the student to review artwork completed (usually completed since the fall review) for the graduate exhibition and again the graduate faculty will provide direction and set expectations for the graduate student. The graduate oral examination takes place while the graduate student’s art is on exhibit at the Tarble Arts Center; the graduate student is expected to explain, evaluate, and defend his/her artwork in a manner that demonstrates knowledge of the art process(es) used to create the artwork, use of the elements of design, and how the subject matter/content is articulated visually. In addition, the graduate students in the MA in Art program had the opportunity to be critiqued by four (4) visiting art professionals. The graduate coordinator conferred with each visiting artist after he/she had conducted individual critiques with graduate students; the general response from these professionals was the graduate program has high standards and the graduate students are producing artwork that meets those high standards.

As part of NCATE Self-Study the Art Department will assess MA in Art with Option in Art Education students at three points in the program; during AY2007-2008 two students were assessed at the mid-point in the program.

In Spring 2008 the Art Department conducted an Alumni Survey for 2001-2006 graduates. Responses were tabulated in late May and will be share with faculty in Fall 2008. Alumni rated the quality of the department as High (average score of 4.5 with 5 being High Quality); alumni responses to questions specific to learning objects are noted above. 85.7% of the MA alumni indicated the program adequately prepared them to complete the graduate exhibition requirements and 85.7% of the MA alumni would recommend the EIU Art Department to someone considering art/design studies.

Responses to CASA Director’s AY 2005-2006 comments:

Learning Objectives – COEPS Advanced Candidate Assessment does assess effective oral and written communication skills. Alumni Survey rated quality of instruction in: (a) major studio area at 4.67 (with 5.0 being High Quality), (b) minor studio area at 5.0, (c) critical analysis at 4.0, (d) art/design history at 4.0. These results indicate overall program is very effective at meeting expectations of students.

How, Where, and When Assessed – Department may elect to conduct Alumni survey every 3-5 years (rather than waiting 7 to 10 years) to get responses from alumni at a similar point after graduation.

Expectations – Review expectations may lack specificity, but each Masters Committee conducts a very demanding review that continues to result in the student's artwork and conceptual considerations improving. Alumni survey responses indicate satisfaction with program and rate quality of instruction as high.

Results – Department does not have an instrument that formally measures the "expand and enhance" of students work during the course of the year, but we see growth and change (usually for the better) during the academic year. Will need to confer with graduate coordinator and graduate committee and consider development of instrument since program is going to revise the critique/review structure for AY2008-2009.

How Results Will be Used – Timeline for surveys are connected to formal program reviews by IBHE (Spring 2008) and NASAD (Spring 2009). Department may elect to conduct Alumni survey every 3-5 years (rather than waiting 7 to 10 years) to get responses from alumni at a similar point after graduation.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment
program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and
in past years, what are your plans for the future?

The graduate faculty are closely involved with the assessment of MA students through direct instruction and masters’ committee reviews (fall
review, review of artwork and artist statement for graduate exhibition, and review of comprehension (oral examination)). These assessment
processes have continued to be effective in raising and maintaining the academic performance of the students. However, as a result of discussions
with visiting artists who teach in MFA programs it was determined the graduate student in additional experiences in group critiques to be better
prepared for MFA program. The alumni survey also indicated this an important element in their educational experience; MA in Art grads rated the
importance as 4.5 (with 5 being Very Important). The department plans to implement a series of group critiques that will replace individual Master
Committee reviews in the Fall (mid-term and end of term) and Spring (prior to graduate exhibition). Graduate Committee with evaluate change at
end of AY2009.

Graduate teaching assistants are required to take a Art 5850, Teaching Practicum, a one-semester hour credit courses offered in the Fall Semester;
the instructor of the course also is assigned the teaching assistantship supervision. The Alumni Survey respondents rated the assistantship
experience at 4.5 (out of 5 being Excellent) in contributing to personal and career development, 4.25 in preparation for subsequent professional
responsibilities, and 4.0 in supervision, guidance, and attention received from faculty supervisor. Expect supervision, guidance, and attention
received to improve with department moving back to campus beginning Fall 2008 that will allow supervisor and grads to be in closer proximity;
future alumni surveys should answer that question.

Department continues to get informal assessment information from visiting artists; these professionals conduct individual graduate critiques.
Department hopes to develop a survey instrument which can be used for a more formal assessment of MA in Art program by visiting art
professionals.