

Ph.D. in Art History Academic Assessment Plan 2012-2013

College of Fine Arts
Margaret Mertz, Associate Dean
mmertz@arts.ufl.edu

Office of the Provost

*University of
Florida*

*Institutional
Assessment*

*Continuous Quality
Enhancement*

Table of Contents

Academic Assessment Plan for ASHLEY ENTER Level and Degree Name	3
A. Mission	3
B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures	4
C. Research.....	4
D. Assessment Timeline	5
E. Assessment Cycle	6
F. Measurement Tools.....	7
G. Assessment Oversight.....	8
Figure 1. University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric.....	9
University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric, continued.....	11

Academic Assessment Plan for Ph.D. in Art History

College of Fine Arts

A. Mission

The Ph.D. Program in Art History is committed to advancing students' education through critical methods of interpretation and in-depth study of the world's art traditions. The curriculum provides the intellectual foundation necessary for developing thorough knowledge of the field and its critical methods, and offers the specialized training needed to conduct advanced scholarly research. This training is intended to culminate in the Ph. D. Dissertation, a work that demonstrates student's independent thinking, analytical skills, art historical knowledge, and correct scholarly practices.

The Ph.D. in Art History program supports the college's primary mission to "to produce artists, performers, scholars, teachers, and practitioners who combine the qualities of academic and professional excellence" (College of Fine Arts Mission Statement).

The program supports the University of Florida mission to "to lead and serve the state of Florida, the nation and the world by pursuing and disseminating new knowledge while building upon the experiences of the past...to advance by strengthening the human condition and improving the quality of life." (University of Florida Mission Statement).

B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures

SLO Type	Student Learning Outcome	Assessment Method	Degree Delivery
Knowledge	1. Identifies, describes, and explains the historiography, methodology, and theory of art	Dissertation and Oral Defense	Campus
Skills	2. Selects area of specialization and identifies scholarly resources for original advanced art historical research	Dissertation and Oral Defense	Campus
Professional Behavior	3. Produces written scholarly research that conforms to academic publishing conventions 4. Verbally describes thesis research, relevant historiography, and theory	Dissertation and Oral Defense	Campus

C. Research

Ph.D. students in Art History specialize in a primary art historical field, defined by world region, chronological period, or a combination of these two elements, along with a secondary art historical field. Students must also have a strong background in the history of art more broadly, with a general knowledge of art historical fields closely related or relevant to their own. Students become conversant with their field's key scholars, their contributions and approaches to the field, and the theoretical discourses that have contributed to the development of the field. They are expected to conceptualize an original research topic that makes a substantial contribution to their field, and to conduct original research in order to pursue that topic. Students must demonstrate their mastery of the field through a written examination accompanied by an oral defense, which tests both the breadth of their knowledge of their own and closely related art historical fields, and the depth of their knowledge of scholarship directly related to their thesis subject.

Preparation: Doctoral students must take courses in primary and secondary art historical fields, in addition to courses in an outside or minor field. Students must attain a high level of scholarly accomplishment in each of these fields. They must also attain proficiency in two

foreign languages related to their area of research. Students must pass the PhD qualifying examination, assessing the student's mastery of the primary and secondary art historical fields as well as their outside field, incorporates both written and oral elements. Following approval of their Ph.D. proposal, the student conducts extended, original research in order to produce a dissertation that makes a substantive contribution to scholarship in their field. An oral defense of this work further assesses the student's mastery of their subject and its relationship to the field as a whole.

D. Assessment Timeline

Program: Ph.D. Art History _____

College : College of Fine Arts _____

Assessment	Assessment 1
SLOs	
Knowledge	
#1 Identifies, describes, and explains the historiography, methodology, and theory of art	Dissertation and Oral Defense
Skills	
#2 Selects area of specialization and identifies scholarly resources for original advanced art historical research	Dissertation and Oral Defense
Professional Behavior	
#3 Produces written scholarly research that conforms to academic publishing conventions	Dissertation and Oral Defense
#4 Verbally describes thesis research, relevant historiography, and theory	Dissertation and Oral Defense

E. Assessment Cycle

Use this Assessment Cycle template for your plan. Add or delete rows as needed to accommodate your SLOs.

Assessment Cycle for:

Program : Ph.D. Art History

College: College of Fine Arts

Data Collection:

Spring/Fall Terms of Indicated Year
(F12-S13)

Analysis and Interpretation:

Subsequent Fall Term (F13)

Improvement Actions:

Subsequent Spring Term (S14)

Dissemination:

Next academic year (F14-S15)

SLOs	Year	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Content Knowledge							
#1				X	X	X	X
Skills							
#2				X	X	X	X
Professional Behavior							
#3				X	X	X	X
#4				X	X	X	X

Note: Data collection for these assessments will begin in the 2012-13 academic year. We did not collect data in prior years.

F. Measurement Tools

Please see appendix A for a comprehensive rubric use to measure the SLOs.

Both direct and indirect measures would be taken into account

Methods:

During the fall review and analysis cycle, a faculty committee will review the DIRECT and INDIRECT DATA, answering key questions such as:

What does the data show us about each individual SLO?

And

What changes do we want to make, based on these observations?

Should there be observations that lead the faculty to consider revisions, the faculty would have the options to

- *change the SLOs and ALC

- *change the data collected (assignments, etc.)

- *change the curriculum

DIRECT DATA: The Ph.D. chair will complete the rubric (Appendix A) based on the committee's findings at the conclusion of the PhD dissertation defense. The chair will supply the school office with the rubric. The school office will electronically collect a copy of the dissertation. These data samples will be submitted online or in hard copy, as appropriate. Both will be decoupled, meaning that no grades, no student identification, and no comments will be on the data (rubric or paper). In the fall assessment and analysis cycle, samples will be reviewed based on recommended sample sizes according to the number of students in the program.

INDIRECT DATA: The College of Fine Arts Dean's Office will collect institutional data for the program, including but not limited to statistical data such as enrollment, grade distribution, recruitment and retention patterns. An additional source of data, the biennial SERU data, will be collected from the University of Florida Office of Institutional Planning and Research in the Spring. During the spring semesters, the Dean's Office will collect the INDIRECT DATA for the ARH7980 and the degree program.

The assigned committee made of faculty from the degree program would meet the fall semester of the review and analysis year to generate a report that would be submitted to the College office, along with recommendations for changes, if any.

With the concurrence of the administration, the changes would be made for the next academic year.

G. Assessment Oversight

Name	Department Affiliation	Email Address	Phone Number
Dr. Margaret S. Mertz	Associate Dean, College of Fine Arts	mmertz@arts.ufl.edu	(352) 273-1484
Prof. Richard Heipp	Director School of Art & Art History	heipp@ufl.edu	(352) 273-3021
Associate Prof. Lauren Lake	Assistant Director School of Art & Art History	lglake@arts.ufl.edu	(352) 273-3032

Appendix A. Rubric for assessment of PhD Dissertation & Oral Defense

Score	2	1	0	SCORE
	Exceptional	Acceptable	Unacceptable	
	Evidence of exceptional performance and competency.	Evidence of an accomplished level of competency	Does not demonstrate competency	
Content				
Identifies, describes, and explains the historiography, methodology, and theory of art	Dissertation elegantly deploys appropriate range of methods and theoretical frameworks in order to most clearly describe, analyze and interpret the thesis topic. Situates dissertation compellingly in relation to the current state and history of the field.	Demonstrates a mastery of the state of a field through accurate summation of major claims and arguments. Demonstrates an awareness of the methods and theoretical tools used in the dissertation.	Provides an unclear, confused, or inaccurate account of scholarship pertaining to the dissertation topic. Demonstrates no theoretical or methodological self-awareness	
Critical Thinking				
Selects area of specialization and identifies scholarly resources for original advanced art historical research	Selection of dissertation topic reflects a thoroughgoing understanding of the state of the field. Offers a credible thesis that is compellingly argued through the use of original research materials.	Adequately engages secondary materials and makes use of primary sources. Offers an acceptable thesis but offers little original insight.	Deploys secondary and primary source materials in a muddled, confused, and ineffective manner. Offers little or no original, synthetic contribution to the field.	
Communication				
Produces written scholarly research that conforms to academic publishing conventions	Exceptionally well-structured, methodologically and theoretically innovative, and historically grounded. Written in language that is clear, fluent, and error-free. Ready for peer-review submission with minimal revision.	Dissertation adheres, in large part, to the formal expectations academic publishing, but does not offer enough original insight to merit publication without major revisions.	Dissertation is riddled with errors, using language that impedes meaning.	
Verbally describes thesis research, relevant historiography, and theory	Oral presentation of dissertation is conveyed in a readily accessible manner, demonstrating an exceptional ability to respond with agility to questions while remaining faithful to the conceptual complexities of the project. Presentation suggests preparedness to engage a range of interlocutors, from students to eminent colleagues in the field.	Oral presentation adequately conveys the claims of the dissertation and suggests the candidate's readiness to present aspects of the dissertation in a classroom setting.	Oral presentation does not demonstrate the merits or stakes of the dissertation.	

Figure 1. University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric

Related resources are found at <http://www.ua.assessment.edu>

Program:		Year:			
Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Mission Statement	Mission statement is articulated clearly.				
	The program mission clearly supports the College and University missions, and includes specific statements describing how it supports these missions.				
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Assessment Measures	SLOs are stated clearly.				
	SLOs focus on demonstration of student learning.				
	SLOs are measurable.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLO.				
Research	Research expectations for the program are clear, concise, and appropriate for the discipline.				
Assessment Map	The Assessment Map indicates the times in the program where the SLOs are assessed and measured.				
	The Assessment Map identifies the assessments used for each SLO.				
Assessment Cycle	The assessment cycle is clear.				
	All student learning outcomes are measured.				
	Data is collected at least once in the cycle.				
	The cycle includes a date or time period for data analysis and interpretation.				

	The cycle includes a date for planning improvement actions based on the data analysis.				
	The cycle includes a date for dissemination of results to the appropriate stakeholders.				

University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric, continued

Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Measurement Tools	Measurement tools are described clearly and concisely.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLOs.				
	Methods and procedures reflect an appropriate balance of direct and indirect methods.				
	The report presents examples of at least one measurement tool.				
Assessment Oversight	Appropriate personnel (coordinator, committee, etc.) charged with assessment responsibilities are identified				