

**2012-2013 Assessment Report**  
**Department of Art**  
**Art History**  
**Submitted by Daniel Frye**  
[frye@csus.edu](mailto:frye@csus.edu) 916.278.7515

1. As a result of last year's assessment effort, have you implemented **any changes for your assessment including learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment tools (methods, rubrics, curriculum map, or key assignment etc.), and/or the university baccalaureate learning goals?**

Art History faculty completed and submitted an assessment model last year. Although faculty assessed the program in the past, this is the first time with the new assessment model. This new model collects data about student performance through analysis of submitted student assignments, discussion by faculty of student performance on those assignments, student discussion with interviewer about program (students from senior seminar), and reflection of faculty on points raised by students in that discussion (this interview is conducted by a faculty member outside the Art History faculty and students' names are withheld during the faculty debriefing). Student assignments are collected by faculty and placed on the same server used to collect data for the studio concentration. At this point, although assignments have been collected, they cannot be read due to some technical glitch. This should be resolved by the next assessment.

In addition to direct observation of what students achieved, faculty desired a student interview session from graduating seniors who were enrolled in the Art History senior Seminar. In this way, faculty believed they could capture any stray or extra-textual issue that might not be obvious by looking at student assignments. This interview session was set up as the last class of the semester during finals week. Students were informed that this would be an assessment piece and that individual answers would be made anonymous when shared with the Art History faculty. The desired results were for students to feel open and free in sharing their opinions about the program. This appears to have occurred as students did not hesitate to answer questions, shared anecdotal stories, or further developed points raised by other students. Their demeanor was sincere and they were willing to contribute with little prompting.

2. As a result of last year's assessment effort, have you implemented **any other changes at the department, the college or the university, including advising, co-curriculum, budgeting and planning?**

There have been no other changes implemented.

3. What **PROGRAM** (not course) learning outcome(s) have you assessed this academic year?

- (1) Visual literacy: a broad foundation in Western and Non-Western art and visual culture and greater literacy in one of four areas of specialization (i.e., European Art prior to 1800, Asian Art, Art of the Americas, and Modern and Contemporary Art). This includes familiarity with a wide range of canonical works from throughout the world as well as the most significant art works in regional and Bay Area museum collections and exhibitions. The art of women and other underrepresented groups also are addressed in the Art History curriculum.
- (5) Information literacy: the ability to find trustworthy information using digital and traditional resources including: a) databases, collections, interlibrary loan and other university library resources; and b) primary sources such as archives and personal interviews.
- (6) Written and oral communication skills enhanced by competence in the use of digital technologies for art historical research, information management and design (e.g. the production of PowerPoint and video presentations).
- (10) Understanding of the relationship of art history to other histories, related academic disciplines (e.g., literature, anthropology, religion, sociology, and political science, and history), and to lived experience outside of art.

4. What method(s)/measure(s) have you used to collect the data?

Data were collected through faculty submission of student assignments. This part of the assessment is not yet, up-and-running. However, the student interview and faculty debriefing provided solid data, particularly where students and faculty agreed about points raised.

5. What are the criteria and/or standards of performance for the program learning outcome?

The criteria or performance standards are embedded in the learning outcomes.

6. What data have you collected? What are the results and findings, including the percentage of students who meet each standard?

Data collected were from the student interview session and faculty debriefing. Given that these were qualitative measures, there were no percentages calculated. Resolutions and ideas raised in these discussions may be outside the framework of this template but do point at how faculty and students believe their program can be improved and what aspects should be preserved. The following discussion of findings will highlight points of the student interview and faculty debriefing. 12 students attended the assessment interview, the entire Senior Seminar class. 2 of the 3 Art History faculty were debriefed at separate times.

There were four general questions asked of the students:

1. What is your overall view of the Art History program? What works well? What needs improvement?
2. How does the program measure against these learning outcomes?
3. What do you like most about the faculty?
4. What are you going to do with your degree?

Students were enthusiastic in answering the questions. They reflected on what each other said and at times attempted to come up with consensus. However, looking for consensus did not undermine independent voices, thought, or ideas.

Students wanted to see greater course offerings, yet understood that to be a function of the number of faculty and their areas of expertise. Students wanted to know if it was possible to cross-list other courses with Art History courses. A specific exemplar was given from Women Studies 146 Women in Art.

Faculty have considered the low number of art historians and are seeking another full-time art historian position.

In addition to more course offerings, students believe some of the current courses attempt to go over too much information. It may be helpful to split some of the current courses into two courses. Courses cited were Art 3A Traditional Asian Art, Art 3B Modern and Contemporary Art, and Art 117B Art of China and Japan. Art 112 Contemporary Art was also viewed as needing to be split. More time would be appreciated concerning artists of last 30 years. As for contemporary art, there is a desire for Asian Contemporary Art in the upper division.

Faculty teaching these courses have given consideration to expanding some of the current courses. A concern is how to offer these courses in a pattern where students who work within an emphasis area would be able to take all of the course within a two-year period.

Students desire a whole class on art theory. Currently, there is no specific course whose content deals solely with theory. What theory is introduced occurs in a variety of Art History courses for a short period of time with little depth. Yet, this desire from the students comes after a discussion among the Art History faculty for the need to introduce theory into the courses. Now that it has been introduced, the students want more. A possible solution could be using a course from Art Education, Art 130 Aesthetics and Art Criticism, which has been discussed among faculty.

Students were dismayed with campus career fairs and found them dehumanizing. There seems to be nothing in the practice of Art History according to the career fairs. Although students are required to attend extra curricular Art History presentations for class credit where speakers describe their various positions,

students would like a more hands-on opportunity. One suggestion was “a day in the life of a curator.” This approach may be more appropriate for an internship.

Students discussed 4 of the 11 program outcomes.

- A. (1) Although they believe they are introduced to a wide variety of work and artists through their courses, they desire more in contemporary Asian and contemporary art. Some of this has been discussed earlier. In addition, students raised the idea of writing more including in the lower division classes. One student said, “I remember the stuff I write about.” Another student inquired about developing a reading list for those students who might want to explore during the summer.
- B. (5) Students seemed concerned about 2 points: why doesn't the University have access to “Art Store, and how long student may hold onto intra-library loan material? One student recalled having access to a piece of material for only 2 weeks. A professor recalled during the debriefing session that a number of students waited until the last moment to get their resources.
- C. (6) Students for the most part felt comfortable with what they had learned and practice opportunities in the assignments. As stated earlier, some believed there could be more writing.
- D. (10) Students thought this happened more in Art 112 Contemporary Art. It did occur in other Art History courses but more as a “footnote.”

7. As a result of this year's assessment effort, do you anticipate or propose any changes for your program (e.g. structures, content, or learning outcomes)?

Students showed interest in expanding some courses (e.g., Art 117B and Art 112) to two separate courses. Faculty have already come to this conclusion and in some instances have already started to develop the curricular changes. Although it was not part of the discussion with the students, Art 1B is being expanded to Art 1B and Art 1C. Art 1B originally went from the Renaissance to the present and will now stop at modern art. Art 1C will handle modern and contemporary art.

8. Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

No plans have been made for next year.