Instructions: Each year, the department will prepare a brief (two page maximum) report that documents the assessment of the course during the year. This report will be electronically submitted, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by September 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1
To be completed by the course coordinator:

1) What SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

   All.

2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?

   Students in ARTH 70C have a wide range of backgrounds and competencies in design knowledge and writing. Per its Catalogue description, the ARTH 70C features “Major trends in the art of China, India and Japan, as well as Southeast and Central Asia and Korea, from the Neolithic period to the twentieth century.” To accomplish this, the course uses contextual and visual analysis of specific objects of art and architecture set within their specific cultural contexts. It can be particularly challenging to students with reading comprehension problems or those with difficulties in abstract thinking. Primary issues examined in this GE course include diversity in culture and art, cross-cultural interactions, and the roles of men and women in making and using art. Instruction is conducted through PowerPoint slide lectures covering India, China, Japan, Southeast Asia, and part of Central Asia.

   The Spring 2012 instructor is not available for data on student performance in his course. However, until his retirement in Spring 2011, Dr. Arthur Kao taught all sections of the ARTH 70C. Kao consistently found that most students performed well and mastered all SLO areas as measured by extensive quizzes, exams and writing assignments. (His sections featured nine short quizzes, five in-class writing exercises, a short museum paper, a term paper, a midterm, and a final exam.) Kao found that historically approximately 14% of all ARTH 70C students, roughly ten out of each class of 70, failed to meet the goals of this Area C1 course. The most prevalent reason for lack of mastery stems from what Dr. Kao identifies as serious deficiencies in student writing and research skills. He also noted that most students who fail meet goals defined by the SLOs are hampered by their lack of general cultural knowledge.

   Similarly, student success in achieving the learning outcomes of an ARTH GE course is assessed in two ways. First, written assignments are assessed for evidence of improvement in three areas: style, organization and content. Improvements in style and organization provide evidence that students are increasingly able to write clearly and effectively on a variety of topics. Improvements in content shows that students are able to interpret objects of art and architecture using the conceptual tools and historical information learned in the course. Second, quizzes and exams are assessed for both knowledge of course issues and ability to translate visual perception into verbal communication. Students are required to know the specific contextualized histories of each area addressed, as well as the more general key concepts, terms and definitions of the study of art.

   (con’t:)
Quizzes and examinations assess the following learning outcomes: ability to translate visual perception into verbal communication; recognizing basic issues inherent to objects of art and architecture in general; knowledge of aesthetic qualities and social contexts; and understanding of basic themes and problems in design. Written assignments, in addition to fulfilling basic GE writing requirements, assessed the following additional learning outcomes: writing clearly and effectively using terminology appropriate to the study of the arts of Asia; ability to interpret art and architecture from multiple points of view; learning the characteristics of examples studied; knowledge of the issues related to and accomplishments of diverse cultures as reflected in examples of art and architecture; and understanding of how art and architecture are affected by specific cultural and historical contexts.

The Spring 2012 section reduced the overall student course load in an attempt to make learning outcomes easier to assess. It also expanded coverage of contemporary and especially 21st-century Asian art to increase student satisfaction with the course. All students gave up to two short, 500-word in-class presentations to expand the scope of course content and in fulfillment of the public speaking component. In theory, requiring all students to give multiple brief presentations promised increased student interaction with course material. In practice, however, these proved too brief to adequately convey knowledge or otherwise benefit the class as a whole. Further, the greensheet notes that the public speaking portion could be fulfilled through unspecified alternate means. As with the similar assignment introduced by this instructor in another of our GE course offerings, this assignment has been permanently discontinued.

Finally, course materials, including images, course materials and assignments were enhanced through an optimal combination of the extensive resources of the Visual Resources Library and D2L. These modifications appeared to enhance student learning and satisfaction with the learning environment.

(3) What modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming year? (If no modifications are planned, the course coordinator should indicate this.)

Since Dr. Kao’s retirement, this course has been taught by two sequential part-time instructors, each of whom has left SJSU to pursue more permanent employment. The Art History and Visual Culture program is actively searching for part-time instructors with doctorates in one or more areas covered by this course. Ideally this person or persons will also be able to address the key problem area identified by Dr. Kao, namely students’ lack of adequate writing skills.

Part 2

To be completed by the department chair (with input from course coordinator as appropriate):

(4) Are all sections of the course still aligned with the area Goals, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

Yes. The single ARTH 70C course offered during the 2012-2013 assessment period featured assigned coursework more aligned with that in the ARTH program’s upper-division courses. Against counsel, students were given four equally weighted assignments (two exams, a research paper, and a 500-word presentation). Future instructors will be required to adhere to university and program standards for meeting GE requirements through more frequent assessment tools and multiple writing assignments featuring instructor feedback and student revision.
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