

Annual Program Review 2011-2012 - INSTRUCTIONAL

Division - Program

VISUAL & PERFORMING ARTS

ART HISTORY

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and <u>submitted to the Program Review</u> <u>Committee by the Division Chair</u>.

Author:Dr. Trudi AbramDivision Chair:Dr. Peter GreenDate Received by Program Review:November 8, 2011

Overview of the Program

All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).

Statement of Purpose - briefly describe in 1-3 sentences.

The primary purpose of the Art History program is to supply general education courses for transfer to four-year colleges and universities. Art History satisfies the Humanities Requirement under the IGETC paradigm. Secondarily, it provides students who are art majors the necessary requirements for lower-division major transfer (TMC). The tertiary purpose for the Art History program is to supply courses for students who would like to major in art history when they transfer to a four-year college.

Please list the **most significant achievement** accomplished since your last program review. We continue to make minor changes in our curricula based on faculty discussions and meetings. Meetings were held on: 2/8/11, 3/18/11 (Division Retreat), 6/5/11, 8/21/11, 8/31/11, 10/6/11

List the current major strengths of your program

1. Students in multiple sections of the primary survey courses (Art 101 & 102) receive uniform content from all instructors teaching the class. Again, this has been accomplished by regular meetings to discuss methodology and pedagogy.

2. Not only do we have great cohesiveness among the faculty, but through both private talks and more formal meetings we are constantly coming up with new ideas to improve our teaching.

3. Our biggest strength lies in our links to the college CORE Competencies and the ongoing efforts and commitment to the Student Learning Outcome assessments. All classes have been evaluated as to their relevance to the CORE competencies and we have been able to design uniform assessment tools that enable us to assess the student learning process not only for courses with multiple sections, but also individual course. This then leads to analysis and measurement at the program level which we have now accomplished.

List the current weaknesses of your program

- 1. The most pressing weakness is the lack of full-time faculty.
- 2. Equipment is becoming obsolete and unreliable.
- 3. We do not have rooms assigned to us that allow for large lecture.
- 4. Because of the lack of full-time faculty we have not been able to convert our webpage to the new college website. We plan to ask for an ancillary stipend for an adjunct faculty member to accomplish this task.

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

	Academic						Succe	
	Year			WSCH /			SS	
		FTES	FTEF	FTEF	Full-Time	Fill Rate	Rate	Awards
Program		Trend	Trend	Trend	% Trend	Trend	Trend	Trend
ART HISTORY	2007-2008	172	9.0	607	42.2%	84.5%	61.7%	1
	2008-2009	193	9.4	653	31.9%	91.0%	61.5%	1
	2009-2010	194	9.4	658	23.4%	91.6%	66.3%	0
	2010-2011	191	9.0	676	20.0%	99.0%	60.0%	1
	% Change	+11.4%	+0.0%	+11.4%	-52.6%	+17.2%	-2.6%	+0.0%
	4-Yr. Trend	increasing	stable	increasing	decreasing	increasing	stable	Stable
VISUAL &	2007-2008	1,281	74.5	547	56.0%	86.5%	69.2%	36
PERFORMING	2008-2009	1,338	72.4	588	53.1%	97.5%	70.5%	40
ARTS	2009-2010	1,328	76.4	553	50.0%	96.6%	72.1%	22
DIVISION	2010-2011	1,228	79.3	493	50.6%	94.4%	70.0%	28
TOTAL	% Change	-4.1%	+6.3%	-9.8%	-9.7%	+9.2%	+1.3%	-22.2%
	4-Yr. Trend	stable	stable	stable	stable	stable	stable	decreasing

1.1. Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and student learning:

The only area of concern that this data shows is our decreasing ratio of full-time faculty. We do not concentrate on awards because the primary focus for our students is GE transfer. An AA in art history is extremely limited in the marketplace. Most students who plan to major in Art History at a four-year institution follow a transfer pattern rather than an award pattern.

At this point, our limitation of FTEF and room size limits any possibility of serving more students. Our courses all fill to the maximum level during registration and have healthy waiting lists. We could definitely benefit by having large lecture classrooms.

The above data also shows that even with a reduced amount of FTEF our classes are in great demand and are continuously over-enrolled.

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

One other area of interest we have found is an increasing demand for online instruction. At present we offer Art 102 online (1 or 2 sections). The online classes are highly desirable for working adults who in prior years have registered for our evening classes. We have noticed that the demand for evening, Friday and Saturday classes has dropped with the advent of online classes. Art 101 is currently in the approval process for online delivery.

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

Provide the following information on each department and program within the division.

List each Department within the Division as well each degree, certificate, or other program* within the Department	Active Courses with Identified SLOs		Active Courses Assessed		Course Sections Assessed		If this area has program outcomes have they been assessed?	
	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%	Yes or No	
ART HISTORY	18	100%	20	100%	101-8 102-7	101 - 100% 102- 100%	yes	

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

We have two courses that are currently inactive and haven't been taught recently. The first, African, Oceanic Art has not been taught because we have not had enough FTEF to offer this class in addition to our regular and rotational offerings. However, the principle reason this class has not been offered is that we employ discipline specialists to teach our courses in order to maintain the highest possible quality. No discipline specialists have been available in this field. Consequently, we have incorporated much of this course material into our new non-Western survey class (Art History 115) that is taught every semester. The second class, History of Ceramics, has not filled the last few times we have offered the class. Both of these classes are under consideration for retirement from the catalog, but not the general curriculum.

As our statistics show, our efforts in completing the SLO cycle of continuous improvement has reaped countless rewards in terms of program improvement.

- 2.2. a) Please provide a *link** to all program <u>assessment timelines</u> here. This link could be to your division /department website, eLumen, etc.
 - b) Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.
 - c) Based on the program assessment timelines you have developed and the evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your division/program is in the assessment process.
 - a) http://www.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=1959
 - b) No changes at this time.
 - c) We have completed the assessment process for our primary survey classes and are continuing to assess courses taught on a rotational basis.
- 2.3 a) Please provide a *link* to any program and/or relevant course <u>assessment reports</u>. Does the evidence from assessment reports show that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes?
 - b) Please briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses and/or programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.

Assessment reports are available through Research and Planning.

2.4 Please list all courses which have been reviewed in the last academic year. Note: Curriculum Review is required by the Chancellors Office every 6 years.

Art 101 (constant review), Art 102 (constant review), Art 103, Art 106, Art 107, Art 113, Art 115, Art 125, Art 199, Art 105 Are course outlines up to date in PeopleSoft?

2.5 Please list all degree/certificate programs within the division that were reviewed in the last academic year.

Although we do not concentrate on degree programs, we have evaluated our program in regard to the new transfer model curricula protocols that are being developed. Our program now duplicates the lower division core for Art History and for studio and other practicum courses in Art in the CSU system. (3 courses are standard for Art History majors, Art 101, Art 102, Art 115. All other courses transfer as IGETC credit and for some elective credit depending upon the institution.

2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.

Continued refinement of core course concepts though faculty dialog.

3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes?

Department meetings, the first of which was held on 8/31/11. The following meeting, scheduled for October 6, 2011 will focus on a discussion of an innovative pedagogical success brought forward by a faculty member. The meetings that follow will stress the same point. Throughout the year one faculty member at each meeting will explain and discuss a pedagogical problem, success or failure for the group to consider.

3.2 Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please <u>briefly</u> describe your plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements				
Website conversion or new design	Ease of students, faculty and administrators to access Art History information more easily				
New hire?	Better coverage for our classes and				
New projectors	Students will be able to view the images more clearly.				