How to use this template

1. Click **File** > **Make a copy**.
2. Type a new document name.
3. Click **OK**.
4. Go to Google Drive (drive.google.com) to find your template copy.

Need help? See Get started with Google Docs.

MFA MID-PROGRAM REVIEW

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, *5 minutes maximum - should not be a live reading of the statement of intent*				
Content	Speaker thoroughly, yet succinctly, conveys the subject/form/content/context of the presented work ☐	Speaker conveys most of the subject/form/content/ context of the work presented ☐	Speaker conveys little of the subject/form/content/ context of the work presented ☐	Speaker fails at explaining work, appearing to have given the work little thought or consideration ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
Delivery	Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. Excellent posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness. ☐	Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. Good posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness ☐	Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. Okay posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness ☐	Delivery techniques detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. Poor posture, gesture, eye contact and vocal expressiveness ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF INTENT, *1 page preferred, 2 pages maximum, 12pt double spaced*				
Completeness	The written material discusses all the required elements of the mid-program review by clearly addressing the form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work ☐	Addresses the form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work - some elements could be further resolved ☐	Has not addressed all the required elements: form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work ☐	Multiple required elements are missing: form, technical aspects, content, and context of the work ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
Quality	writing is free of errors ☐	writing is nearly free of errors ☐	writing has several errors ☐	writing has many errors; writing is very unclear ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
PROCESS DOCUMENT *Must include: Name, Expected graduation semester and year, Semester and year your mid-program review takes place, Your mentor's name, Photos (in-progress/completed), Titles of works mentioned, Dates, discussion of themes, discussion of research/influences, works cited bibliography). 5-10 pages is our expectation and you may include sketches.*				
Completeness *(can be hard copy or electronic presentation)*	Document contains ALL the required elements; there is clear evidence of reflection, research, and exploration of the candidate's field and influences ☐	Document contains most of the required elements; some evidence of reflection, research, and exploration of the candidate's field and influences ☐	Document is missing many of the required elements; little evidence of reflection, research, and exploration of the candidate's field and influences ☐	No document presented. ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
THE WORK/EXHIBITION				
Installation of work	Excellent installation/execution of work in the space. Installation	Good installation/execution of work in the space. The	Adequate installation/execution of	Poor installation/execution of work in the space. The

☐ *DNA*	is clearly intentional, well-executed, and enhances the work. ☐	installation begins to enhance and support the work. ☐	work in the space. The installation somewhat distracts the viewer/participant ☐	installation is very arbitrary and unintentional. ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
Awareness of Form *(most frequently visual, but may also include aural, scent, tactile, taste)* ☐ *DNA*	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth exploration of formal choices and sensory experience of the work with detailed explanation ☐	Demonstrates good exploration of sensory experience, and some explanation of formal choices ☐	Demonstrates little exploration and/or unclear understanding of form or sensory experience in the work presented ☐	Demonstrates no evidence of exploration or understanding of formal/sensory experience of the work presented ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
Awareness of Technical Explorations / Processes ☐ *DNA*	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth investigation of technical explorations and/or processes with detailed explanation ☐	Demonstrates some investigation of technical explorations and/or processes, and some explanation of choices ☐	Demonstrates little/unclear investigation understanding of technical explorations and/or processes in the work presented ☐	Demonstrates no evidence of investigation or understanding of technical explorations and/or processes ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
Awareness of Content / Central Message ☐ *DNA*	Central message is clear and compelling (precisely articulated, and strongly supported); ☐	Central message is clear. ☐	Central message is basically understandable but is unclear. ☐	Central message is not stated in the presentation. ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				

Exploration of Ideas ☐ *DNA*	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth exploration of ideas; risk-taking, asking questions ☐	Demonstrates good exploration of ideas; has some risk-taking, asks questions	Demonstrates little exploration of ideas; risk-taking or question-asking ☐	Demonstrates no evidence of exploration of ideas; no risk-taking, no asking of questions ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				
Awareness of Context ☐ *DNA*	Demonstrates remarkable in-depth investigation of context from both the candidate's point of view, and that of the audience/ participants ☐	Demonstrates some investigation of context from both the candidate's point of view, and that of the audience/participants; ☐	Demonstrates little investigation of context from both the candidate's point of view, and/or that of the audience/participants; ☐	Demonstrates no evidence of investigation of context from the candidate's point of view, or that of the audience/participants; ☐
Optional additional feedback on the above:				

MFA MID-PROGRAM REVIEW

MFA Candidate Name:_____ Date of Review:

Committee Reviewer Name:_____ Mentor Name:

In essence, the Mid-Program Review demonstrates a student's progress in the program and indicates a student's potential to produce a cohesive, accomplished, and successful Thesis Paper and Exhibition that demonstrates their ability to contribute to their field of art and design discourse and practice upon graduation. Please use this sheet as a tool for keeping notes during the candidate's Mid-Program Review. Please turn in this sheet to the Program Director at the end of the review process. **Please write 3 or more items in bullet points in the third person for each area.**

STRENGTHS

CONCERNS

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Final Grade (circle or highlight one): Pass / Pass with reservation / Fail