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In AY 2006-2007, as in previous academic years, faculty in each of the three areas of the Department of Art (Art Education, Art History, and Studio Art) participated in a review of their courses and curricula. Our study combined recent first-hand observations by full-time and part-time faculty, based on results achieved in the courses they had taught, with ones that were made during recent external reviews by NASAD (National Association of Schools of Art and Design; Spring 2005) and the CCTC (California Council on Teacher Credentialing; Summer 2006).

Art Education

1. What goals or learning objectives/outcomes were assessed in AYs 2006-2007?
   Because of the CCTC review, the entire pre-credential program was examined by Art Education faculty in 06-07. Effectively, all of the objectives were of interest, though particular attention was given to those that had to be discussed in the Self Study submitted to the CCTC.

2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?

   a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered.
      One of the tools used to assess a select group of Art students each academic year is the entrance examination/portfolio review of art students applying for admission to the College of Education’s single subject program (these applicants are reviewed by the full-time faculty in Art Education). Many of the applicants earned the BA degree in Art (either Art Studio or Pre-Credential Preparation/Art Education) at Sacramento State.
      The other way in which assessment-related information is gathered is through area-specific meetings of Art Education faculty to discuss their curriculum. This year, the research related to the Self Study required the collection of additional assessment data.

   b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program’s success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?
      Our efforts were directed more towards identifying areas in need of improvement.

   c. In what areas are students doing well and achieving expectations?

   d. What areas are seen as needing improvement within your program?
      The Art Education faculty agreed with the CCTC reviewer’s perception that the studio art component of the existing undergraduate program was not rigorous enough—that students needed to complete additional upper division coursework in selected artistic media in order to be
better prepared to teach art in the public school system (especially at the secondary level, where most teaching opportunities are located).

3. **As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?**

   a. **If so, what are those changes?**

   As a result of internal discussions and after considering recommendations made during the NASAD and CCTC reviews, the Art Education faculty decided to revise and expand the undergraduate Art Education program (single subject, pre-credential preparation).

   The Art Education faculty also decided to implement a 3-unit requirement in non-western art history. The program proposal that resulted was approved at all levels and had the following key components:
   - Increase in unit count from 48 to 60
   - Creation of a category in non-western art history from which Art Education students must select one class
   - Establishment of several “core areas” in studio art from which Art Education students must select a series of courses covering beginning through intermediate/advanced levels (including 9 units of upper division coursework)
   - Creation of a culminating course (senior seminar) that includes a fieldwork experience component (ART 192C)

   (for a full description, see the paperwork for the program change proposal, especially Form B)

   b. **How will you know if these changes achieved the desired results?**

   The results will not be evident immediately, given the catalogue rights of students currently enrolled at Sacramento State. However, we would expect to start seeing evidence of improvement once the senior seminar is implemented (this has proved to be an excellent venue for assessing a program’s success) and after students graduating with the 60-unit major start to apply for admission to the single-subject credential program. Full-time Art Education faculty also will be tracking the academic progress of their advisees.

4. **Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics or course alignment?**

5. **What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?**

   The Art Education faculty are continuing to hold regular meetings to discuss the courses and curriculum. Also, at the annual Art Department faculty retreat in late August 2007, we will discuss the contents of this report and consider what assessment activities and goals might be appropriate for the 2007-2008 academic year.
1. What goals or learning objectives/outcomes were assessed in AYs 2006-2007?
We were particularly interested in assessing the critical thinking, research, and writing skills acquired by students as they entered the final semesters of the Art History concentration.

2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?
   a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered.
   As a culminating class taken by all graduating seniors in Art History, ART 192B provides its instructor with important insight into the results of our program (the same is also true of the comparable course in studio art, ART 192A. It was offered for the first time in Spring 2007.
   
   b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program’s success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?
   Our efforts were directed more towards identifying areas in need of improvement.
   
   c. In what areas are students doing well and achieving expectations?
   
   d. What areas are seen as needing improvement within your program?
   ART 192B has confirmed our awareness of the need for increased emphasis on critical thinking, research, and writing throughout the art history curriculum, from the introductory through the advanced levels. The art historians have been discussing ways of facilitating this. The new seminar requirement, proposed over a year ago when ART 115 and 116 were created (see below) and made a part of the new (2008-10) catalogue, will solidify these skills for juniors and seniors. However, we also want students in the beginning classes (many of whom are not majors or minors in Art or Art History) to have some introduction to these skills. The challenge is that these also are our largest lecture classes.

3. As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?
No major changes were proposed for the Art History area this academic year.

   a. If so, what are those changes?
   One way to improve the students’ communication skills (both oral and written) could be the creation of 1-unit seminar components that would be attached to the existing art history lecture courses, and would give students the opportunity to discuss course topics in small group situations. We have discussed adding 3 units to the concentration (raising it from 48 to 51 units) so that each art history student would be required to enroll in at least three of the 1-unit seminars. This change is still in the planning process.

   As mentioned above, the two new topics seminars, ART 115 and ART 116, already have been added to the concentration and will appear in the list of major requirements in the 2008-10 Catalog. They are part of the new seminar requirement intended to increase the research and writing skills of students in the Art History concentration.

   b. How will you know if these changes achieved the desired results?
4. Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics or course alignment?
A rubric was developed for Art History courses over two years ago. First introduced for the lower division GE courses, it also has been adapted for use in upper division courses.

5. What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?
The Art History faculty are continuing to hold regular meetings to discuss the courses and curriculum. Also, at the annual Art Department faculty retreat in late August 2007, we will discuss the contents of this report and consider what assessment activities and goals might be appropriate for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Studio Art

1. What goals or learning objectives/outcomes were assessed in AYs 2006-2007?
Studio Art faculty were concerned about the success of lower division courses in giving students the foundation skills and knowledge needed for the next level of study. Another one of their goals has been to increase the independence and self-motivation of students in the Art major. As a venue for student-designed shows, the Witt gallery also has contributed significantly to this effort.

2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?
   a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered.
   As was the case in Art Education, the undergraduate concentration in Studio Art was the subject of a rigorous review and significant change by the faculty this academic year (essentially, it was the culmination of a three-year process). After reviewing the NASAD report, examining the curricula of Studio Art majors at comparable institutions, and discussing the results achieved by the existing sequence of courses in the major, the Studio Art faculty was able to make a strong and persuasive case for revising and expanding the concentration. Again, as with Art History, the instructors teaching the senior seminar were able to contribute insights about the strengths and weaknesses of our program.

   As in past years, regular meetings of full-time and part-time Studio Art faculty played an important role in the assessment process in this area. In May 2007, faculty attending the end-of-semester assessment meeting shared information and insights about a variety of instructional and programmatic issues, ranging from effective ways to design portfolios in beginning drawing classes, to the amount of homework appropriate in Studio Art classes, to the structure of the senior seminar (its strengths, how it might be improved, etc.).

   b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program’s success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?
   c. In what areas are students doing well and achieving expectations?
   d. What areas are seen as needing improvement within your program?
   The Studio Art faculty agreed that the existing concentration needed additional strengthening and structure at both the lower division (foundation) and upper division levels. Students needed to establish basic skills in two-dimensional, three-dimensional, and new media, regardless of their
area of specialization at the upper division level. Additional upper-division coursework in specific artistic media was needed to help them achieve a higher level of skill. They also needed to be introduced to both western and non-western art history in the lower division core, and to be required to study modern or contemporary art history at the upper-division level. Finally, they needed additional opportunity to develop the critical and aesthetic skills addressed in the senior seminar. All of these changes together would help assure that students graduating with a BA degree in Studio Art would be more successful in applying for admission to graduate programs or pursuing a career in the visual arts.

3. As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?
   a. If so, what are those changes?

A proposal for a 60-unit concentration was passed at all levels and will be implemented with the 2008-10 Catalog. The desire to offer a vital learning environment, in which students may prepare for the increasingly competitive rigors of the world they will face after graduation, has been the underlying intention guiding our design of the new program.

The new program proposal in Studio Art has the following key components:
   • Increase in unit count from 48 to 60 (30 units lower division, 30 upper division)
   • Creation of a lower division category in non-western art history from which Studio Art students must select one class
   • Implementation of a specific 3-unit requirement in electronic art, lower division foundation (ART 97 or equivalent)
   • Implementation of a specific 3-unit requirement in three-dimensional composition, lower division foundation (ART 70 or equivalent)
   • Implementation of specializations in the upper division area (students must complete 12 units in one group in order to acquire in-depth knowledge and enhanced technical ability in a specific medium)
   • Implementation of a two-semester requirement for the senior seminar (ART 192A must be taken twice in two different semesters to enhance students’ verbal, written, and visual skills in a variety of art disciplines)
   • Implementation of an upper division requirement in modern or contemporary art history (one of the two courses taken to fulfill the upper division art history requirement must be in modern or contemporary art)

(for a full description, see the paperwork for the program change proposal, especially Form B)

b. How will you know if these changes achieved the desired results?

4. Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics or course alignment?

The development of the 60-unit concentration was the most significant by-product of on-going assessment processes in Studio Art. Other steps that also were taken in recent semesters, with more complete implementation in AY 2006-07, include:
   • The creation and distribution of a grading rubric for use in all Studio Art classes (also mentioned in the assessment report submitted in June 2006)
• The continued use of the Witt Gallery for shows of work by students enrolled in classes (e.g., a show of work by students in ART 163, ART 183, etc.): this provides all faculty and students with the opportunity to observe, and assess (informally), the level of work accomplished by students in specific Studio Art courses

5. What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?
The Studio Art faculty are continuing to hold regular meetings to discuss the courses and curriculum. Also, at the annual Art Department faculty retreat in late August 2007, we will discuss the contents of this report and consider what assessment activities and goals might be appropriate for the 2007-2008 academic year.