

MFA MID-PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC - SPRING 2024

MFA Candidate Name: _____ Date of review: _____

Committee Reviewer Name: _____ Mentor Name: _____

*DNA = Does not apply	Exemplary - 4	Accomplished - 3	Developing - 2	Beginning - 1
ORAL PRESENTATION <i>At the beginning, 2-3 minutes (5 minutes maximum) - should not be a live reading of the statement of intent. Also consider content and delivery throughout discussion.</i>				
Content	Speaker thoroughly, yet succinctly, conveys the subject/form/content/context of the presented work <input type="checkbox"/>	Speaker conveys most of the subject/form/content/context of the work presented <input type="checkbox"/>	Speaker conveys little of the subject/form/content/context of the work presented <input type="checkbox"/>	Speaker fails at explaining work, appearing to have given the work little thought or consideration <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				
Delivery	Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. Excellent posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness, etc. <input type="checkbox"/>	Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. Good posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness, etc <input type="checkbox"/>	Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. Okay posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness, etc <input type="checkbox"/>	Delivery techniques detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. Poor posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness, etc <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				
Provided Questions <i>Did the student arrive with discussion-provoking questions for the committee?</i>	Arrived with multiple thoughtful and discussion-provoking questions for the committee. Avoided yes/no questions. <input type="checkbox"/>	Had at least one question prepared and it was discussion-provoking. <input type="checkbox"/>	Had at least one question prepared. <input type="checkbox"/>	Did not arrive with any questions for the committee. <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF INTENT *1 page preferred, 2 pages maximum, 12pt double spaced, 1-inch margins*

Completeness	The written material discusses all the required elements of the Mid-Program Review by clearly addressing the subject, form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work presented. <input type="checkbox"/>	Addresses the subject, form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work - some elements could be further resolved <input type="checkbox"/>	Has not addressed all the required elements: subject, form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work <input type="checkbox"/>	Multiple required elements are missing: subject, form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	--	--	---	--

Optional additional feedback on the above:

Quality	writing is free of errors <input type="checkbox"/>	writing is nearly free of errors <input type="checkbox"/>	writing has several errors <input type="checkbox"/>	writing has many errors; writing is very unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	---	--	--	--

Optional additional feedback on the above:

RESEARCH SUMMARY AND ONLINE DOCUMENTATION OF WORK *Must include all the elements listed in [the template](#).*

Completeness of Research Summary Document	Document contains ALL the required elements; there is clear evidence of reflection, research, and exploration of the candidate's field and influences <input type="checkbox"/>	Document contains most of the required elements; some evidence of reflection, research, and exploration of the candidate's field and influences <input type="checkbox"/>	Document is missing many of the required elements; little evidence of reflection, research, and exploration of the candidate's field and influences <input type="checkbox"/>	No document presented. <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	---	---	--

Optional additional feedback on the above:

<p>Quality of Online Documentation of Work Installed for Review <i>This documentation is in a separate folder from the Research Summary. This could be photos, video, audio, multi-page PDFs, 3D scans of objects/installations, etc.</i> Considerations: lighting quality, in-focus images (not blurry), color is similar to real objects, cropped to enhance viewing, understandable audio if present, etc.</p>	<p>High-quality images of the candidate's Mid-Program Review installation are provided. Images are not redundant of work in the Research Summary. (See "Considerations" in column at left for further info).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Generally accurate and adequate documentation (one or two items could be improved)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Some accurate and adequate documentation (several items could be improved)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No documentation presented.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--	---	---	--

Optional additional feedback on the above:

THE CREATIVE WORK, AND EXHIBITION/PRESENTATION [*DNA = Does not apply. Some client-based creators may petition to opt out of physical installation]

<p>Installation/Presentation of work</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> *DNA</p>	<p>Excellent installation/presentation of work in the space. Choices are clearly intentional, well-executed, and enhances the work. Installation choices supported by the candidate's written and verbal explanations of the work</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Good installation/presentation of work in the space. The installation/presentation choices begin to enhance and support the work. Candidate can explain installation choices to some extent.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Adequate installation/presentation of work in the space. The installation/presentation somewhat distracts the viewer/participant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Poor installation/presentation of work in the space. The installation/presentation is very arbitrary and unintentional.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	---	---	---	--

Optional additional feedback on the above:

<p>Awareness of Form <i>(most frequently visual, but may also include aural, scent, tactile, taste)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> *DNA</p>	<p>Demonstrates remarkable in-depth exploration of formal choices and sensory experience of the work with detailed explanation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Demonstrates good exploration of sensory experience, and some explanation of formal choices</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Demonstrates little exploration and/or unclear understanding of form or sensory experience in the work presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Demonstrates no evidence of exploration or understanding of formal/sensory experience of the work presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	--	--	---	--

Optional additional feedback on the above:

Awareness of Technical Explorations / Processes <input type="checkbox"/> *DNA	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth investigation of technical explorations and/or processes with detailed explanation <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates some investigation of technical explorations and/or processes, and some explanation of choices <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates little/unclear investigation understanding of technical explorations and/or processes in the work presented <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates no evidence of investigation or understanding of technical explorations and/or processes <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				
Awareness of Content / Central Message <input type="checkbox"/> *DNA	Central message is clear and compelling (precisely articulated, and strongly supported): <input type="checkbox"/>	Central message is clear. <input type="checkbox"/>	Central message is basically understandable but is unclear. <input type="checkbox"/>	Central message is not stated in the presentation. <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				
Exploration of Ideas <input type="checkbox"/> *DNA	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth exploration of ideas; risk-taking, asking questions <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates good exploration of ideas; has some risk-taking, asks questions <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates little exploration of ideas; risk-taking or question-asking <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates no evidence of exploration of ideas; no risk-taking, no asking of questions <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				
Awareness of Context <input type="checkbox"/> *DNA	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth investigation of context from both the candidate's point of view, and that of the audience/participants <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates some investigation of context from both the candidate's point of view, and that of the audience/participants <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates little investigation of context from both the candidate's point of view, and/or that of the audience/participants <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates no evidence of investigation of context from the candidate's point of view, or that of the audience/participants <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Optional additional feedback on the above:</i>				
MFA MID-PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY Please write 3 or more items in bullet points in the third person for each area (Strengths, Concerns, Specific Recommendations):				

STRENGTHS

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

CONCERNS

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.