**SJSU Annual Program Assessment Form**

**Academic Year 2016-2017**

**Instructions**
1. Complete the attached form and submit it as an email attachment to *Graduate and Undergraduate Programs* (academicassessment@sjsu.edu) on or before **March 1, 2017**.

2. Please copy your college’s Associate Dean and *Assessment Facilitator* on the email submission. Assessment Facilitators are also available to provide support - please feel free to contact them with any questions or concerns.

3. Completed forms will be posted on your *Program Records webpage*.

This report is organized into three sections designed to organize your annual assessment efforts and to inform your department’s Program Planning. Here is the rationale behind each section.

**Part A – The Big Picture**
- This section will likely only need to be prepared once at the beginning of your assessment cycle, although it should be reviewed each year and updated as necessary. This information should be included in each annual report, even if it has not changed.
- This section lists your Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and, more importantly, how they connect with your curriculum within the program and the *University Learning Goals* (ULGs).
- Finally, this section presents your assessment plan for the current planning cycle in the form of a multi-year schedule (usually 5 years, updated as part of Program Planning). This schedule should indicate which PLO(s) will be assessed each year, as well as your plans for implementing changes based on assessment results, and re-assessment after changes have been given time to take effect.

**Part B – What We Did This Year**
- This section details your assessment efforts over the last year (AY 2016-17).
- Which PLO(s) were assessed, how was the data collected, and what do the data tell you with regard to student achievement on this PLO? What do you plan to do, if anything, to improve future achievement levels (i.e., “close the loop”)?

**Part C – Keeping Track of the Changes (“Closing the loop”)**
- This section is meant to keep a running record of your efforts to improve your students’ outcomes. This table should grow throughout your assessment cycle and will be an important part of your next Program Plan.
- Create a new row in the table each time you propose a change as a result of your assessment efforts. Then be sure to keep track of your change efforts in subsequent years.
Part A
1. List of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

PLO1. Will be able to analyze and research visual and conceptual problems and both apply and explain their sophisticated use of the elements and principles of art to solve those problems. Our graduates will be artists capable of studio practice and exhibition at the professional level, in addition to other, parallel career possibilities such as curators, gallery directors, art critics, etc.

PLO2. Will be able to demonstrate master-level technical capabilities and skills relevant to their areas of expertise (Photography) upon exit from the program, and be able to explain and evaluate degrees of success/failure in individual and group critiques. Prior to participation in a final thesis exhibition, MFA candidates will have demonstrated professional-level technical, conceptual and intellectual abilities through ATC (Advancement to Candidacy), and through frequent faculty and peer critiques, evaluations by thesis committee members, and in solo and group exhibitions.

PLO3. Will demonstrate their commitment to valuing art’s role in offering cultural critique and addressing issues of social responsibility in a global society. As graduate students, our MFA candidates will demonstrate their understanding of the values of contemporary art in their visual and written responses to class assignments in area and interdisciplinary seminars and in the successful articulation of their ideas in exhibitions, artist. As creative professionals, our graduates will have the potential to assume leadership roles in engaging with social and cultural change—as teachers, as critics, as spokespersons for important issues which cannot yet be imagined.
PLO4. will apply their knowledge of visual history and theory to their creative endeavors and to their professional practice. They will be able to speak and write clearly about art and global culture and demonstrate their understanding of the contemporary and global art world. They will demonstrate their ability to place their own work within the broader context of historical and contemporary art and theory through their visual and written responses to class assignments in area and interdisciplinary seminars and in the successful articulation of their ideas in exhibitions, artist statements and written thesis upon exit from the program. Our graduates will commit to continued professional engagement with intellectual issues in contemporary art and culture.

PLO5. Will not only be capable of studio practice and exhibition at the professional level but also will have demonstrated the ability to organize and present technical and intellectual information and to lecture/teach. Those students who seek teaching options while still in graduate school will be mentored in classroom assistant capacity for two semesters, carefully screened for a teaching pool, trained as teachers, and carefully evaluated when hired as Teaching Associates. We expect our graduates to be experienced and professional teachers.

2. Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULGs)
(Please indicate how your PLOs map to the University Learning Goals below by listing the PLO under each relevant ULG, or including this map in table form (see examples here). Use the link above for a full description of each ULG.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOs</th>
<th>1. art knowledge</th>
<th>2. art skills</th>
<th>3. art values</th>
<th>4. hist/theory</th>
<th>5. prof prep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Knowledge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Integrative Knowledge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Skills</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Knowledge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Global Responsibilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix developed through consensus of the department’s program coordinators

ULGs: [http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/S13-2.pdf](http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/S13-2.pdf)

3. Alignment – Matrix of PLOs to Courses
(Please show in which courses the PLOs are addressed and assessed. The curriculum map should show increasing levels of proficiency and alignment of curriculum and PLOs. See examples here)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 art knowledge</th>
<th>2 art skills</th>
<th>3 art values</th>
<th>4 hist/theory</th>
<th>5 prof prep</th>
<th>Assessed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u.d. studio courses* 6-hr/wk, each w/portfolio of assignments, critiques</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate tutorials (supervised individ. work)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ART 281 and other graduate seminars | a | a | a | a | a | AGC
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
ART 276 Artists teaching ART | a | a | a | A | AGC
Teaching associate position— when available, when selected for teaching pool | A | area, coord AGC, SOTES
ART 200W Writing/thesis book prep. | a | a | a | AGC
Art history (6 units upper-division | a | a | area
ART 282A/B Contemp art, theory | a | A | area,
1st semester review presentation, portfolio | a | a | a | AGC
1st year review presentation, portfolio | A | A | A | A | a | AGC
ATC - Advancement to Candidacy exhibition, formal presentation | A | A | A | A | a | AGC

a = addressed
A = assessed

feedback loop:
area = current faculty who teach courses in a program area such as Pictorial Art, Photography and meet 2-8 times/semester for planning and assessment purposes; areas have coordinators
coord = program (area) coordinator committee—coordinators of the 6 areas who meet monthly
curric = curriculum committee which consists of program coordinators + liaison to college curric comm who meet as necessary
AGC = art graduate committee: faculty from all areas with special interests in BFA/MFA + student reps who meet monthly

4. **Planning – Assessment Schedule**
(Please provide a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that specifies when a PLO will be assessed (A), when you might plan to implement changes as a result of your assessment (I), and, if applicable, when you might reassess a given PLO (R) to gauge the impact of the change. All PLOs should be assessed at least once during each program planning cycle (usually 5 years). Add rows and columns as necessary.)

See next page
ongoing, continuous feedback loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2016-17 | A: Required Graduate courses evaluated by area regularly.  
I: Recommendations made to curriculum committee as needed;  
R: Changes made when deemed necessary.  
A: staffing of interdisciplinary grad seminars determined by program coordinator committee to maintain a diverse and highly qualified rotation of faculty;  
I: AGC meets monthly and recommends needed changes to curriculum and needed conditions to be placed on students with weaknesses in PLOs;  
R: Suggested changes are implemented  
A: 2 elected student representatives sit on AGC and raise issues as needed - provide student feedback;  
A: 1st semester review, 1st year review, ATC (2 days of presentations + exhibitions)—each attended by all ART faculty; faculty committee of 3 serves on ATC pre-thesis committee.  
R: Student may opt to maintain or change committee members to later support and review written thesis and thesis show;  
A: teaching associate interviews are conducted by areas and teaching associates are mentored by area coordinators + department chair |
| 2017-18 | as above |
| 2018-19 | as above |
| 2020-21 | Process may change, to some degree, based on suggestions made by NASAD  
Next NASAD accreditation cycle: 2020-2030 |
| 2020-21 | Continue ongoing feedback loop, based on changes (if deemed necessary), after NASAD review. |

5. **Student Experience**

(PLOs should be described with student-friendly terms. Provide a weblink that points to your PLOs. The weblink should be one-click away on your department/program homepage. Quick links on the right side panel, menu items on the top or side panel, or explicit links on your department/program homepage are one-click away links.)

a. How are your PLOs and the ULGs communicated to students, e.g. websites, syllabi, promotional material, etc.

PLOs have not been systematically communicated to students, but materials regarding expectations for each landmark event (1st Semester Review, 1st Year Review, ATC, MFA written thesis and thesis exhibition) are disseminated to graduate students by area advisors, the Graduate Coordinator (head of the AGC) and Administrative Analyst/Specialist Elizabeth Quintana, who works on necessary
administrative paperwork with grads in the Art and Art History Departmental Office, throughout their
time with us. As they progress through our program. They also actively participate in public review
activities.

b. Do students have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding your PLOs and/or the assessment
process? If so, please briefly elaborate.

There are two elected reps on the AGC—where all policy and assessment matters for the Department’s
MFA programs are discussed. Students also work closely with faculty, through tutorials (independent
studies), teaching assistantships, and studio visits. The Photo faculty in particular, regularly invites
feedback from students, including and especially grads. SOTES are also provided for graduate level
courses, where students my anonymously comment on their perception of the course strengths and
weaknesses. Program Coordinator, Valerie Mendoza, applied for and was granted assigned time for
Spring 2018, when she returns from sabbatical. Mendoza will actively engage with students through
meetings and surveys, as well as FT and PT area faculty, with the specific intended purpose of improving
student experience/success, including grad success.

Part B

6. Assessment Data and Results
(Please briefly describe the data collected for this report (e.g., student papers, posters, presentations,
portfolios, assignments, exams). The instruments used to evaluate student achievement (e.g., rubrics or
other criteria) and actual data (e.g., assignment description or instructions) should be attached as
appendices. PLOs should be evaluated based on direct assessments of learning, not grades earned by
students)

Last year report stated: "The Department retains ATC applications and thesis books." While this is true,
there are many other means of evaluating grad student success, including, but not limited to, tracking
successful outcomes after graduation, for which there are many (teaching positions, exhibitions,
speaking engagements at professional conferences, etc.).

The problematic (University and CSU initiated) conditions described in this section of the BFA Annual
Program Assessment for Photography, impact MFA students as well, but to a lesser degree, since their
actual program of study has not been impacted in recent years by university austerity. The undergrad
BFA program of study was reduced, from 132 units to 120. No such change took place in the MFA
program. However, the reduced number of FT faculty negatively impacts grads, as does reduction of
director release time and increased administrative workload, since faculty workload is increased by
all of these factors, and FT faculty members have less time to spend with grads, as a result. Perhaps
because graduate students tend to be more intellectually mature, they are more willing to make the
sacrifices necessary to produce strong work, (including incurring debt, and living frugally, when
necessary), and tend to come to us better financially prepared as well. Quality of graduate work remains
high. There is no notable difference in the quality of graduate work in recent years. However, we are
having a more difficult time attracting qualified students, and our Departmental Graduate program, as a
whole, is slightly smaller as a result. A smaller FT faculty and the inevitable reduced support for students
is believed to be contributing factors to this problem. When asked for feedback, grads site this as an
issue, and we believe they voice these concerns in the larger art community.
7. **Analysis**

From report last year: *The Department’s faculty and graduate students regularly participate in public reviews of student work (first-semester, first-year, ATC presentations, for example); readiness for teaching is evaluated by professional interview by a committee and then teaching evaluated via the university’s SOTE evals.* This remains an accurate report.

While our program remains strong, it is the opinion of the faculty that University or CSU policies initiated over the last 5 to 6 years, are a contributing factor to the reduction in interested applicants to our programs. Applications are retained, and the number of applicants can be tracked. As noted in the BFA Photography Annual Program Assessment, having fewer FT faculty members is a serious problem, Department wide. In Photography, for instance, FT faculty has been reduced by half over the past 7 years, with the retirement of two full-time faculty members who were not replaced. The reduction, by half, of release/assigned time for program coordination is another serious problem, along with an ever-increasing administrative workload. These changes combined, mean that faculty members have less time to spend with graduate students, for whom mentorship is especially important, but also to develop coursework, and to engage in program curriculum planning. These factors are beyond faculty control, since they were University initiated. The dramatic rise of tuition costs has also reduced the appeal of attending a CSU school, though SJSU is still relatively inexpensive compared with private art schools. The high cost of rent in the Bay Area is another contributing factor, which makes attending SJSU a difficult choice for applicants who are considering programs in other areas of California or the country.

8. **Proposed changes and goals (if any)**

From report last year: *In 2016-17 the department will begin the planning and collection of data appropriate to completing an accreditation report in early fall 2019. NASAD is particularly interested in the quality of work by current students in the MFA program, as demonstrated via on-campus exhibitions in our galleries and in achievements of recent alums.* Again, this remains accurate.

We are hopeful that our modestly increasing BFA Photography major numbers will warrant an additional full-time hire in Photography within the next few years. We have managed to maintain a stable number of grads in recent years, with the usual level of slight fluctuation from year to year. The applicants who do apply to our program, while fewer, are still of high quality, which has helped us maintain our numbers. We have, and will continue to make adjustments to our program in an attempt to help buffer any potential, negative impact upon our students produced by the increased expense of attending SJSU and living in the Bay Area, as well as the reduced number of FT faculty.

As a program, we are actively engaged in assessment and improvement, as we have been throughout our history. This process will be accelerated by the assigned time granted to Mendoza for spring of 2018, which is intended to compensate, in the short term, for halved Program Coordinator release time over the past 4 years. Regardless of the impact made by CSU/University changes, we are committed to fostering a positive, rigorous student learning experience with resulting graduate student success.

**Part C**

(This table should be reviewed and updated each year, ultimately providing a cycle-long record of your efforts to improve student outcomes as a result of your assessment efforts. Each row should represent a single proposed change or goal. Each proposed change should be reviewed and updated yearly so as to create a record of your department’s efforts. Please add rows to the table as needed.)
### Proposed Changes and Goals

Our Photography Program has a long history of success. We recognize that our medium, and the world, are both in a constant state of change. We meet regularly and consistently engage in the process of measuring and improving student success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mendoza Assigned Time, S18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively engage with students and faculty. Identify necessary curriculum changes. Implement changes through major/minor course change paperwork, and other means, where necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status Update

This is the first time, in recent years, that we have reported in this section. This area will be updated next year - 2018. After Mendoza’s work, we will have a better idea of where problems might exist (assuming they exist) and will address identified potential problems by initiating changes.

---

Last updated: Feb. 20, 2017