



**Academic Program Assessment
AY 2025-2026 [Due 6/1/26]**

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Program Name | Date Completed |
| Museum Studies Minor | 06/01/2026 |
| Report Completed By | Report Contributors |
| Rachel Zimmerman | |
| Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals | |
| <p>The Museum Studies Minor challenges students to examine how objects, texts, and experiences create meaning. The minor centers experiential learning to empower students with a breadth of skills, analytical tools, and perspectives, enabling multidisciplinary approaches to problem-solving. The minor prepares students for the study of museums and for work in museums and related institutions.</p> | |

Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2025-2026 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessment cycles or other data.

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>A. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2025-2026 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below.</p> |
| <p>SLO 1. History and Theory—The ability to analyze historical, political, social, financial, cultural, and ethical factors that affect museum operations.</p> <p>SLO 2 Collections—A foundational understanding of collection care, acquisition, repatriation, and deaccession.</p> |
| <p>B. In which prior academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s) this year?</p> |
| <p>Spring 2025</p> |
| <p>C. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle?</p> |
| <p>Number of students and average is listed; could show break down per students (% above / % below, for example)</p> <p>No doubt, assessment plan and tools will develop over time and author already acknowledges planned improvements for next year.</p> |



Is there a final portfolio or presentation that other faculty might easily assess as part of the process (since courses are taught by adjunct – that is certainly a challenge!) ... or maybe a survey that museum staff where students observe or intern could complete or exit survey students complete? These could be effective assessment tools that do not press a service requirement on adjunct faculty (which I agree, must be avoided!)

D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?

The Assessment Plan was edited to have a goal of 80% of students meeting a score of 3 (proficient).
An end-of-internship self-assessment form was created for students to describe and assess their learning throughout the internship.
A Feedback form for internship supervisors was created to gather information about student preparation at the onset of an internship. If feedback suggests that students are underprepared, curriculum can be changed to require students to take a certain set of courses before beginning an internship.

E. How did the change(s) implemented impact student learning? If the change was not effective, what are the next steps or new recommendations?

I don't know whether the changes affected student learning (although metacognition should be beneficial), but I now have better mechanisms to learn about student learning.

Enter Comments on Table I Closing the Loop Below

| |
|--|
| |
|--|



**Academic Program Assessment
AY 2025-2026 [Due 6/1/26]**

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Program Name | Date Completed |
| Museum Studies Minor | 06/01/2026 |
| Report Completed By | Report Contributors |
| Rachel Zimmerman | |

Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in AY 2025-26

1. Include information to share assessment processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Copy this table for each assessed outcome.

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A. Program SLO(s) assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan. |
| SLO 4: Experience—Foundational skills required for a variety of tasks that are performed within a museum, gallery, library, or archive environment. |
| B. Semester and year this SLO was previously reported on before this cycle. |
| first time being assessed |
| C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO(s). |
| Examination of ART 415 end-of-semester exhibition and the process by which it was implemented. |
| D. Describe student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed. |
| 20 students enrolled in ART 415/CS 410 Exhibiting Latinx/Chicanx Art in Fall 2025 collaboratively created an exhibition in the gallery. |
| E. Explain the expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level. |
| 80% meeting score of 3 (proficient) |
| F. Provide Assessment results and number of students who met defined proficiency level. |
| <p>Since students worked collaboratively, I do not have methods for scoring them individually; however, collectively, the exhibition, its execution, and the various components all meet the desired proficiency for the SLO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students gained hands-on experience in researching, designing, and creating an exhibition. • As in a museum institution, students were divided into groups with varying duties: |



- 4 students in curatorial
- 1 in education (translations into Spanish and educational pamphlet)
- 3 in collections management
- 12 in design/preparation
- Students experienced real-world logistical challenges: working with multiple artists and needing to manage late delivery of artworks and other challenges that arise when depending on others.
- The gallery was professionally prepared with all holes patched and freshly painted, exhibition entrance freshly painted and exhibition title professionally displayed in vinyl.
- Label and artwork height followed ADA guidelines.
- Social justice and community engagement initiatives were included (cultural relevance, Spanish translations, community involvement, collaboration with dancers)
- All 20 students enrolled in the course participated in the exhibition and attended the reception
- The reception was very well-attended by on and off-campus community members.

The instructor handled liability waivers and the artists handled transportation of artworks to and from the gallery.

G. Describe what the results or trends indicate about student performance.

100% student attendance at the reception suggests high student engagement and a sense of ownership over the exhibition. The exhibition was one of the most complex to design (multi-artist exhibitions are more complex than single-artist exhibitions), most professionally executed, and most well-attended that we have had in recent years.

All students participated in researching and developing the exhibition theme. Because students were then divided into departments, they received a similar experience to working within an institution; however, the division also means that the skills that were practiced varied from group to group. This is not necessarily a problem but is something to be aware of when thinking about assessment and student learning.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for next AY (2026-2027?) which are informed by this assessment.

This course is taught by multiple faculty who have their own approaches, and methods are dependent on the type of exhibition (invited artist vs open call for submissions). I will, however, recommend some aspects of this semester’s approach as a model to future faculty: dividing students into departments as would be the case in a museum institution, and announcing and listing the students in each department during the reception.

Enter Comments on Table II AY 2026 Assessment Below

Using this exhibition and its process as a guide, I will create a simple rubric for assessing exhibitions that can also serve as a checklist when designing exhibits to ensure they meet professional standards.