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Executive Summary

For what reason(s) did this department become involved in the WEC project? What key implementation activities are proposed in this edition of its Writing Plan and what, briefly, is the thinking behind these proposed activities?

The motivation for the Department of Art History’s participation in the WEC program initially developed from a faculty retreat in the late summer of 2010 at which professors expressed broad concern about the sequencing of courses taken by Art History majors, the flatness of the curriculum, the insufficiency of requirements for the major, and the inadequacy of the senior project. Faculty also described a common perception that writing skills among undergraduate majors and non-majors were in decline. Those concerns have taken on greater urgency in the intervening period as we have attempted to respond to the internal need for discipline-specific writing instruction, even while facing increasing administrative pressures to expand undergraduate enrollments and to reduce TA support. Following the retreat, the department undertook the comparatively more straightforward efforts to revise degree requirements and reorganize the curriculum. This year the opportunity of participating in the WEC program has allowed the department to begin to tackle the much thornier problems of writing instruction and the senior project in the current economic climate, problems that reverberate from individual classes across the curriculum ultimately to touch virtually every member of our community: undergraduate majors, graduate teaching assistants and instructors, faculty, academic advisers, and
administrative staff.
As the department moves forward into the implementation phase of the program, we will disseminate the Writing Plan to faculty, majors/minors, and prospective students (via the Department website and course syllabi); conduct further research on the curriculum; support writing pedagogy among faculty in a variety of achievable ways; emphasize the importance of writing to students; and develop an new model for the capstone project in the major. Obviously our first task is the broad dissemination of the Writing Plan itself, to ensure that faculty, students, advisers, and graduate teaching assistants have access to it and can make it central to their respective roles in the department. In addition, the department will undertake new and more focused research to gain specific information about enrollment patterns among majors as they navigate the art history curriculum. We intend to offer a variety of resources to aid faculty and teaching assistants in the teaching of writing, including shared assignments, grading rubrics, samples, and student handouts. We hope to organize a series of lectures for undergraduate students, as well as grads and faculty, about writing skills in the discipline and its related professions. Finally, we will undertake the work of researching, developing, and teaching a pilot major project course for AY2014-15.

The complete results of the first year of WEC activities are the subject of this report.

Section 1: DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC WRITING CHARACTERISTICS
What characterizes academic and professional communication in this discipline?

Writing in art history is characterized by (1) its use of visual, spatial, and material observation as a form of evidence and basis for argumentation; (2) its clarity and logical precision; (3) its critical and interpretive evaluation of secondary literatures and primary sources (including the art object/ artifact); and (4) its wide-ranging and original synthesis of interdisciplinary forms of knowledge.

(1) Uses visual, spatial, & material observation as a form of evidence and basis for argumentation
   a) Derives knowledge from visual, spatial, and material artifacts
   b) Descriptive writing & visual analysis

Art history's efforts (a) to derive knowledge from visual, spatial, and material artifacts is the most distinctive hallmark of the discipline. The "artwork" in art history (broadly construed to include anything made or altered by humans) is an artifact: born from a particular set of historical conditions, witness to changing social realities, and surviving to confront the historian in her or his own time. Art historians may examine an artifact for insight into any
moment in its lifespan: from when it was conceived and made, to when it was purchased and used, to its current placement in a museum, private collection, historic site, or film archive. How art historians convert the visual, material, and spatial properties of their artifacts into evidence is a dilemma solved variously by the many different methodologies available to the discipline (e.g., archaeology, formalism, Marxism, etc.). The most reliable constant across the discipline's many methods and subfields is the emphasis on (b) descriptive writing and visual analysis. The art historian aims to reproduce its objects unambiguously, concretely, and accurately, and occasionally with language that appropriately evokes the mood or aesthetic impact of the artifact. However, while art historical writing may incline toward evocative, lively, and even poetic forms of prose, it is not primarily an evaluative or editorial form of writing. In other words, its aim is not (or not only) to assess the aesthetic, political, or moral merits of the artifact, so much as to understand the force of these values in the broader contexts of history, aesthetics, or philosophy.

(2) Exhibits clarity and logical precision
a) Logical precision in the assembly, analysis, and presentation of both evidence and argument
b) Transparent clarity in the transmission of information and ideas
c) Represents the many forms of evidence that support the case being made
d) Fluid, well-organized narrative
e) Grammatically and typographically correct

Artifacts speak obliquely. The painted portrait records an idealized, not actual self; the colors in a textile point only subtly to trade patterns and agricultural development; the performance piece issued self-consciously political speech, but cast it purposefully to the wind. Because of all this, the art historian prizes (a) logical precision in the assembly, analysis, and presentation of both evidence and argument. Indeed, the art historian aspires to (b) transparent clarity in the transmission of information and ideas, enough so that the reader is able to follow along with the logic of the argument and be more persuaded by it. Art historical writing aims (c) to represent the many forms of evidence that support the case being made, so that readers might reproduce the same interpretive results on their own. This leads to texts that report explicitly on much of the evidence compiled, in the form of descriptive writing, illustrations, summaries of the relevant literature, direct quotations from relevant primary and secondary sources, etc.

(3) Offers critical & interpretative evaluation of secondary literature & primary sources (including the artifact)
a) Synthetic and interpretive
b) Many different forms of evidence brought to bear on historical, aesthetic, or theoretical problem

c) Accounts and adjusts for the interpretative (vs. factual) nature of some of the resulting claims

The art historical argument is both (a) synthetic and interpretative. This means both that the art historian brings (b) many different forms of evidence to bear on an identified historical, aesthetic, or theoretical problem, and that (c) she or he accounts and adjusts for the interpretative (vs. factual) nature of some of the resulting claims.

(4) Offers a wide-ranging and original synthesis of interdisciplinary forms of knowledge

   a) Links together wide-ranging and perhaps disparate historical contexts, artifacts, or ideas
   b) Original

Because of its novel assembly of different forms of evidence — (a) linking together wide-ranging and perhaps disparate historical contexts, artifacts, or ideas — and because of the interceding work of critical interpretation, art historical writing offers an (b) original piece of scholarship.

Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES

With which writing abilities should students in this department’s major graduate?

Art historical writing is diverse in its forms (encyclopedia entries, scholarly books and articles, exhibition catalogs, book, film, or exhibition reviews, archeological site reports, didactic texts in museums or galleries, etc.), but in all its variety, it does more than merely report on pre-existing knowledge, or simply represent research that the writer has undertaken and amassed elsewhere. It is rather the means by which knowledge is generated for specific audiences (scholars, students, museum patrons, movie and gallery goers, professional colleagues, etc.), and it is thus a key site in which art historical research and thought take place. In other words, writing is a form of thinking. Students of art history should thus demonstrate those abilities that help them: to perform the work of art history, that is, to do art history by writing and, equally importantly, to be aware of how they are doing it.

(1) Students should be able to think historically.

   a) To place art objects in clearly delineated and richly detailed historical contexts
   b) To read art objects as contexts in which larger cultural forces can be found &
c) To write accurate, fact-based, and carefully cited historical information
d) To use historical information to support descriptions, interpretations, and evaluations

Students should be able to demonstrate their understanding of different theories of history—theories that assert how historical events occur in relation to specific actors and in response to specific cultural forces, how those events are interrelated, and in what historical artifacts their traces may be found and understood. Thinking and writing art historically requires that students are able both (a) to place art objects in clearly delineated and richly detailed historical contexts (where “art objects” is broadly construed to include everything from buildings to manuscripts, photographs, performances, craft and utilitarian objects, prints, furniture, sculpture, devotional objects, films, paintings, jewelry, archaeological sites and artifacts, etc.) and (b) to read such objects as contexts in which larger cultural forces can be found and reconstructed. Such thinking also requires the ability to balance simultaneously the ethical obligations of the historian (c) to write accurate, fact-based, and carefully cited historical information and (d) to use that information to support the more subjective writing of descriptions, interpretations, and evaluations of art.

(2) Students should be able to think visually.
   a) To attend carefully to the art historical objects
   b) To look at works of art and not through them

They should have the ability (a) to attend carefully to the art historical objects (again, broadly construed) under examination. This means that they must learn (b) to look at works of art and not through them; students should understand how to read and then to write about the materials of which such works are made, the styles in which they are rendered, their symbols and visual languages, etc., and not just see them as pointing elsewhere to some self-contained meaning or straightforward historical reference. Art should not be seen as merely an illustration of something (presumably of greater importance) exterior to it. Art historical writing is not simple decipherment.

(3) Students should be able to demonstrate their strong research abilities.
   a) To conduct thorough, expansive searches for sources in digital databases, print catalogs, books and articles
   b) To identify useful comparata, primary sources, and secondary sources
   c) To provide careful and detailed descriptions of the sources used
   d) To offer thoughtful evaluation of the sources used
   e) To employ professional citation practices
f) To move from a research topic to an original and innovative research question

g) To synthesize the sources they use

Students should be able (a) to conduct thorough, expansive searches for sources in digital databases, print catalogs, books and articles, in order (b) to identify useful comparata, primary sources, and secondary sources. ("Comparata" refers to other images, objects, films, etc. that help establish a wider visual or cultural field or provide useful comparisons to main images. "Primary Sources" refers to sources that represent historical attitudes or "eye-witness" perspectives, such as a religious text influential during the same century as the church's construction, or a private diary kept by an artist. "Secondary Sources" refer to sources written at a historical remove from the subject under investigation, usually formal pieces of academic scholarship.) Strong research abilities also means being able (c) to provide careful and detailed descriptions of the sources used (their historical contexts, key arguments, the evidence they deploy, the information they supply, their rhetorical strategies and unstated assumptions, etc.), (d) to offer thoughtful evaluation of the sources used in terms of their reliability and utility for the writer's purposes, and (e) to employ professional citation practices (usually footnotes and a bibliography, written in the format prescribed by the Chicago Manual of Style). Further, this requires that students are able (f) to move from a research topic to an original and innovative research question, which is developed in conversation with the scholarship on that topic and aposite art historical debates and concerns. Students should be able (g) to synthesize the sources they use, which means to identify common themes, intellectual questions or concerns across various texts; to recognize and explain similarities and differences between texts; and to claim a position relative to them.

(4) Students should be able to think logically and to marshal diverse forms of evidence to support their clearly articulated assertions and convincingly to set forth a thesis.

a) To present visual evidence
b) To present historical evidence
c) To present textual evidence
d) To present theoretical evidence

Students should be able (a) to present visual evidence (what can be seen in works of art or forms of visual documentation such as photographs and videos), (b) to present historical evidence (what can be demonstrated through historical events and contexts), (c) to present textual evidence (what can be shown through archival or scholarly writings), and (d) to present theoretical evidence (what specific approaches to the historical past help to reveal). The precise deployment of evidence is necessary not only in scholarly forms of
writing, but perhaps especially in more evaluative forms such as film or exhibition reviews, which should express informed opinions, not simply personal reactions.

(5) Students should be able both to describe and to analyze-- carefully, vividly, accurately, and convincingly -- their different forms of evidence.
   a) To convert visual information into evidence, through description, interpretation and analysis
   b) To describe the basic elements of works of art
   c) To describe what it is like to experience the artwork in time and space
   d) To teach the reader how to see the work

Students should be able (a) to convert visual information into evidence, through description, interpretation, analysis. In other words, students should be able not only (b) to describe the basic elements of works of art (size, shape, materials, appearance, etc.), but also (c) to describe what it is like to experience the artwork in time and space: how it feels to witness a performance, to walk through a temple or cathedral, to circumambulate a sculpture, to read an illuminated manuscript or codex, to survey an archaeological site, to watch a film and to hold a print or photograph in one’s hand. Art historical writing does not simply describe what all viewers presumably see or what the writer thinks is self-evident; it works (d) to teach the reader how to see the work. Moreover, such writing directs the reader’s eye over a work of art as a means to assert something particular about it; as a form of knowledge. Similarly, students should be able to describe texts and artifacts—how it feels to read them, leaf through them, touch them, to be moved or changed by them; how they produce revelation or disillusionment, frustration or clarity. In keeping with this inherently subjective task, the student should combine an awareness of the lack of a single Truth about what art is or how it is experienced, what texts and artifacts are or how they may be interpreted, with a dedication to the validity and accuracy of written description and analysis.

(6) Students should be able to write in an organized, logical manner through which a consistent, lucid narrative emerges.
   a) To write with no grammatical or spelling errors that obscure content
   b) To proof-read and self-edit
   c) To present ideas in a clear and well-organized manner
Section 3: PLANS FOR INTEGRATING WRITING INTO UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

1. Current state of writing and writing instruction in the Art History undergraduate curriculum:
Opportunities for writing abound in Art History courses and the forms of writing are extremely diverse: take-home essay questions, bluebook essays and image comparisons, book reports and reviews, blogs and Moodle postings, collaborative writing, catalogue raisonné entries, discussion summaries, papers that analyze specific works of art, films or texts, annotated bibliographies, free writing, attributions, exhibition proposals (including an imagined cabinet of curiosities), and independent research papers that themselves take on a variety of forms and parameters.

There are a number of courses in the Art History curriculum that maintain the Writing Intensive (WI) designation. Currently 1002W “Why Art Matters,” 1004W “Intro. to Asian Art,” 1921W “Intro. to Film Study,” 3014W “Art of India,” and 3921W “Art of the Film” are being taught, and 3020W “Buddhist Art and Culture,” has been proposed and is pending approval. Such courses require a stepped writing process in which students work from initial research proposals to bibliographies to first drafts and final drafts. This kind of instruction is not, however, limited to WI classes. Numerous other courses (especially those at the 3xxx and 5xxx level) employ similar methods without utilizing that designation.

The Department of Art History employs a flat curriculum, with distribution requirements across three tiers of instruction (at the 1000, 3000, and 5000 levels) and almost no pre-requisites for its courses. Because the distribution requirements represent different geographical and historical areas, and because the department comprises only one faculty member for each of these subfields, there is a fair amount of idiosyncrasy in writing instruction, skill development, and student evaluation from course-to-course. While faculty in Art History prize the internal diversity of its discipline and curriculum -- and the freedom it provides to its undergraduates as they prepare for a variety of career tracks -- it understands the challenges this presents. First, we understand that students may be ill-prepared to view variance between classes as variance between subfields (not between professors). Second, we understand that students may be ill-equipped to view the different skills offered in all of their classes as cumulative -- building to a broader, if diverse, disciplinary skill set.

In spite of the challenges presented by curricular diversity, we discovered that there is
currently some stepping between the 1000, 3000, and 5000 levels, moving progressively from visual analysis (1000-level classes), to argument-driven analysis, mixing visual analysis and at least one other form of visual or textual evidence (3000-level classes), to longer papers reflecting the synthesis of many more forms of evidence (5000-level classes). Knowing this will help faculty become more self-conscious of this skill progression within their own portfolio of classes and across the curriculum more generally; it will also help them make this stepping more explicit to students.

Writing instruction at the 3000 level demonstrates the most variance from course to course, with assignments running the gamuts of length (from 1 to 20 pages) and genre (from question-based response papers, to creative essays, to research papers). Courses at the 5000 level uniformly engage the skill of synthesis, as well as the effort of original thought that comes with it; they do not uniformly engage the skill of research. However, there is more uniformity at the 5000 level overall, with most faculty assigning traditional research papers, with the goal of producing a serviceable draft for the Senior Project.

Currently, all students in the major complete a Senior Project, for which a grade is assigned under the course number 3971W. This is a one-credit hour course, requiring students to meet at least once with the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who oversees the final grading of the projects in consultation with each student’s primary adviser. The Senior Project requirements, as currently outlined, are minimal. Students are directed to write an approximately 15-page paper based on prior course material. Typically students build upon one of their 5000-level courses, although they may also elect to develop work initiated in a Junior-Senior Seminar (ArtH 3930), any of their 3000-level courses (with permission from the adviser and Director of Undergraduate Studies), or, in special cases, an 8000-level graduate seminar. Currently, there is no formal capstone-style class associated with 3971W. Nor are there standardized guidelines as to the nature of the paper, although the requirements of a bibliography and set of illustrations indicates that textual and visual research is to be employed. Instead, the parameters of expectations and evaluation are set by the original course and its adviser, now serving as the student’s Senior Project adviser. Thus, variance across our 5000-level classes carries over into variance across our Senior Projects.

REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF WRITING INSTRUCTION
As Currently Offered in Art History Courses, By Level and Type of Course

1000 level introduction and survey courses train students in the following:
- Introduction to methods of historical interpretation
- Understanding art objects as products of specific historical contexts and reading
such objects as acting in and on culture

- Introduction to the use of fact-based historical information and appropriate citation practices
- Methods of effectively describing art historical objects and structures
- Formalist and iconographic analysis
- Writing in a logical and well-organized manner

1000 level WI introduction and survey courses include additional instruction including:

- Techniques for self-evaluation of writing
- Techniques for revision and editing

3000 level courses are diverse in structure (some narrowly focused on a single artist, others on specific historical periods and/or geographic regions, others on specific media, and others on philosophical/theoretical debates), and thus have a wide range of instructional goals. Despite their diversity, they reinforce and repeat the training students receive in 1000 level courses (historical methods, description of art objects, formal analysis, lucid writing, etc.) and, in addition, train students in the following:

- Introduction to research methods, conducting expansive searches
- Preparing a bibliography
- Evaluation and utilization of primary and secondary sources
- Proper citation practices
- Comparative analysis of artworks
- Comparative analysis of sources via annotated bibliography, critical analysis papers, book reviews, or take-home essay exams that incorporate critical texts

3000 level WI courses include additional instruction including:

- Techniques for self-evaluation of writing
- Techniques for revision and editing

5000 level courses tend to be both more narrowly focused than those in lower divisions (studying specific cities or countries, art media, religious traditions, political or social questions, etc.), and more deeply rigorous. They build on and repeat the training that students receive in lower division courses (visual analysis, logical argumentation, research techniques, critical analysis of sources, citation practices and editing), but add skills related to the following:

- The development of a research question
- The development of a literature review and independent thesis
- Techniques for marshaling visual, historical, textual, and theoretical evidence in
support of the thesis
• Comparative analysis of sources via critical analysis papers, take-home essay exams that incorporate critical texts
• The oral presentation of independent research via group or individual class presentations
• Collaborative writing and peer-evaluation of writing

2. Proposed place and form of writing and writing instruction in a “writing enriched” Art History curriculum:
Data collection and discussion revealed Art History faculty to be in remarkable consensus about the nature and value of writing, both in the discipline and in the department’s curricular offerings. Certainly, a number of issues arose that require attention and support, but the department is unanimous in its appreciation for the variety and vigor of its existing writing instruction across courses.

Going forward, WEC support will help the department approach its goals in three main areas: (1) further research, so as to reveal the existing curricular and instructional landscape with greater precision, (2) enhanced pedagogical strategies, so as to improve and buoy existing instruction, especially in order both to cater to a diverse student body (majors and non-majors) and to make instructional objectives more explicit to students, and (3) revision of the Senior Project, so as to maximize its function as a capstone experience for graduating seniors in the major. Specifics related to all three areas are outlined in Section 5 of this document.

SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT WRITING
What concerns, if any, have unit faculty and undergraduate students voiced about grading practices? What, if any, new grading systems or practices are proposed, whether for individual courses or for a program? How satisfied is the unit faculty that students are adequately familiar with writing expectations? What do these expectations look like when they are translated into grading criteria?

Our Writing Plan aspires to respect the inherently diverse nature of pedagogical approaches to writing in the department, while at the same time establishing common values and consistent instructional goals. Our task is not to create a set of uniform assignments and identical grading rubrics or modes of assessment, but rather to ensure that writing instruction at the micro level is mindful of student needs and disciplinary standards at the macro level. Thus we seek to establish congruence between instructor expectations and the appraisal of writing internal to individual courses, on one hand, and a collective awareness of the place of such courses within the larger picture of the major, on the other. Essential to this approach, therefore, is the need to communicate more
effectively and consistently the expectations and grading criteria that will be utilized in evaluating specific assignments.

In this first year of the WEC program we have already profited from formal and informal discussions about writing, systematic collection of information about our current curriculum, degree requirements, and teaching practices, and the establishment of discipline specific writing characteristics and criteria. We have already started and will continue to utilize the research we’ve conducted, the criteria we’ve established, and the techniques we have learned over this first year to inform curricular decisions, to revise and update syllabi, to make changes to our website, and to inform our advising. These efforts will continue as we work to disseminate key components of the Writing Plan to different constituencies (faculty, teaching assistants, graduate and undergraduate students) through the following means:

1. The incorporation of parts of the Writing Plan directly into course syllabi
2. The use of the Writing Plan to create individual assignment grading rubrics
3. Posting the Writing Plan to the departmental website
4. The distribution of the plan to adjunct faculty and during the orientation of new graduate teaching assistants
5. The widespread use of the plan in undergraduate advising (by faculty, teaching assistants, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and through our Senior Academic Adviser)

Along with these action items, ongoing departmental discussions of the plan as we move into the next phases of the WEC project will help to raise the level of discourse on writing among those in the Art History community and thus to communicate faculty expectations by bringing them into common parlance.

In addition to publicizing and implementing our Writing Plan, we expect that this summer’s rating of student papers by faculty outside the department, utilizing a rubric based on our newly established list of characteristics and abilities, will teach us a great deal about the alignment (or potential misalignment) of faculty expectations and actual results. This information will influence the planning and implementation of the initiatives described in Section 5.

Moreover, our ongoing research into patterns of instruction, trends in student writing, and students’ experience of the curriculum in the major, as well as our learning new techniques and strategies for teaching writing will help us to develop more precise and accurate assessment tools. We can already see the effects of this shift, as this year’s work on the Writing Plan has helped us to start rethinking individual writing assignments that tend to
have been based on page length (a symptom of the pressures imposed by an increasingly enrollment centered university administration). We can now envision more skill driven assignment designs. We expect that such revelations will continue to contribute to grading efficiencies—better assignments that teach more targeted skills and that can be graded more easily and consistently.

The following are grading criteria, that emerge from Sections 1 and 2, from which department faculty may pick and choose as they assign and evaluate writing:

- The text is logical and well-organized
- The text is free of grammatical and spelling errors that obscure content
- The text reads art objects through careful, detailed, and vivid description
- The text exhibits the use of visual, spatial, and material observation as a form of evidence and basis of argument
- The text places art objects in clearly delineated and richly detailed historical contexts
- The text incorporates accurate, fact-based, and properly cited historical information
- The text uses appropriate primary and secondary sources
- The text contains a clearly stated thesis appropriate to the goals of the assignment
- The text describes, evaluates, and utilizes sources in support of its thesis

A more complete menu of grading criteria can be found in Appendix A.

**SECTION 5: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS AND REQUESTED SUPPORT**

*Based on above discussions, what does the unit plan to implement during the period covered by this plan? What forms of instructional support does this unit request to help implement proposed changes? What are the expected outcomes of named support?*

As noted in Section 3, Part 2 above, the department has outlined three major areas to focus on in the next phase of WEC support. Discussion and details about all three follows here. A snapshot view of associated costs appears as Appendix B.

(1) Further Research
While illuminating, the data-collection and discussions related to the first year of WEC participation revealed areas in need of further research. The department proposes to award a one-time WEC Research Fellowship to a graduate student during Summer 2014. The Research Fellow would work with WEC Co-Liaisons to gather data related to the following two questions:
1. DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO EXISTING WRITING INSTRUCTION
   First, the department would value a more complete and accurate picture of its existing curriculum and writing instruction. The self-reported information we got from faculty at this stage was insufficient in this regard, first because it did not encompass courses delivered by adjunct faculty, graduate students, or online platforms. It was insufficient, second, because faculty tended to report on assignments according to page-length and genre, without sufficient explicitness regarding the specific skills taught, exercised, and evaluated within those assignments. (There were other, minor problems related to faculty absences, erroneous transcription of faculty handwriting, etc..) Additional research is thus needed to get a clearer picture of where and when students learn the abilities we value.

   **Related Support:** We budget $1,500 for this one-time award.

   **Objectives & Measures:** The Research Fellow will work with faculty to collect writing assignments for all their undergraduate classes. She or he will then deduce from the assignments which writing characteristics and skills are expected and evaluated by the assignments. This will yield a much more detailed and accurate picture of writing across our curriculum than was possible during the course of this first year of WEC (which also did not expand to include P&A faculty). The results of this research will inform future WEC-related discussions in the Department, especially as regarding curricular mapping.

2. DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO STUDENT NAVIGATION OF MAJOR
   Second, the department understands that a more precise curricular map is meaningless without a better understanding of how students actually negotiate our curriculum. Thus, the department proposes to investigate student trajectories through the major. Possible questions related to this include: What courses do our majors take? Are they predominantly enrolled in Western art history courses, or do small clusters of majors appear across the board? Do majors tend to “specialize” in certain subfields and with professors, or do they aim for breadth? Do majors enroll in 5000 courses in their Sophomore or Junior years, or do they put off those required 6 credits until their Senior year? In short, the department aims to determine whether there are any predictable patterns in how our students navigate their way through the major. This information, paired with a more robust curricular map, will help determine what kinds of writing instruction students get and when.
Related Support: This work will be conducted by the same graduate WEC Research Fellow as described in the above task. (The same $1,500 will cover this work.)

Objectives & Measures: It is the Department’s hope that further research into our curriculum and how our students use it will help us address an issue revealed in the first phase of WEC. Namely, it was discovered that writing instruction is repeated from level to level and across the curriculum. Indeed, most or all of the identified Writing Abilities are taught and expected in every class. An improved picture of our curriculum and its use by students can clarify how or whether we might develop more self-conscious and explicit stepping or skill-distribution across classes. The Research Fellow will work closely with Peter Harle (Senior Academic Adviser, Art History) to track enrollment patterns of our majors. Sample questions to be addressed include: During what year of school do students typically declare an Art History major? For double-majors, is Art History typically the first or second major adopted? Do students tend to take their 5000-level courses throughout their years in school, or put them off until Senior year? Do students appear to specialize in specific subfields, or assemble a more random portfolio of classes?

(2) Enhanced Pedagogical Strategies
Some of the most energizing conversations the faculty had related to WEC involved how the process might directly enhance our current pedagogical practices. We identified four readily achievable outcomes for 2014-15. The department proposes to award one WEC Fellowship award per semester during the academic year. (The same student may receive the award both semesters.) The undergraduate WEC Fellow would perform light support duties for all WEC activities, and would cooperate with the WEC Co-Liaisons in order to coordinate and oversee the following:

1. WRITING RESOURCES WEBPAGE:
Writing instruction as currently performed in the department frequently entails workflow redundancies across faculty and from semester to semester. This is especially true in the gathering and distribution of resources for students related to their work as writers in the discipline (e.g., resources for citation styles, relevant research databases, a glossary of disciplinary terms, etc.). The faculty expressed the strong desire to design and implement a UMN Art History Writing Resources webpage, where these resources could be housed and endure. As distinct from a departmental style guide or resources handout (another idea discussed), the webpage boasts the advantages of dynamism and timeliness. We foresee this outcome as having a long life beyond 2014-15. One member of the faculty even
noted that it could become a popular website for art history undergraduates at other institutions.

Related Support: The undergraduate WEC Fellow will provide support for this work in consultation with the WEC Liaisons. We budget $2,500 for this initiative ($1,250/semester).

Objectives & Measures: The undergraduate WEC Fellow will work closely with faculty to gather paper and electronic resources currently distributed to students in-class or online. Working with this information, the student will weed out redundancies and fill in perceived gaps, then work with the Administrative Specialist in Art History to put together a webpage to be accessed through the Department’s official site.

2. POOLED DEPARTMENTAL RESOURCES:
Related to the interest in a departmental writing resources webpage, faculty also expressed interest in a means by which to share instructional materials and ideas with one another. We discovered that we all shared a consensus on the sorts of writing values and skills we aim to impart, so we agree that it would be useful to learn more about how we have all approached those goals individually in our classroom. To this end, we proposed to develop an internally accessible share drive (or similar) where faculty and TA might share handouts, assignments, and resources.

Related Support: The undergraduate WEC Fellow will provide support for this work in consultation with the WEC Liaisons (This will be the same undergraduate involved in the above-described task.)

Objectives & Measures: As with the website, the undergraduate WEC Fellow will work with faculty (and with the graduate WEC Research Fellow) to collect existing handouts, course assignments, and other writing-related resources. These will be uploaded to a departmental share-drive (with the help of the Administrative Specialist). This goal will have been achieved when there is wide participation from the faculty in contributing to the website and share drive, a lively exchange among the faculty around the incorporation of their resources in teaching, and the expansive use of these resources among undergraduate majors.

3. UNDERGRADUATE WORKSHOP/ EVENTS SERIES:
In order to make our students aware of the importance and ubiquity of writing in art
history and its related professions, the department proposes to sponsor an undergraduate series of workshops and events during 2014-15. We will invite a series of 4 or 5 speakers representing a range of associated professions who will lead workshops on a variety of topics related to writing. They will be invited based on their work with or success as writers in the field and will reflect an array of different real-life writing contexts. For example, we might invite an art journalist for print or online media, a museum educator in an art or other public museum, an academic noted for her or his style of writing, a corporate curator or archivist, an academic publisher, or a grants writer. Given the diversity of writing contexts, we expect an equal diversity of event types: from formal lecture, to workshop, to informal brown-bag conversation. The audience for these events will draw from the UMN undergraduate population, especially Art History majors, minors, and prospective students. These events will serve this constituency by modeling success in a specific field and genre of writing, demystifying career paths in the arts, and emphasizing the diversity of writing styles supported by training in art history. To ensure both the efficacy of these events and the longevity of that efficacy, videos or podcasts will be made of each for distribution via the department's website.

Related Support: We project the event series will entail invitations to 4-5 speakers, all of whom will be local and whose participation in the series will be solicited as a gratis appearance. We budget approx. $1,500 to cover the A/V requirements of filming and posting the events to the department website, and another $1,000 to provide drinks and pizza during the events. We have earmarked funds from the AY14-15 departmental discretionary budget in support of this initiative.

Objectives & Measures: Because the goal of this plan is to inspire faculty and students, to demonstrate the broad range of writing in the discipline, as well as to model the variety of professional options for our majors, its success will be harder to measure than other efforts (such as data collection). However, we hope that this element of our plan will make writing a prominent concern and topic of discussion among members of our community, during the course of the event and in its afterlife (through its digital presence on the department website). In addition, because some of our other efforts are directed at senior projects, which have a narrower target among our undergraduate majors, this series will help expand the audience for our efforts to include majors, minors, and prospectives at all levels. It is our belief that Art History offers one of the most rewarding majors for students interested in and excited by the art of writing. A speaker series can help draw a spotlight to this benefit. Indeed, we believe that the other aspects of our WEC-related work will have only limited efficacy without something of a culture-shift in our attitudes toward
writing in the department: precisely the sort of morale-boosting and get-the-word-out goal that an event series can foster.

4. **INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT: FACILITATED DEPARTMENTAL WORKSHOPS:**
Related to many of the needs identified elsewhere in this document, the faculty would like to enlist specialists from the UMN Center for Writing to lead and facilitate workshops within the department. Topics for these workshops, which would be open to all Art History faculty and graduate students (but not mandatory), might include: strategies for efficient and consistent grading, consultation on writing assignment design, tips for teaching the non-major, and approaches to teaching non-native English speakers.

**Objectives & Measures:** The WEC Co-Liaisons will consult with faculty to determine the most urgent areas of instructional concern, and with specialists at the Center for Writing to match concern with support. Our intention is to stage 2-3 workshops, lasting approx. 50 minutes, on Wednesdays at 2:30pm (a time in which no classes are scheduled in the Department). Such efforts will have been successful if individual faculty feel greater confidence and adaptability in teaching with writing in a wider range of contexts, and if students’ writing becomes more masterful.

**(3) Revision to the Senior Project**
Reflecting a longstanding conversation in the department, WEC conversations repeatedly focused on the Senior Project as a possible target for important intervention. We already know that our capstone experience is insufficient in terms of training our majors in discipline-specific writing skills. The current process is also ill-equipped to evaluate student success, either in a given semester or from year-to-year. Our plan is to make this experience more rich for students and to make it a higher priority for the department through the following initiatives:

1. **REVISION TO DELIVERY OF ARTH 3971W**
   Currently students register for a one-credit capstone course (Arth 3971W), which is approached like an independent study involving required meetings with the student’s adviser and the Director of Undergraduate Studies. We propose to change this scenario primarily by associating a required meeting time for this existing course requirement. Students will now attend a class one hour per week, commensurate with the one-credit hour. This will provide students with a more rigorous, systematic, and collegial education in writing. It will communicate department-wide standards for writing. It will help students to become more self-conscious about the skills they’ve acquired in the major. Lastly, it will serve the
department by adding consistency in 3971W from year-to-year, so that student
abilities can be assessed long-term.

**Related Support:** a graduate student WEC Teaching Fellow will conduct the work of
developing a syllabus and assembling related course materials during Summer
2014. The same individual who receives the WEC Teaching Fellowship in the
summer will be employed as a TA during the academic year. The TA will lead the
course in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. We budget $1,500 for the summer
component, and $19,147 for the academic year.

**Objectives & Measures:** The success of this first phase of reforms will be
manifested in the achievement of greater uniformity in expectations and grading
practices for major projects, the availability of more systematic real-time feedback
from majors about their writing experiences, and ultimately a higher level of
proficiency which can be rated by faculty outside the department using our rubrics.

2. **INCREASED DEPARTMENT VALUATION OF THE SENIOR PROJECT**

We hope to make the capstone writing project a bigger priority *within* the
department and to create a higher profile for it and our majors *outside* the
department through a number of immediate and long-term goals. These include: the
development of at least one juried award for an exemplary Senior Project
(accompanied by a cash prize), designing a web-based platform on which students
can showcase their research (utilizing the expertise of those in the Digital
Humanities, including Rebecca Moss in the UMN Digital Content Library), and
organizing a spring symposium at which students could present their work to the
university community, perhaps to be held at the Weisman Art Museum.

**Related Support:** Work related to these goals will be overseen by Jennifer Marshall
(Director of Undergraduate Studies) as part of her usual work. The
cash prize will be paid from departmental endowed scholarship funds.

**Objectives & Measures:** The success of this first phase of reforms will be
manifested in the greater prominence within the department (and beyond) of
undergraduate research in Art History at the U.

For subsequent years of WEC support beyond 2014-15, the department anticipates further
research, reflection, and work. Likely areas for further attention include: the need to
renumber courses more appropriately in regards to their level of instruction, the distribution
of Writing Intensive courses across course levels and distribution requirements, the pacing
of classes for our majors, and the special challenges attending to a department with high course enrollments but small major population.

SECTION 6: PROCESS USED TO CREATE THIS Writing Plan

How and to what degree, were stakeholders in department unit - faculty members, instructors, affiliates, teaching assistants, undergraduates, others - engaged in providing, revising, and approving the content of this Writing Plan?

This first version of the Art History Writing Plan was developed by incorporating data and input from three main sources:

1. WEC Survey of Faculty, Graduate Students, and Undergraduates

   In early Fall semester 2013, the WEC staff administered an online survey to Art History faculty, graduate student TAs, undergraduate student majors, and professional affiliates (e.g., art dealers, curators, editors, and journalists). Survey questions aimed to gauge both the perceived value of writing in the field and to identify specific characteristics that distinguish its success. Through heavy rounds of promotion and reminders (posters, emails, in-class reminders), we achieved a 48% response rate from undergraduates, 100% from graduate student TAs, 76% from faculty (100% of core, non-affiliate faculty), and 40% from outside affiliates.

   The survey revealed a number of things, chiefly: general unanimity between students and instructors on the perceived value and characteristics of successful writing in the field, discrepancy between student confidence in abilities and instructor dissatisfaction in the same, and the possible inadequacy of a survey of identified majors, given that the vast majority of our enrollments are non-majors.

2. Four facilitated WEC meetings

   Pamela Flash and Molly Bendzick helped facilitate four meetings with the full faculty in Art History during 2013-14, specifically during the regular departmental meetings on October 23, 2013, December 11, 2013, February 19, 2014, and March 5, 2014. Except for a few absences (related to illness or travel), the majority of all tenure-line and tenured faculty were in attendance. For the second meeting on Dec. 11, Peter Harle (Senior Academic Adviser for Art History) was present to facilitate discussion regarding existing curriculum. For all meetings, two graduate students were in attendance: Aron Lorber (Art History graduate representative) and Andrea Truitt (Art History graduate WEC representative).
3. Consultation with graduate students/ TAs in Art History

Early in the process, co-Liaisons Jane Blocker and Jennifer Marshall decided that graduate student input was invaluable to the success of WEC, given their front-line position in writing instruction in the department. Moreover, faculty agreed that the WEC conversations offered valuable pedagogical insight that graduate students could carry into their classrooms now and into the job market and careers down the line. Aron Lorber and Andrea Truitt were involved at all stages of the process: not only attending the WEC meetings with full faculty, but also attending the coordination and planning meetings beforehand. They were an important source of information, communication, and brainstorming between the faculty and the TA population throughout.

At this stage of the WEC process, consultation was limited to tenure-line and tenured faculty in the department, since nearly all of our courses are delivered by these individuals. We did not consult with P&A faculty at this stage, but anticipate that further WEC research and discussion will expand to encompass instruction delivered by non-tenure-line professors.

All of the content of this Writing Plan came directly from these consultative sources. Its final form was approved by the faculty on April 16, 2014.

SECTION 7: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Briefly, please describe the ways that the ideas contained in this Undergraduate Writing Plan address the University’s Student Learning Outcomes.

The Provost’s Council for Enhancing Student Learning identified seven Student Learning Outcomes for University of Minnesota students. These are that students:

- Can identify, define, and solve problems
- Can locate and critically evaluate information
- Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry
- Understand diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies
- Can communicate effectively
- Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines
- Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning.
The Art History curriculum satisfies all these points across its levels and distributions. Students in the major learn how to initiate inquiry and research through close engagement with images, objects, buildings, and sites. They learn how to locate, evaluate, and apply information related to their inquiry, across a range of disciplines. They learn and assimilate broad swaths of historical and cultural information, while also deepening their understanding of the complexity this information entails. They become fluent in cultural issues related to a range of historical and geographic areas, with distribution requirements that ensure exposure to history from the prehistoric era, to the early Modern, to the present; and to geo-political regions from North America/Europe, to the Middle East/ Islamic World, to Latin America, to South/ East Asia. They learn how to report on information, interpretively create new knowledge, and synthesize both into persuasive written and oral presentations. They become practitioners of interdisciplinarity and develop the crucial skills of visual literacy and critical thinking; key competencies in our increasingly visual world.

Given that the Writing Plan aims to direct its efforts toward all aspects of the Art History curriculum, given that the goals of WEC in Art History are exactly coincident with the goals of its curriculum, and given that the faculty understand improved writing and improved art historical thinking to go hand-in-hand, we believe that the Writing Plan directly serves all stated SLOs.
# Appendix A: Menu of Grading Criteria

## Menu of Grading Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What writing abilities should Art History majors be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate? Students should be able to...</th>
<th>Grading criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>...think historically</strong></td>
<td>The text...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To place art objects in clearly delineated and richly detailed historical contexts</td>
<td>Places art objects in an historical context by positioning them relative to specific dates, locations, cultures, and relevant historical events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To read art objects as contexts in which larger cultural forces can be found and reconstructed</td>
<td>Uses the art object as an evidentiary basis for making claims about the historical past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To write accurate, fact-based, and carefully cited historical information</td>
<td>Uses accurate, fact-based information to describe historical and cultural contexts. Cites sources consistently and accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To use historical information to support descriptions, interpretations, and evaluations</td>
<td>Uses known historical information to support more subjective components of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>...think visually</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To attend carefully to the art historical objects</td>
<td>Treats the artwork in detail as a source of evidence for the writer’s claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To look at works of art and not through them</td>
<td>Contains close, careful description to help the reader see the artwork on its own terms, and not just as a reflection or representation of something else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>...demonstrate their strong research abilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To conduct thorough, expansive searches for sources in digital databases</td>
<td>Utilizes diverse sources found through a variety of research methods (such as, print and online indexes, archival...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and print catalogs</td>
<td>materials and objects, interviews, site visits, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To identify useful comparata, primary sources, and secondary sources</td>
<td>Identifies and deploys useful comparata, primary sources, and/or secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To provide careful and detailed descriptions of the sources used</td>
<td>Provides careful and detailed descriptions of the sources used such that the author has identified their key arguments, the evidence they deploy, the information they supply, and their rhetorical approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To offer thoughtful evaluation of the sources used</td>
<td>Offers thoughtful evaluation of the sources used, such that their utility and reliability are clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To employ professional citation practices</td>
<td>Employs professional citation practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To move from a research topic to an original and innovative research question</td>
<td>Evinces the pursuit of a clear research question relevant to the paper topic, so the reader feels that a new, original idea has been advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To synthesize the sources they use</td>
<td>Synthesizes a wide variety of sources through application to the argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...think logically and to marshal diverse forms of evidence to support their clearly articulated assertions and convincingly set forth a thesis

| 14. To present visual evidence | Presents visual evidence that is commensurate with and effectively supports the writer’s arguments |
| 15. To present historical evidence | Presents historical evidence that is commensurate with and effectively supports the writer’s arguments |
| 16. To present textual evidence | Presents textual evidence that is commensurate with and effectively supports the writer’s arguments |
| 17. To present theoretical evidence | Presents theoretical evidence that is commensurate with and effectively supports the writer’s arguments |

...describe and analyze – carefully, vividly, accurately, and convincingly –
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>their different forms of evidence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. To convert visual information into evidence, through description, interpretation and analysis</td>
<td>Converts visual information into evidence, through vivid description, convincing interpretation, and/or perceptive analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To describe the basic elements of works of art</td>
<td>Describes basic elements of works of art such that the reader can clearly imagine them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To describe what it is like to experience the artwork in time and space</td>
<td>Conveys what it is like to experience the artwork in time and space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To teach the reader how to see the work</td>
<td>Teaches the reader how to see or read the work, so that the act of seeing is shown to be a way of knowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...write in an organized, logical manner through which a consistent, lucid narrative emerges

| 22. To write with proper grammar and correct spelling                                                | Contains few grammatical or spelling errors                       |
| 23. To proof-read and self-edit                                                                      | Is smoothly legible, without errors so distracting as to obscure content |
| 24. To present ideas in a clear and well-organized manner                                            | Allows the reader to follow the narrative from one paragraph or idea to the next |
### Appendix B: Snapshot of WEC Budget, AY 2014-15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Costs</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Summer 2014 first 8 week session | Graduate Student WEC Research Fellow  
*data collection related to existing curriculum and student navigation of major*                                                                                                                      | $1,500  |
| Summer 2014 second 8 week session | Graduate Student WEC Teaching Fellow  
*development of course syllabus for Arh 3971W in consultation with Director of Undergraduate Studies (to be awarded to same individual who will serve as the WEC TA in AY 2014-15)* | $1,500  |
| AY 2014-15            | Undergraduate Workshop Series  
*AV support and refreshments for 4-5 workshop events during AY 2014-15; expenses to be covered by departmental discretionary funds (approx. $2,500)*                                                                 | NA      |
| AY 2014-15            | Undergraduate Writing Award  
*cash awards for exemplary senior projects to be funded by departmental endowed funds (approx. $250-$500)*                                                                                                     | NA      |
| AY 2014-15            | Undergraduate Student WEC Fellow  
*administrative support for work related to the collection of information for the writing resources webpage and pooled departmental instructional support, overseen by the WEC Liaisons ($1,250/semester)* | $2,500  |
| AY 2014-15            | Graduate Student WEC Teaching Assistant  
*instructional oversight of classroom delivery of Arh 3971W in consultation with Director of Undergraduate Studies, who retains ownership of grades and course shell; figure reflects full salary and fringe for ABD graduate student at 50% time for 9 months* | $19,147 |
<p>| <strong>Total</strong>             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <strong>$24,647</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1: Spring 2015</th>
<th>Semester 2: Fall 2014</th>
<th>Semester 3: Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Requests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>$9,733.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student WEC Fellow</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student WEC Research</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Financial Request: $24,647.00

**V. WEC Writing Plan Requests**

Unit Name: Art History
June 26, 2014

To: Jane Blocker, Art History
    Jennifer Marshall, Art History

From: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education

Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal

The Department of Art History recently requested the following funding to support its Writing Enriched Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Graduate Student WEC Research Fellow</td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Graduate Student WEC Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student WEC Fellow</td>
<td>$ 1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Graduate Student Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>$ 9,573.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student WEC Fellow</td>
<td>$ 1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Graduate Student Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>$ 9,573.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUEST**  $ 24,647.00

All items above have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education, for a total of $24,647. Please provide Pat Ferrian (ferri004@umn.edu) with your department’s EFS information so the funds may be transferred.

CC: Suzanne Bardouche, Molly Bendzick, Will Durfee, Pat Ferrian, Pamela Flash, Tim Gustafson, Leslie Schiff, Jules Thompson