

ART HISTORY & MUSEUM STUDIES

ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019 REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

- Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections
- Undergraduate, Graduate and Certificate Programs must submit separate reports
- It is recommended that assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices
- Curriculum Map should be submitted along with Assessment Report

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Karen Fraser, Program Director, kfraser2@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) an aggregate report for a Major & Minor (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

[c] This is an aggregate report for: 1. Art History & Museum Studies major 2. Art History minor and 3. Museum Studies minor

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Has there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

Yes: we revised our programs in the 2018-19 academic year. The former Art History/Arts Management major is now the Art History & Museum Studies major. The former Art History/Arts Management minor was renamed the Art History minor. We also added a new Museum Studies minor. (Changes were finalized and approved in Spring 2019). Curricular maps for all three are attached.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program

Mission Statement (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

No change (apart from program name): The Art History & Museum Studies Program trains students in the history, visual literacy, critical thinking, research, and communication skills necessary to become ethical, forward-thinking leaders in the art world and beyond.

Mission Statement (Minor):

Art History minor: The Art History minor trains students in the history, visual literacy, critical thinking, and research and writing skills that will help them to become successful professionals in the art world and well beyond.

Museum Studies minor (NEW): The minor in Museum Studies offers students training in the history, theory, and practice of museums and other cultural institutions, and provides significant “hands on” experience designed to complement a student’s major area of study. This uniquely practical program serves students in the arts, humanities, science, and professional fields (like art, design, history, English, education, science, music, anthropology, law, business, and technology) who wish to diversify their skills and pre-professional experience or to pursue rewarding careers in museums and other cultural institutions. (I realize this is more of a program description – should we develop a more focused mission statement here?)

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

NOTE: PLOs for the major and two minors were revised in spring 2019 as part of program changes.

PLOs (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

1. Analyze a broad range of works of visual art and architecture in their aesthetic, historical, and/or cultural contexts.
2. Develop persuasive art historical arguments in oral or written form using common disciplinary methodologies.
3. Articulate critical roles that art and arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.
4. Apply skills and knowledge essential for successful professional patterns of behavior and practice in museums and arts organizations.

PLOs (Minor):

Art History minor:

1. Analyze works of visual art and architecture in their aesthetic, historical, and/or cultural contexts.
2. Develop art historical arguments in oral or written form using common disciplinary methodologies.
3. Articulate critical roles that art can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.

Museum Studies minor:

1. Articulate a critical understanding of the histories, challenges, and methodologies related to museums and/or arts organizations as complex public service organizations.
2. Explore critical roles that museums and arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.
3. Apply skills and knowledge essential for successful professional patterns of behavior and practice in museums and arts organizations.

3. State the particular Program Learning Outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019.

PLO(s) being assessed (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

3. Articulate critical roles that art and arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.

PLO(s) being assessed (Minor):

1. We are on a three-year assessment cycle for the Art History minor, due to low # of minors (currently 5). This 3-year report will be submitted in Fall 2021 and will assess PLO 1, *Analyze works of visual art and architecture in their aesthetic, historical, and/or cultural contexts.*
2. We will adapt a three-year assessment cycle for the Museum Studies minor as it is a new program (currently with zero declared minors). This 3-year report will be submitted in Fall 2022 and will assess PLO 1, *Articulate a critical understanding of*

the histories, challenges, and methodologies related to museums and/or arts organizations as complex public service organizations.

III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions.”

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods” which relate to a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

Important: *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

Methodology used (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

The department used direct evaluation of work from three classes to conduct this assessment. The products were: an assignment from ART 101/Survey of Western Art I (Introductory level) that asked students to answer a list of questions (mostly factual, about 15% of assignment involving slightly more critical analysis) about readings and short videos related to current debates about Confederate monuments and related issues (10 papers reviewed); a final assignment from ART 200/Museum Studies I (Developing level) that asked students to design an exhibition that drew on one critical theme addressed in the class (such as representing diverse cultures or dealing with looted or stolen art objects) (10 projects reviewed); and a final research paper from ART 390/Art & Trauma (Mastery level) in which student topics addressed significant ethical issues (9 papers reviewed). A group of three faculty read the assignments: one did not teach any of the classes, the other two each taught one of the classes (all three readers read work from all three classes).

Methodology used (Minor):

N/A

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,
- b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and
- c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example.

Results (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Summaries of overall results are as follows:

- At the Introductory level (ART 101):
 - Beginning to Developing: 20%
 - Developing: 50% *[meets expectations]*
 - Developing to Competent: 30% *[exceeds expectations]*
- At the Intermediate level (ART 200):
 - Developing: 40% *[meets expectations]*
 - Developing to Competent: 20% *[meets expectations]*
 - Competent: 40% *[exceeds expectations]*
- At the Advanced level (ART 390):
 - Developing 22% *[below expectations]*
 - Competent: 22% *[below expectations]*
 - Mastery: 56% *[meets expectations]*

The results for this year's assessment seem to be consistent with last year's results in indicating that the students are generally learning the breadth and depth of skills, subject knowledge, and methods of analysis that our program is aiming to teach them. At the introductory level 80% performed at a Developing or higher level in considering the role of the arts in considering ethical issues. At the intermediate level fully 100% met the "Developing" target, with 40% reaching Competent. At the advanced level students are engaging in significant research projects that consider ethical issues, with 56% reaching Mastery and 22% rated Competent. This may be underperforming somewhat, due to complications with assignments, explained below. Overall, the students seem to be largely performing at expectations, though fewer are exceeding expectations across the three levels compared to last year's assessment. Our data set is small, as we don't have that many students, and that provides something of a challenge.

However, we did have some significant realizations from this year's assessment. While the vast majority of our classes have content that does indeed consider ethical issues in relation to arts

and arts institutions, we found that we are not asking questions or designing assignments that explicitly address the second part of PLO 3: “effecting positive social change.” Thus, that part of the assessment exercise was often “N/A” on the rubric, dragging down some of the overall assessment scores. Primarily we ended up evaluating how well assignments met the first part of the PLO. We also realized we are not designing questions or assignments **intentionally** that explicitly address the first part of the PLO, “Articulate critical roles that art and arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues.” The assignments we ended up selecting for this assessment were ones that more or less fit the PLO in retrospect, and because students were not being asked to address these issues explicitly, that led to some ambiguity in the results.

Regarding the Mastery level courses, we realized we may want to rethink/add to the PLO map. Currently ART 421/Museum Internship and ART 423/Non-profit Internship are the only two courses that map to this PLO at the Mastery level. However, we found we didn’t have relevant assignments to evaluate. This may be attributed to a change in staffing: a part time faculty member who taught the fall 2018 section (and was schedule to teach the spring 2019 section) may well have had a relevant assignment, but she left the university to take another position mid-year and we didn’t have access to her assignments. Another faculty member stepped in rather last minute to pick up the class and taught it for the first time; unfortunately no assignment from that section mapped to this PLO. Thus we ended up using an upper-division seminar paper from a class specifically tied to ethical issues (Art & Trauma) to assess for the Mastery level. Our upper-division seminars at the 300 level (including ART 390/Art & Trauma) are not on our curricular map for this PLO, and perhaps they should be, as final papers and perhaps other assignments often may be relevant to this PLO.

Results (Minor):

N/A

V. CLOSING THE LOOP

1. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

Closing the Loop (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

As explained above, primarily we have realized that we need to be certain we have designed at least one assignment across multiple classes that may be used to assess our PLOs – this is particularly the case for PLOs 3 and 4, which involve aspects that are not quite as straightforward to assess without a targeted question/assignment (versus the more standard exams and papers we typically use for PLOs 1 and 2). As mentioned last year, we also need to continue to have discussions about consistency in the types of assignments required by different

faculty especially at the Introductory and Intermediate levels (where we have a number of adjunct faculty, too), to ensure that we have a consistent scaffolding of assignments and skills that is serving our students well.

In addition we need to continue discussion about what we are expecting in terms of Mastery and Competence at intermediate and advanced level classes and try to arrive at some consensus. There is also some ambiguity around the categories listed on the rubrics we have been developing and the actual PLO mapping – i.e. the rubric has 4 categories and slightly different terminology (Introductory, Developing, Mastery are used in the PLO, but Beginning, Developing, Competent, Mastery are used on the rubric). Advice from assessment folks on this matter would be very welcome. We also expect to continue to refine our PLOs and our assessment rubrics.

Our biggest challenge continues to be our small student numbers. Though our program enrollment is stable, many students deviate from the order of classes we envision, due to a combination of factors: coming in with test credits, transferring in from other universities, changing to the major (somewhat late), and taking classes abroad, which are often not as rigorous as ours. Our revised major was designed to try and help with some of these issues, but it is an ongoing discussion.

Closing the Loop (Minor):

I am quite concerned about the very small enrollments at the minor level and how to conduct assessment there. Thus far we have been picking three levels of classes at the I, D, and M level and pulling relevant work by majors from those classes. With only ~5-6 minors, there is no guarantee that any one class will have minors in it. Should we be seeking out and saving work by minors across all classes on a yearly basis and eventually using more than three classes for assessment? I would greatly appreciate any advice about gathering appropriate work products for future minor assessments.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

Suggestions (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Confirmation that we are on the right track in thinking about/trying to refine our PLOs, how they map to the different levels, and making sure we are trying to develop appropriate assignments (i.e, “calibrate and increase consistency.”) As this year’s assessment shows, clearly we need to continue to do this!

Suggestions (Minor):

N/A

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

Rubric for ARTM PLO 3: Articulate critical roles that art and arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.

PLO 3	Mastery	Competent	Developing	Beginning
Identification of ethical issues	Describes issue(s) comprehensively, addresses significant aspects in a complex manner	Issue stated and described, scope is focused and manageable for the assignment	Issue stated but with some ambiguity, relevant aspects not explained	Struggles to identify issues
Articulation of connections to arts/arts institutions	Effectively and convincingly develops strong, logical, and coherent connection(s)	Effectively articulates connection(s)	States a main idea or connection(s), but struggles to effectively articulate	Fails to make connection
Use of evidence, research (visual and/or textual) <i>Note: citations and research are not required for all assignments</i>	Synthesizes, evaluates, and analyzes in-depth information from various sources; questions viewpoint of sources; develops a comprehensive interpretation and analysis; uses accurate & complete citations (appropriate use of paraphrasing and direct quotations, distinguishing between common knowledge and info requiring citation, and info requiring citation, accurate citation style)	Presents information from relevant source(s); acknowledges varying perspectives or approaches; incorporates analysis and/or synthesis of information; mostly correct use of citations with minor errors (mostly appropriate use of paraphrasing and direct quotations, distinguishing between common knowledge and info requiring citation, and accurate citation style)	Presents relevant info with limited interpretation or analysis; does not question source, information, or assumptions; limited use of citations (may struggle to distinguish how and when to cite information appropriately; uses specific citation style but makes consistent errors)	Presents irrelevant info, uses info without any interpretation or analysis; does not accurately cite information
Organization and written or verbal expression	Organization and writing or speech effectively supports thesis or purpose, with fully effective transitions, well organized information, clear writing/speaking style	Organization and writing or speech mostly supports thesis or purpose, with appropriate transitions and sequence of ideas.	Organization and writing or speech adequately supports a simple thesis or purpose, some adjustments could improve flow of ideas	Weak or unclear organization and writing or speech, abrupt shifts in logic or flow of ideas
Analysis and interpretation, connection to ethical issues and effecting positive social change	Effectively organizes and analyzes evidence, ideas to reveal insightful observations about ethical issues and social change	Organizes and analyzes evidence, ideas to articulate ideas about ethical issues and social change	Lists and organizes ideas or evidence, but struggles to effectively consider ethical issues or connection to social change	Lacks analysis, minimal interpretation, doesn't connect to ethical issues or social change
Conclusions	Conclusion is sophisticated and logical, emerges from informed evaluation, analysis, and synthesis of appropriate evidence	Conclusion is more complex, arises from and responds to inquiry and analysis presented	Conclusion is general, or is logical because information has been chosen to fit the desired conclusion	Conclusion is absent or is ambiguous, illogical, unsupported, or inconsistent