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**SUMMARY**

Educationfor the trainingof artists, outside the format of academies of the nineteenth century, is an activity that from the second half of the twentieth century has been inserted intothe curricula and formalstudyprograms, since then, questions and concerns have beenaddedabout what are the best teaching andevaluationstrategieson research processes. ón/creaciónaddressed in art workshops (because, diffícilmente, the creationofart,is considered research),the above presents a challenge: toobjectify with a critical sense,not only products and results, but alsothepractices and meanings to questions that, because of their constantevolutionand nature, they can become subjective.

Thepresent article, born from the observations made during the January June 2019 semester in a visual arts program of the higher levelinMexico, is based on the explorationandanalysis of previous studies oneducationor evaluationin artistic disciplines, to analyze informationthat provides ideas that clarifyaspects that can be evaluated by observing processes of ResearchandCreationorArt(CI) born in schooled programs; the possibilities and responsibilities involvedin appointments, not onlyto students, but alsoto teachers and governing bodies, influencing through Thatis theirpractice, in the society that embraces and sustains them.
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**ABSTRACT**

Education for the training of artists, outside the format of academies of the 19th century, is an activity that from the second half of the 20th century has been inserted in the curricula and formal study programs, since then, questions and Concerns about which are the best teaching and evaluation strategies regarding the research / creation processes approached in arts workshops (because artistic creation is hardly considered research), the above presents a challenge: to objectify with a critical sense , not only products and results, but also the practices and meanings of issues that, due to their constant evolution and nature, can become subjective.

This article is born from the observations made during the January-June 2019 semester in a visual arts program of the higher level in Mexico, is based on the exploration and analysis of previous studies on education and evaluation in artistic disciplines, to analyze information that provides ideas that clarify aspects that can be evaluated by observing processes of Research and Artistic Creation (CI) born in school programs; the implicit possibilities and responsibilities, not only to students, but also to teachers and governing bodies, influencing through their practice, the society that embraces and supports them.

**Keywords:** Formative assessment. Arts education. Visual arts. Research. Artistic creation.

## Introduction

The learning andpractice ofartoutside Academies are relatively recent processes, product of the rupture that manifests itself in the early nineteenth century in the culture of the West, where theteaching of theso-called "major arts" (Painting, Sculpture, Literature and Architecture) begins to leave the traditional structure inherited from the Renaissance (Storr, 2009), where the activities were developed within a studio-workshop, usually of the expert artist, structured around the instruction,understanding andmasteryoftechniques and skills, based on classical models(Greece and Rome), transmitted from master to his apprentices.

From this rupture, with the heyday of the universities during the twentieth century, a process begins to integrate,techniques and practical skills,with cognitive domains based on theory, inorderto assimilate and produce new knowledge, within the normativity of the curricula.

At present,formativeevaluation in productionworkshopsin visual arts faces challenges born in the very nature of the discipline, since it is a process that aims to know both skills, abilities and mastery of materials; as well as the evidence of knowledge, reflection,innovationand creativity, the balance tends to tip to the area of visualperception,exceeding the value of the conceptual load, especially in a world with a predilectionof "powerfulgenes" (Bauman, 2005):advertisements, objects reproducible on a massive scale, fashion trends, and other media prepared for immediate consumption.

Michaud (2007) writes in this regard the existence oftwo large groups where the manifestation ofartmovesin the twenty-first century; one where worship is rendered, almost of adorationor n to theprefabricatedbeauty, the triumph of theprofuse estética, to the experience estéticatransient and withoutsupports, almost gaseous; and at the other extreme, but with the same result, the saturationand serial reproducibility of the artisticobject,the transformationof museumsand galleriesinto art supermarkets. With the monitoring of theselines, the evaluationof theartistic objectcanbe skewed towards the standardizationof aesthetic trends forconsumption (real or abstract) of the spectators (Spentsas, 2017, p.218).

Theevaluationcarried out in such a way, or in the present case, of the artistic object,is usually influenced by the tastes or previous experiences of the teacher-spectator (Romero, 2011),or to the standardizationof aesthetic trends formass consumption. In the specific caseof theeducational system, the higher level, this responsibility falls primarilyon the subject teacher, with the commitment that is assignedtohim fromthe parameters established by the educational program, curricula andinstitutional policies, in conjunctionwiththe criterion, experience and personal tastes of the teacher responsible for theevaluation.

Thisarticleis born from the interestfrom the professional practice andtheobservations made in the field, in a searchto know what are the indicators that are considered relevant when evaluating the productionorartinworkshops,of the students at the higherlevel, the challenges faced by teachers and possible alternatives to reduce the gap betweentheory,practiceand appreciationofartistic expressions. It should not be forgotten that the aesthetic judgmentscorrespond to contexts and realities nuanced by the culture and knowledge of the social group where it is carried out, therefore, the complexity can become greater.

## Development

To understand when talkingaboutworkshopsin the field of study (higher level), reference is made to the joint and collaborative work between groups of students, with the supervisionofa teacher, to carry out activities that promote learning through the executionor"The classroom workshop is a scenario to learn by doing" (De Vincenzi, 2009, p.42). This "learning by doing" also hasthe characteristicthat is carried out ina collaborative way, where students exchange ideas, proposals, méall and concerns; the teacher in such a context is in charge of proposing a problem or situationto beaddressed, supporting with proposals of technicalor methodologicalaspects, aswell as of bibliographytothat of contributions for the constructionorn of the skills and / or knowledge sought.

In a complementary way from the thought of Liv Mjelde, it is possible to consider that it is in the workshops where"learning takes place in a community of social practice in which cooperation and the feeling that what isbeing produced is a collective work predominate." (Mjelde, 2015). It is in the workshops (classroom-workshop) where the dynamicthatfavors the procedural constructions throughthe actionis propitiated,the use of the body in connection withthe mind, is the opportunity then to involve all the senses, for the constructionof ideasand learning.

To analyze whatare the best teaching andevaluationstrategieson the processes of researchorn/ creationaddressedinarts workshops, we start fromthe principles of theGrounded Theory (hereinafter TF); which seek that visionorn episté Mica, multidimensional of the creative process and itsevaluation, and that emerges from the "data collected ina systematic wayand analyzed through a process of investigation" (Strauss and Corbin, 2002).

The first step was towork with the observer participantin the workshops of the Department of Visual Arts of a universityinthe centerof mexico, where the data collection was carried out throughafield diary, bittocora and interviews with experts, revealing the first variables of the study, leading the researcher to originate theoreticalorrich propositions, based on observationfor obtainingempirical data(Jiménez-Fontana, García-González, Azcárate, Navarrete and Cardeñoso, 2016), obtained direct amente in the natural environment.

The participantobservation was developed at the time of the course/workshop, to understand and analyze the different interactions, dynamics,didactic strategiesand toolsfor evaluation,and to collect data that demonstrate the criteria on whether aformativeevaluation is givenand what it is what the teacher takes into account: the knowledge, skills, creativity, among others, that are impededin the CI processes.

Throughthe participant's observation,it was possibleto recover: the type of evaluation,if itcorresponds to the processes (formative), to the products (summary), and if there is anybias ofthe teacher, derived from interferences outside the educational process. For theanalysis of results derived from observation, theAtlas ti 8.4.4 programwasused, whichyields or the Observation Units(UO) from whichthe trainingof three groups was derived:Teachers, Students and Creative Process.

#### 

#### Creative Process

Graham Wallas (1926) is credited with the first manual on the elementsand steps that a creative process follows:preparation, incubation,illuminationand verification,although it is the first reference, and has served as a basis for understanding the evolutionof thecreative process; Wallas' model is linear, and it translates into the partial understanding of a system that has become more complex, as a result of changes in the way of teaching,learning and evaluating, in the twenty-first century.

To clarify the concept Herrán (2014) mentions that to value creativity it is necessary to separate it from its results, because these can be relative. Therefore, we can argue that, "novelty, value, functionality can be indicators of creative product, if andonly ifthe valued creativity is oriented or considered from the perspective of its tangible effect" (p.28), since there are creative manifestations that do not carry an added functionality or value, since they can be the result of new combinations or arrangements, with old elements, whether material or conceptual.

This last proposal is the one that is considered closestto the field of educationorin visual arts; moreimportant is the reference to adifferent field, in the case of Larrea, from the economicormica sciences; to confirm that the creative processes are relevant to other areas, different from the academic,which suggests the possibility of taking instruments and references that nourish from their model, to the process that interests in this case. In Larrea's perspective, although the creative process is presented as a linear sequence, it is also true that such a decisionissupportedby the structure it promotes: specific momentsto evaluate and analyzethe feasibility of a creative proposal, with the opportunity to detect failures or weaknesses in time, which allows us to avoid moving forward, dragging economic losses, expenditure of time and human and material resources.

In thepublication"Lessons of class" (2018), Schwember affirms, based on a series of artistic productionsmade in different school scenarios in Chile, he affirms that "the creative process translates into a complex thought process where rationality is integrated together with approaches that welcome intuitionandthe senses asvehicles conducive to the productionof knowledge" (p. 70).

To round off the construct about creativity, creative product andcreative process, it is necessary to take them asindependent terms, but intimatelylinked by the common thread called energía(González-Cubillán, 2008). Creativity is the action ofthecreative process andis represented in the creative product. The creative product is the visible, external part of theactionof creating throughthecreative process. The productwill be classified as creative and innovative, at the time of being finalized and agreed.

Only the definition of one of the three elements, product of decoding,will bedone, considering that any descriptionn the other two(Students and Teachers), could lead to a redundancy teórica.

## Preliminary results

Next,some deductions resulting from the participant's observation are presented in the firstplace, specifically with the three professors involved during the case study (A, B and C).

* Thedynamic that resultsin interactionbetweenstudents is directly linked to the teacher they meet.
* Theteacher'sbehaviour and character have a direct impact on thestudents' attitude and response.
* The understandingof the researcher is extended when involved not only in coexistence, but in the exercises proposed by the teacher, since it allows him to take the place of the student.
* Managers, teachers and students, process and accept the participation of theobserver at different times andpartially.
* All the laboratories and workshops observed are taught by artists with a verifiable track record.
* The technicalorrich-pedagogicalaspecthas developed a posteriori, in mostcases, to the insertionin theteaching staff.
* Theevaluationof creative processesis still poorly understood and delimited, so that each teacher observed does not have a single método or specific tools,andthe criterion tends to be reduced only topersonal perception.
* Evaluationin workshops tends to be limited to metersandmeters recommended by the study program.
* The creative process isobservedand is relevant for feedbackbetween teachers and students, butit does not directly affect the evaluationorsummary, since there is resistance to evaluating creative aspects, considering that this limits the expressive capacity of the student.
* According to the degree or level of the course, teachers perceive greater freedom to involve conceptualaspects related to creativity, that is, at initial levels a close accompaniment ispromotedforthe obtainingof technical skillsrelated tomaterial handling, with the advancement during the career of Arts and Design, a tendency to value the formationof adiscourse andthe line ofartisticproductionisincreasing.
* The processes linkedtoproduction, if they are considered for the evaluationof learning, since they involve the applicationoftechniques and development of skills that are susceptibleto quantitative measurements, based on material qualities.

Based on the observations, itiscontemplatedthe existence of a tendency to avoid the evaluationor evaluation of creative processes in the direct sense to grant value judgments with respectto the artistic works / works ofthe students, since forthe mostpartthey agree that any evaluationorcriticaltothem, it becomes an arbitrary legitimacyand excludes those students who propose discourses other than those normally accepted by the artistic guild. Some partial conclusions are:

* Theformative evaluationis revealed as anidealway to attend to the creativeprocess. This is because it contains the transverse and longitudinal elements necessary to give both structure and flexibility.
* Mostof the participating teachers carry out assessments with different degrees oftraining.
* Atendency toavoid giving a rhythm with the elements present in thecreative process, since it is considered, detracts from its freedom.
* It is considered as the main reason to avoid any type of rubric, the lack of a deep and clear consensus, regarding the elements thatshouldcontain an instrument to monitor the creative processes in visual arts.

Theevaluationof the creative process, linked to researchfrom thearts,does not havewell-defined and consensualmeasurement toolsto obtain instrumentalinformation, which reflects in a general way, the attributes, characteristicsand competencies achieved within said process,aswell as the corresponding evaluationor n to the student.

Asaresult of the previous analysisand discussion,we have the basis forproposinga list of actions that can be taken as a model for the exercise of evaluationorcreative processes in Visual Arts programs, specifically in the practical workshopsthat are part of itscurricular structure, which gives an answer, at least in the operational part, to the research questionon how to evaluate thecreative process.

The list isordered in a line of successive temporal follow-up, but, as in anyformativeevaluation, its elements can change or rden, overlap, repeat or be eliminated; according to the needs of each program and the criteria of the teacher in charge, following a little the noción of"travel diary" in the style of Julio Cortázar and CarolDunlop (Dunlop and Cortá tsar, 1984),who, following a highway route, managed to find that you can, if you look closely, discover new things on every leg of the journey. Supported by travel notes, without discriminating details no matter how insignificant they seem at first glance. That said, the following arethe recommendations of activities for structuringFormativeEvaluationin contexts of Visual Arts workshops at the Higher Level inMexico.

* Reviewofbackground and evaluationor diagnosisto know the degree of skills, intellectual, cognitive and motor, of the students.
* Dialogues individually with each student to have a frame of reference on the interests, expectations andspecificskills that thestudent manifests.
* Promote a sessionat the beginning of the school year to delimit:
  + The theme and activities to be developed
  + Relevance of the skills and knowledgesought(rich, formal, symbolicandlúdicas)
  + Proposal and opening of communication channelsto follow up on the creative process in a personal way, regardless of the stage within the creative process
* Proposal andpresentation of the scheme of the rúbricato be used as an instrument to support the evaluation,the format shouldbe the result of the discussionand suggestionsproposedby students and teacher.
* Observe and record elements inherent tothe research processes,and whether they are evident or implicit within the school project that each studentcarriesout; with the above the teacherwill have tangible evidence for administrative purposes, but with evidence of the creative processes, both formal and subjective.
* Designan instrument to record errors or deficiencies observed when retrieving, analysing and categorising the informationobtainedfrom the heading used.
* Based on the informationrecorded,determine if it is necessary to redirector modify the teaching strategies;which also transforms it intolearning, both for the teacher and for the student.

The above list ispresentedbelow ina diagr amatofacilitate its understanding, where it also showsthe characteristicsof the process, in a constant cycle that nourishes itself; the model is based on the one described above in the chapter of the creative contact.

**Figure 1**: Model for evaluation of the creative process. Own elaboration

The model described is a flexible proposal, since it can be adapted according to the objectives of the specific program ofeach area of study, the steps it describes, are those that were revealed as ideal for the evaluation processor the creative process in visual artsworkshops, however they can be adaptedto other areas (architecture, Whilemaintaining the central methodologicalstructure,other specific objectives can beembedded,draftedin such a way that they can benefit fromthe proposed model.

Within itsflexible character, the model is also an alternative to adapt to other areasand contexts (architecture, architecture,designand all those where there is a creativeprocess), maintaining the structure of thecentral structure, other specific objectives can be embedded, providedthat the general schemeis respected to preserve the structure and í benefit from the proposed model

## Conclusions and recommendations

The closure for thepresentarticlerevolves around the particularities revealed throughcontrasts between what has been observed and the position of therichthat underpin the researchcarriedout. The pathwill be to start from the particularities of the case studies. The first, and perhaps the most forcefully revealed again and again, is the ingrained idea that evaluating is equivalent to qualifying and, therefore, if one seeks to make a judgment by means of a note, the result of an ex amen or final exercise; such an event can be transformed into Mazur's words: a "killer for creativity" (Mazur, 2020).

The next question that arises is, whyis creativity and its products relevant within the context of study? One of the answers is that the value of creativity is implicitnot only inthe arts, but inpractically all areasof life; creativity is required to devise new ways of thinking (creative thinking); the creative process is present when planning commercial strategies; researchfornew medicines; productionof veh Andthelist can go on from every area inthe world.

In the case ofacademicinstitutions, evaluationis part of the teaching and learningprocesses,where, in general(at least in the cases observed), it is only used as validationof thelearning achieved, leaving aside its possible contributionsalso to the teachingprocess.

In order to integrate both processes and obtain benefits fromthe evaluation, theformative evaluation isrevealedas the ideal tool,since from it both elements canbe integrated, so that not only to help the student to achieve the objectives set in the course, but to learn from the mistakes, with which it is possible to nourish the one who learns and the one whoteaches; the one who learns (the student), becomes aware,with the help of the teacher, of the failures and difficulties he faces; and theone whoteaches(the teacher), learns from such an exchange, aided in his "travel diary", from where it can propose new didacticstrategies.

The list proposed to help the evaluation ofthe creative process, is revealed as an incomplete tool, with the intentionofopening the discussionor topossible modifications, annexes, corrections and adaptations, according to the interests and needs of future researchers; but an assertionderived from the Thesis in conclusionor n, is that creative processes are susceptible to be evaluated; and in the educational context, they must be, if it is intended to take steps for the complete validationandintegrationof the study of the arts in educational programs, so that they can move from being considered only an area of artistic expressionand emotional recreation, to an element withmultiple applications prá ctic and functional, with equivalent importance to studies of engineering,economics, medicine, among others, traditionally considered as careers of practical applicationsfor life.

To give closure, the thought of Luis Camnitzer (2012) is left, "It can be said that the teaching of art is fundamentally dedicated to teaching how to make products and how to function as an artist, instead of howtoreveal things. " The core concept of the phrase leads us to reflect on the validity of learning and teachingfrom the rigorof science, in this case born ineducational institutions, and once masteringtwo fundamental elements, encourage jumps into the void, using the "hat" of creativity (De Bono, 1988) , to unexplored terrains, which is where infinite possibilities await and that allow new knowledge, skills and ways of beingin theworld, to be revealed.
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