College of Visual and Performing Arts

School of Art and Design

Art + Design Education

Doctor of Philosophy

February 2019

John Siblik, Director

1. Introduction

The Doctor of Philosophy in Art and Design Education provides art and design educators the opportunity to continue their studies in the field to a terminal degree, preparing them to become researchers and theorists for possible careers at higher education institutions as scholars and teachers as well as leadership positions in all aspects of visual arts education. The Ph.D., initiated in 2008 in the School of Art, is a 60-semester-hour-program beyond the master's degree emphasizing rigorous research, theory and philosophical development, and applications of new knowledge in the visual arts and education. The degree enables graduates to contribute substantial knowledge, exhibit original scholarship and conduct independent research concerning teaching and learning in the fine arts and other forms of visual culture.

The Doctor of Philosophy is one of multiple programs within the Division of Art+Design Education. Each member of the A+DE faculty has primary responsibly for the supervision and evaluation of a structural component of the division's activities. Student progress in each program structure is reported at faculty meetings with any recommendations or requests for approval of changes to be made in the following semester or academic year. We also participate in program evaluations by CAEP and NASAD.

The Assessment Plan for the Ph.D. in Art and Design Education is provided in Appendix A. The assessments for this program include three that are standard for all doctoral programs in the university and one that is specific to this program. This table provides a clear picture of the program structure and timeline for assessment.

Preparation of candidates for employment in higher education is not confined to the job market in the state of Illinois. Most of our doctoral graduates have found employment in other states or countries. However, not all candidates who complete the Ph.D. choose to move into higher education. Two recent graduates have elected to remain in K-12 education. One recent graduate prefers to work as an adjunct. The program has 100% placement records for graduates who choose to move up to higher education. This indicates that the learning outcomes of the program align to market values.

The program maintains a rigorous admissions protocol. Students who are not deemed as have the academic ability or dispositions necessary for success in higher education are not admitted to the program. Potential candidates are screened using a variety of tools including, writing samples, previous academic performance, GRE scores, interviews, and referee reports.

In response to the annual assessment from 2015 indicating concerns about slow progress to completion, several changes were made in the program to move students more efficiently toward graduation. These included a new requirement that all Ph.D. students must meet with their course advisor each semester and all students must take a new course (ARTE 780 - Research Development and Writing), which was taught for the first time in Fall 2016 to aid the proposal development progress. These improvements have been successful in accelerating progress towards graduation.

2. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

1   **Scholarship:** The student will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of scholarship in the field of art education, including leading edge research and theory.

2   **Research Knowledge:** The student will demonstrate competence in the use of research methods and processes as well as the ability to generate theory.

3   **Pedagogical Knowledge:** The student will reveal a broad and deep knowledge of the conditions and contexts of art learning and a high level of proficiency in developing, researching, and evaluating pedagogical experiences and practices related to art in K-12 and higher education.

4   **Communication:** The student will apply highly effective written, verbal, nonverbal, and visual communication skills; effective selection of appropriate modes of communication to promote learning, report research, and articulate theory.

5   **Community and Collaboration:** The student will collaborate with peers and other members of the professional community in a highly effective manner and make constructive contributions to the professional community.

6   **Professionalism and Leadership:** The student will exhibit integrity and leadership in serving the professional community, behave in a socially responsible manner, and take responsibility for their own learning.

3. Program-by-Baccalaureate Student Learning Outcomes Matrix

Not Applicable

4. Curriculum Map

Required core courses are listed along the vertical axis of the matrix in chronological order. Degree program student learning outcomes are listed on the horizontal axis. For each course determine: (1) which outcomes are the **primary** focus of the course, and (2) the degree to which the course supports the outcome (i.e., at a beginning (B), developing (D), or proficient (P) level). Place a B, D, or P in the corresponding cell. It would be *unusual* to find all courses supporting all student learning outcomes—instead, concentrate on the primary focus of each course. This will map out the degree to which core courses support the development of your program student learning outcomes. The Four-Year Degree Path provided by the Academic Advising Center may be helpful (www.niu.edu/advising/your-advising-plan/degree-paths). Look for strengths and gaps in the curriculum. Ideally, all outcomes should be supported with coursework through the proficient level. Below is an example of a curriculum map you can modify or model. Note that each course should address at least one student learning outcome, but does NOT have to support all learning outcomes.

Course	Program Student Learning Outcomes						
	1. Scholarship:	2. Research Knowledge:	3. Pedagogical Knowledge	4 Communication	5 Community and Collaboration:	6 Professionalism and Leadership:	
ARTE 790	B		B	B	B	B	
ARTE 791	B		D	B	B	B	
ARTE 783	B	B	D	B	B		
ETR 520	B	B		B			
ETR 521	B	B		B			
ARTE 784	B	D		D	D	D	
ELEC 1	D			D			
ELEC 2	D			D			
COG 1	D			D			
COG 2	D			D			
ARTE 780	D	D		D	D	D	
ARTE 792	D	D	D	D	D	D	
COG 3	P			P			
COG 4	P			P			

Course	Program Student Learning Outcomes						
	1. Scholarship:	2. Research Knowledge:	3. Pedagogical Knowledge	4 Communication	5 Community and Collaboration:	6 Professionalism and Leadership:	
ELEC 3	P			P			
ELEC 4	P			P			
ARTE 799	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Note. Course supports the outcome at the B=beginning, D=developing, or P=proficient level.							

5. Assessment Methods

This final section of the assessment plan describes the assessment methods your degree program will be using to measure how well students are meeting program student learning outcomes. See the *UAP Academic Program Assessment Plan and Status Report Rubric-Checklist* for a description of characteristics seen in well-functioning assessment methods.

EXPLANATION OF ASSESSMENT METHODS TABLE

The first part of the assessment methods section is an explanation of each assessment method you will be using to measure student learning outcomes. The description needs to be in enough detail to communicate to others what each assessment is, when it will be given, who is responsible for carrying out the assessment, what the desired target level of individual student performance is (to say a single student met the student learning outcome(s)), and what the desired overall target level of performance is for all students (to say the program is meeting the outcome(s)). Individual student-level achievement targets are often preset scores on an exam, scores on a rubric, etc. Program-level targets are often expressed as the percent of students demonstrating they meet individual student-level achievement targets. See the *UAP Academic Program Assessment Plan and Status Report Rubric-Checklist* for a list of characteristics seen in well-functioning assessment methods. Below is the table you should use to clearly communicate each of the assessment methods to other stakeholders.

Assessment Method	Explanation					
	Description	Student-Level Achievement [a]	Program-Level Target [b]	When Data Will be Collected	Person Responsible	SLOs
Dissertation Proposal Presentation	Each committee member must approve a written dissertation proposal and an oral presentation of the proposal before the student takes the candidacy examination in art education.	The student outcome is a holistic pass/fail. Since both part-time and full-time students are in the program, a strict calendar standard is not held for completion. .	The program expects a 100% pass rate	At the end of required course work and before independent dissertation research can begin	Student's major professor	1, 2, 3, 4,
Candidacy Exam	The Candidacy exam is a set of written questions provided to the student by her/his committee.	The student outcome is a holistic pass/fail. Program level of expected performance is: 100% completion on first attempt.	100% pass	Following the successful completion of Dissertation Proposal	Candidate's major professor	1, 2, 3, 4,

Assessment Method	Explanation					
	Description	Student-Level Achievement [a]	Program-Level Target [b]	When Data Will be Collected	Person Responsible	SLOs
Dissertation Defense	The dissertation allows students to demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of scholarship, competence in the use of research methods and processes, broad and deep knowledge of the conditions and contexts of art learning, high level proficiency in developing, researching, and evaluating, and apply highly effective written, verbal, nonverbal, and visual communication skills. The dissertation must demonstrate new knowledge and theory, and complete the trajectory set forth in the Proposal and Candidacy Exam.	The student outcome is a holistic pass/fail. Program level of expected performance is: 100% completion on first attempt of final oral defense.	100% pass	At the completion of the program as a condition for graduation	Candidate's major professor	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Public Presentation Assessment:	The candidate will have a peer-reviewed, research proposal accepted at least one public discipline-specific state or national conference	Acceptance at either the Illinois Art Education Association, the National Art Education Association, American Educational Research Association annual meeting.	100%	Annual	Student reports to the Division secretary.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Assessment Method	Explanation					
	Description	Student-Level Achievement [a]	Program-Level Target [b]	When Data Will be Collected	Person Responsible	SLOs
Note. [a] Student-level target is the score or performance an individual student must demonstrate to say the student met the student learning outcome. [b] Program-level target is the percent of all students that must demonstrate they meet the student learning outcome.						

ASSESSMENT METHODS-BY-OUTCOMES MATRIX

Assessment Method	Program Student Learning Outcome						
	1. Scholarship:	2. Research Knowledge:	3. Pedagogical Knowledge	4 Communication	5 Community and Collaboration:	6 Professionalism and Leadership:	
Dissertation Proposal Presentation	F, D	F, D	F, D	F, D	F, I	F, I	
Candidacy Exam	F, D	F, D	F, D	F, D	F, I		
Dissertation Defense	S, D	S, D	S, D	S, D	S, I		
Public Presentation Assessment:	S, D	S, D	S, D	S, D		S, D	
Note. F=formative assessment, S=summative assessment, D=direct assessment, and I=indirect assessment. See the paragraph above for an explanation of each type of assessment.							