

2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report Template
College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)

1. Identifying Information

Name of Program:

Art History/Arts Management (Department of Art + Architecture)

Type of Program (Major, Minor, Graduate Program, Non-Degree Granting):

Undergraduate Major

College of Arts and Sciences Division (Arts, Humanities, Sciences, or Social Sciences):

Arts

Name/Title/Email Address of Submitter:

Kate Lusheck, Director and Assistant Professor, Art History/Arts Management (A+A),
Kate Lusheck <chlusheck@usfca.edu>

Name/Email Address of Additional Individuals Who Should Receive Feedback:

Paula Birnbaum, Associate Professor, Art History/Arts Management (and Museum
Studies Academic Program Director), Paula J Birnbaum <pjbirnbaum@usfca.edu>

Seth Wachtel, Associate Professor and Department Chair, Seth Wachtel
<slwachtel@usfca.edu>

2. Mission Statement:

Shared Mission Statement of the Department of Art + Architecture:

The Department of Art + Architecture at the University of San Francisco is situated within a vibrant liberal arts setting that provides an arts education without boundaries. Our mission is to teach historical, theoretical and practical foundations across disciplines with the common goal of critically reflecting upon the global condition while becoming local agents of change.

Has this statement been revised in the last few years?

No.

3. (Optional) Program Goals:

Have these goals been revised in the last few years?

4. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

PLO1: Students will gain solid historical knowledge of the objects of art and principal artists of all major periods, and their associated theories, analysis and criticism. This includes a broad understanding of the cultural diversity of art movements from prehistoric times through contemporary culture, both locally and globally. [a.] Identify sources and tools for art historical research and produce formal analytic written papers or projects; and [b.] Evaluate, compare and criticize different forms of art, architecture and design representing different social, cultural, religious, and aesthetic contexts, in visual, written, and oral formats.

PLO2: Students will gain an understanding of basic visual principles, concepts, media, and formats in the various fine art disciplines, and the ability to apply them to meet a specific objective. This includes an ability to think critically and propose creative solutions to aesthetic problems. [a.] Develop and practice skills, techniques and processes to make new original project work in two-dimensional and three-dimensional formats; and [b.] Create finished works of art, grounded in personal expression, that demonstrate knowledge of historical and contemporary principles of composition, form, style, and technique.

PLO3: Students will gain a deep appreciation and knowledge of how to use their skills to work with diverse communities both locally and globally to create social change. This includes the acquisition of professional skills that will serve them as post-graduate students, professional practitioners, educators, and community leaders. [a.] Express understanding through written and oral reflection of the role that art has and can play in encouraging positive social change; [b.] Produce [add: or contribute to] a meaningful service learning project to a local non-profit arts organization, with active participation and leadership in addressing both organizational and civic concerns.

PLO4: Students will gain knowledge and skills in the use of basic tools, technologies, and processes sufficient to conduct advanced research or project work. This includes the mastery of bibliographic research and understanding of the digital tools and processes necessary to develop that research. [a.] Identify appropriate research related resources to produce a final written or visual project, such as a thesis, portfolio, or exhibition, for presentation within a public context. [b.] Write and prepare applications for graduate study, grants, and other post-graduate professional endeavors [PLO4(b) is subject to revision or deletion.]

Have these PLOs been revised in the last few years?

No.

5. Brief Summary of Most Recent Assessment Plan

In the ARTM plan submitted in late November 2016 (with A+A) proposed that ARTM would a.) assess the first Program Learning Outcome of its Fourth Program Learning Goal by assessing work from one upper-division ARTM seminar from 2015-16. The course will either be ART 302-01: Renaissance Art (fall 2015) or ART 311-01: Medieval Art & Society (spring 2016) *and* b.) develop an ARTM Program Assessment Questionnaire and/or an Entrance and Exit Survey to be given to all ARTM majors to help assess program learning outcomes.

Following was the email feedback on this year's plan received from the Dean's Office on January 19, 2016:

Art History/Arts Management

- a. The proposed assessment plan is too ambitious; we encourage you to pick ONE of the proposed direct assessment methods for implementation in Spring 2016. All of the listed tools are good ideas, but they should be spread out over several semesters and each perhaps repeated once every 2 to 3 years.
- b. Focus on the direct assessment methods first, and later on the indirect assessment methods. The proposed development of an annual assessment survey is a great idea, but first develop some direct assessment tools.
- c. We encourage faculty to attend one of the workshops that will be offered this spring on Rubrics. Like most departments and programs, your rubrics can be strengthened with increased specificity and measurability.

6. Academic Program Review

Date of most recent Academic Program Review's External Reviewer Visit:
March 11-13, 2009 (next External Reviewer visit will be in fall 2016)

Date of most recent Action Plan Meeting: Faculty meeting in April 2016 led by Department Chair Seth Wachtel (ARCD).

Brief Summary of the most recent Action Plan:

Each of the four programs is currently writing a self-study for the fall 2016 external program review. We have already submitted suggestions for external reviewers, and our department chair is working with the Dean's Office to schedule the external review. We also discussed this July 1st assessment materials deadline. My understanding is that the final self-study report for the department (including all four B.A. programs) is due into the Dean's Office in mid-August.

7. Methods

What did you do with regard to assessment of your program/department in 2015-2016?

ARTM assessed PLO4a. by assessing the final research papers from one upper-division in spring 2016: ART 311-01: Medieval Art & Society (instructor: Kate Lusheck)

- a. **Identify appropriate research-related resources to produce a final written or visual project, such as a thesis, portfolio, or exhibition, for presentation within a public context.**

What were your questions?

Q1: To what extent did the student use appropriate research sources (in subject and level) in his/her paper given the stated topic?

Q2: To what extent did the student use peer-reviewed or other trustworthy research sources (e.g., museum exhibition catalogues/websites etc.), including peer-reviewed journal articles and books?

Q3: To what extent did the student use research resources (e.g., found in Gleeson Library, Link+, Interlibrary loan, or through professional art databases) that went beyond what could be easily located online on popular websites?

Q4: To what extent did the student's final bibliography reflect sources reflect knowledge of recent or updated research in the related field or discipline?

Q5: To what extent did the student incorporate these sources effectively and in proper Chicago Manual of Style format into their final research paper in the form of properly cited material (including footnotes etc.)?

How are these questions related to your most recent Academic Program Review and/or Action Plan?

ARTM will be addressing the program's effort since the last APR to raise the research, writing, and critical/historical analysis skill standards for our majors in our upcoming self-study this summer. Training students to locate, identify, and use proper and varied research sources is one important piece of achieving better research outcomes and products in the program.

In the last APR executive summary (2009), the reviewers wrote that they felt the program needed more upper division research courses and that the absence of any "regularly scheduled courses in pre-modern art is especially striking." Working on research

methods in a now regular, rotating sequence of early modern art history seminars helps to address this 2009 critique.

What PLOs are these questions related to?

PLO4: Students will gain knowledge and skills in the use of basic tools, technologies, and processes sufficient to conduct advanced research or project work. This includes the mastery of bibliographic research and understanding of the digital tools and processes necessary to develop that research.

This assessment activity directly relates to the art historical research required to fulfill the following Course Learning Outcome as listed on the ART 311: Medieval Art & Society syllabus:

- Develop, research and execute a well-argued, historically grounded and properly cited research paper on a focused topic related to Medieval art and deliver research findings in a professional, oral presentation to their peers and instructor.

**Students will accomplish this through completing a required series of stringent, research paper “milestones” through the semester and ultimately researching and producing a highly focused, 12–15 pp. term paper on a subject related to Medieval art of their own choosing (subject to instructor approval). In addition to having multiple required meetings to choose and discuss their projects with the instructor, students must produce a thesis statement and clear, focused abstract that are discussed in class, as well as a correctly cited, annotated bibliography related to the research project. They will also attend a research workshop at Gleeson Library, and will engage in at least one in-class workshop on using visual and textual evidence. Students will also deliver formal, in-class presentations of approximately 10 minutes on their topic at the end of the term, using the most common digital technology for professional art historical presentations (i.e., Power Point Presentations). Attendance at special art history lectures at USF and local museums will reinforce these lessons.*

What direct (most important) and/or indirect methods did you employ?

Some Possible Direct Methods (pick ≥ 1 and *briefly describe*):

- a. Published (Standardized) Test (e.g., Major Field Test)
- b. Class Tests & Quizzes with Embedded Questions
- c. Class Presentations
- d. Off-Campus Presentations (NGOs, clients, agencies, etc.)
- e. **Research Projects Reports: The students were required to submit a final 12-15 pp. research paper on a topic of their choosing related to Medieval Art (subject to instructor approval.) This paper was the culmination of a series of research “milestones” that included a project description, annotated bibliography, abstract, draft, and three meetings with the instructor throughout the semester. Only the final paper was assessed.**
- f. Case Studies
- g. Term Papers

- h. Portfolio
- i. Artistic Performances, Recitals & Products
- j. Capstone Projects
- k. Poster Presentations
- l. Comprehensive Exams
- m. Thesis, Dissertation
- n. Pass Rates on Certification or Licensure Exams
- o. Group Projects
- p. In/Out-of Class Presentations
- q. Competency Interviews (e.g., oral exams)
- r. Simulations
- s. Juried Presentations
- t. Other

Some Possible Indirect Methods (*briefly describe*):

- a. Student Survey
- b. Student Interview
- c. Focus Groups
- d. Reflection Sessions
- e. Reflection Essays
- f. Faculty Survey
- g. Exit (end of program) Survey
- h. Exit (end of program) Interview
- i. Alumni Survey
- j. Employer Survey
- k. Diaries or Journals
- l. Data from Institutional Surveys (e.g., NSSE, SSI, GSS)
- m. Curriculum/Syllabus Analysis
- n. Other

8. Results

What were the direct data results?

Q1: M=70%; D=30%; I=0%

Q2: M=40%; D=60%; I=0%

Q3: M=70%; D=30%; I=0%

Q4: M=20%; D=80%; I=0%

Q5: M=60%; D=20%; I=20%

What were the indirect results?

What surprised you?

Related to lower results in Q4: one of the primary skills that needs to be further developed in the project is the attention to the importance and location of *recent*, peer-reviewed literature and knowledge of the recent scholarly trends and discussions in the discipline. We could also do better on Q2, especially related to the *variety* of the sources the students are consulting in their research. There was a general over-dependence on a few good sources.

What aligned with your expectations?

The students seem to be targeting their research materials well given their topics. They also clearly understand given the data (on the whole) what a peer-reviewed source is and its value to their research. They also seem to be using both “hard” copies of texts as well as online sources. It is unclear to the extent to which they are using art and other library databases in their research though.

What do you understand these results to mean?

These results appear to provide evidence that general speaking, our students are learning valuable research skills (online and print), and are able to effectively utilize these skills in the research and writing of an upper-division art history paper. It also shows us we still have a way to go in bringing their levels for these five questions up to “mastery” level, at least by the time they leave the program with their B.A.

What are the implications of the data?

The implications are that we are doing a much better job preparing our students for high level, academic research but that we still have work to do especially in laying the foundations for some of these important skills perhaps earlier in their program during their core major courses.

9. Closing the Loop

What might you do as a result of these assessment results? What curricular or programmatic changes might you implement?

We would consider incorporating an introductory research assignment into either ART 101-102 during the students’ first semesters in the program. We will also continue to work with our library liaison on research training sessions for the students. Finally, we have been discussing adding a sophomore research methods class to the program which would help enormously. The question, though, is how to fit it into an already tight curriculum without losing important program components.

Possible Closing(s) of the Loop(s) (pick ≥ 1 and *briefly describe*):

- a. Revision of PLOs – there are a couple of PLOs that I think could be revisited (esp. PLO4b which I believe is outdated. We also need to rethink whether to require ART 423:Non-Profit/SL internship so as to ensure PLO3b is being met, or alternatively to revise the PLOs.
- b. Changes in pedagogical practices
- c. Revision of program course sequence
- d. Revision of course(s) content -- we might look at how we can introduce some of these research skills at an earlier point in the curriculum (i.e., at core level.)
- e. Curriculum Changes (e.g., addition and/or deletion of courses) – ARTM is currently discussing elective course additions to the curriculum, as well as some changes that might include adding a Methodology class. These will be looked at this year more closely in the wake of our upcoming APR, and with the addition of our two new full-time, TT faculty, Karen Fraser and Nathan Dennis.
- f. Modified program policies or procedures –
- g. Designed measurement tools more aptly suited for the task
- h. Improved within and across school/college collaboration
- i. Improved within and across school/college communication
- j. Revised student learning outcomes in one or more courses
- k. Modified rubric
- l. Developed new rubric
- m. Developed more stringent measures (key assessments)
- n. Modified course offering schedules
- o. Changes to faculty and/or staff
- p. Changes in program modality of delivery
- q. Other

Have you or will you submit any course or program change proposals as a result of these results?

Not directly, but we should be submitting changes to the curriculum in AY2016-17 that may have positive bearing on these results (especially if a Methods course can be added.)