

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Graduate School

Minutes of Executive Committee
Tuesday, May 22, 1973
11:30 A.M. 626 Campus Club

Present: Professors Betty Robinett, Robert Scott, Stephen Prager, Paul Johnson, Frederic McDuffie, Donald Rasmusson, Frank Ungar; Graduate Student Representatives Mary Ebert, Dennis Jackson, Julie White; by invitation Aliniece Crosby, Graduate School Equal Opportunity Coordinator; Deans Frank Boddy, Warren Ibele, Andrew Hein; Taewon Rno; Dean May Brodbeck, presiding; Beverly Miller, secretary.

1. Modification of the M.A. Program in Art History

Professor Robinett reported that the Language, Literature and Arts Policy and Review Committee had discussed the proposal and had an opportunity to question Professor Sheila McNally, a member of the graduate faculty in the department, about it. The proposal will establish a two-track program, one designed for persons with a strong background in Art History wishing to specialize, and the other for persons wishing a broad preparation. The latter would be especially useful to individuals coming out of colleges which did not offer an Art History major at the undergraduate level. The Language, Literature and Arts Committee recommended that the proposal be approved.

In the course of the discussion Professor Scott said that he was disturbed by the proposal, as he had been by similar ones in the past. He was concerned that it really involved making up deficiencies in preparation as a part of the graduate program. Dean Brodbeck pointed out that this was a more general question of policy which will be discussed in connection with the work of the Griffin Committee on the Master's Degree.

Dean Hein asked whether the proposal would retain one related field in the master's program which would be outside the major; Dean Brodbeck responded that it would.

The proposal was approved with Professor Scott dissenting.

2. Proposed Procedures for Processing Thesis Proposals

Dean Brodbeck reviewed the background which prompted this proposal, which was discussed at an earlier Executive Committee meeting. Professor Robinett indicated that the Language, Literature and Arts Policy and Review Committee had not yet discussed the proposal, Dean Hein

pointed out that while the proposal was workable, it would double the processing time for a student's thesis proposal.

A lengthy discussion followed during the course of which a number of reservations were expressed about the probable efficacy of such a procedure. Professor Scott was doubtful that the proposed procedure would be helpful and preferred encouraging department to use other measures, for example, a departmental colloquium. Professor Ungar said that Professor Dennis Watson, head of Microbiology, was proposing requiring a seminar presentation before the committee nine to twelve months before the expected completion date of the thesis itself. Professor Rasmusson pointed out that thesis research in the agricultural and biological science areas often involved raising several generations of plants and necessitated starting the actual research before the thesis committee was even appointed. In these circumstances a departmental committee often monitors progress.

Dean Brodbeck pointed out that it is the lateness with which the thesis reader is often made aware of the problem on which the thesis will center which is the difficulty. The idea was not to commit a reader to approving the thesis as it is eventually executed, but to allow him to enter into the determination as to whether the problem as stated is a feasible one.

Several mentioned their concern that the procedure might have the effect of removing from committees persons whose judgements might be negative, defeating the purpose of the reading committee. Dean Brodbeck responded that it was intended that thesis proposals would be rewritten to satisfy these individuals, rather than that they be removed.

Professor Prager said that he thought this might have the effect of making the readers "assistant advisers", giving them a vested interest in the student's success. Professor Rasmusson added that he thought that faculty were sufficiently busy so that it was necessary to rely on the adviser to assist the student in developing the basic thesis structure. He said that perhaps too much was being expected of the readers.

A suggestion was made that the thesis topic be covered in the preliminary exam, which is already permitted and common practice. It was also proposed that the preliminary and oral examining committees might overlap.

It was finally agreed to set the proposal aside for further discussion at the next meeting.

3. Affirmative Action

Aliniece Crosby, the Graduate School's Equal Opportunity Coordinator,

provided a progress report on steps which have been taken to facilitate the recruitment and enrollment of minorities and women in the various graduate programs. She said that her office had had many contacts with interested individuals, and that they were also frequently in contact with the Directors of Graduate Study in the various programs.

With respect to potential students, her office has been assisting in carrying applications to completion and in providing information and help whenever possible on financial aid and employment opportunities.

In its contacts with the Directors of Graduate Study Ms. Crosby has been obtaining information as to admissions policies, the criteria used in the various programs, especially testing devices employed, and information on validity studies of the criteria.

Her office has also been providing the Director of Graduate Study with lists of minority students interested in the particular major fields. This list is published by the Educational Testing Service, and covers about 100 of the graduate major fields. Reactions to the list have been varied. Some departments have found the list helpful while others are not certain what to do with it. Many have been interesting in knowing whether the Graduate School can provide support money.

The office prepared a brochure for recruitment purposes which was distributed in January, 1973 to 96 women's colleges, 75 institutions with high minority enrollment, 28 campus organizations and individuals, all Directors of Graduate Study, and to a variety of non-campus minority-group contacts in the Twin Cities areas.

Ms. Crosby also said that her office has obtained computer reports on female/male enrollment in the various graduate programs, as well as on minority enrollment. In the fall 1972 female enrollment was 1,880 of a total of 7,092. Minority enrollment totalled 209. She mentioned that the latter figure may include foreign students in some instances.

Professor Ungar asked how these activities are coordinated with those of the professional schools. Ms. Crosby responded that she maintains regular contacts with the Equal Opportunity Coordinators for those units.

Ms. Ebert asked whether there are financial aids or incentives available. Dean Ibele explained the cooperative programs the Graduate School has with the departments. These awards are made on a competitive basis based on proposals for special programs made by departments. A department could get up to \$5,000. Whether or not this program can be expanded will depend upon the budget.

Professor Prager asked whether a study had been done of the success

of specially recruited students. Ms. Crosby responded that a study has not been done, although one is in the discussion stages, but the indications are that there has been a fair measure of success. She added that there has been considerable success in recruiting students; the major problem has been finding support funds.

Professor Robinett asked whether foreign students were included in these efforts. Dean Ibele replied that they were not. Professor Scott asked whether funds were intended only for incoming students. Dean Ibele said that those on the scene were not excluded; for example financial assistance with the dissertation might be available. Also the Office of Financial Aids is to have an identified fund for disadvantaged graduate students, although how much money will be available for this fund is in doubt.

4. Grading Policy Proposal

Dean Brodbeck reviewed the proposal, as it had developed to date, and pointed out that there appeared to be a continuing question about the restriction of student choice, in potentially limiting the use of grading systems at all levels by departmental action. She said that she thought that at the 5-level the option should be the student's, exceptions being granted in unusual circumstances if requested by the department and approved by the Graduate School.

There was a brief discussion of the general differences between courses at the 8 and 5-levels.

Ms. White asked whether it might not be possible to ask that the student declare in advance the grading system under which he chooses to work, and cited the system employed in the undergraduate colleges where this is a part of the registration procedure. Dean Brodbeck responded that this was a possibility, but suggested that the details for implementation of the new grading system could be worked out later by the Graduate School.

Professor Rasmusson said that he thought the question of what an S should mean should be defined. Professor Prager pointed out that at the undergraduate level this is left open to interpretation by the individual instructor. Professor Rasmusson responded that this could also be done at the graduate level, but that he thought it should be explicitly stated if this is the case. Dean Brodbeck asked whether this might not be taken up separately and this was agreed.

The grading proposal submitted to the committee was approved unanimously with the change proposed by the deans that the student have the option in 5-level courses, and with the understanding that two further changes would be made, one clarifying that exceptions at the 5-level could be granted by the Graduate School in unusual cases as requested by the department, the other a change in wording. A copy of the approved new grading policy is included with the minutes.

5. Graduate Program Review

Professor Robinett reported that the Spanish program review was underway. Background materials had been presented to the external reviewers and the Policy and Review Committee would be meeting to discuss the review. The final report will include the substance of the external reviewers report, and it is expected that it will be completed before the end of June.

Professor Scott said that two reviews had been or were being conducted in his area. The Philosophy review was complete and it is hoped that the report of the external reviewers will be received before the close of the quarter. The Social Work review was underway and the materials for the external review were being prepared. Hopefully that report will be in before the end of June. The Internal Committee for Social Work will meet with the external reviewers to "debrief" them and will provide the reviewers with transcriptions. Professor Scott then asked what the final task of the Policy and Review Committee would be with respect to the reviews. Should they comment on the final report? If so it would probably be necessary to delay submission until fall, 1973.

Professor Robinett said that it was their feeling that there was not enough time to meet with the external reviewers. Dean Brodbeck responded that by the end of the quarter she would like to meet with the people who have been involved in the review process to discuss ways of improving future reviews. Professor Prager and Professor Scott both agreed that the reviewers were pressed for time, but added that it would probably be difficult to arrange for three day visits from the external reviewers.

There was a brief discussion of the format of the reports. The Internal Committee should use the report of the external reviewers in drawing up its own report. It was stressed that personal contacts with the departmental faculty and students were important in making an assessment.

6. Council of Graduate Students

Ms White mentioned that COGS was in the process of ending its special advocacy of problems relating to teaching and research assistants on the grounds that it was not an appropriate body to argue their disputes.

She then reported on plans for fall orientation for new students. COGS is seeking funding, which was denied by the Council of College Boards, from the Fees Committee. They have proposed a one time assessment of \$5 from each new graduate student. The Fees Committee has asked that the proposal restrict the assessment to persons who did not graduate from the University.

There was a discussion of the need for an orientation for graduate students. Ms. White pointed out that departments provide only minimal information except for teaching assistants, etc. Of Particular importance is that new students are made aware of the

various University resources (computer facilities, special library collections, etc.) which are available to them. A questionnaire distributed two or three years ago got a favorable response on orientation. Dean Brodbeck agreed that the orientation program, from her participation in it, seemed to be well received.

Ms. White said that it would be helpful if, in going to the Fees Committee, she could report that it was the consensus of the Executive Committee that the request was a valid one, and that the orientation was viewed as a useful experience for incoming graduate students. Professor Rasmusson asked how these activities might be carried on in the future when the enthusiasts who began them had left the University. Ms. White responded that they would be run through the orientation office, whose people are experienced and whose office is well-established. Professor Scott urged that activities be scheduled early to avoid conflicts with departmental and other activities in the first few weeks of the fall term. In response to a question from Professor Ungar Ms. White said that about a thousand graduate students contacted COGS during the past year.

Dean Lease pointed out that Duluth graduate students should be exempted from the proposal to the Fees Committee since there is as yet no functioning student organization for the Graduate School at large there, and no orientation. Ms. White agreed to carry this information to the committee.

The Executive Committee unanimously endorsed the COGS request in principle.

Dennis Jackson reported that COGS was seeking support for a broad study of student involvement in university governance. They will be approaching a foundation for support. There was some discussion of the approach that would be used, and Mr. Jackson indicated that if funding is obtained, the people preparing the proposal would be seeking assistance from faculty with experience in such matters.

Mr. Jackson also reported that the Council of College Boards had funded a proposal for a survey to determine future directions for COGS.

7. Committee on the Master's Degree

A report is expected momentarily and Dean Brodbeck said that Professor Griffin would be invited to the June 12 meeting of the Executive Committee to answer questions and comment on the report.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Beverly Miller
Secretary

May 30, 1973

Office of the Dean

GRADUATE SCHOOL POLICY ON GRADING

Effective Fall Quarter, 1973

The following is the final grading policy of the Graduate School, as approved by the Executive Committee, May 22, 1973. It utilizes the two grading systems adopted by the University Committee on Grading in 1972, and replaces the interim policy used by the Graduate School during academic year 1972-73 and summer 1973.

I. Courses.

- (1) Each and every course offered for graduate credit will be available on both an A-N and an S-N basis, except for courses at the 8-level in which one grading system may be approved by departmental and graduate school action. In exceptional cases, this requirement may be waived for courses at the 5-level if requested by the department offering the course and approved by the Graduate School.
- (2) The individual student will have the option (as to the basis upon which he/she is to be graded), except as restricted in 8-level courses by action of the department offering the course with the approval of the graduate school, or as restricted in 5-level courses by special exception under Rule I, 1. For example, the department may choose to require one basis of grading for all its 8-level courses. The student should make her/his arrangements with the instructor early in the term (within the first two weeks), and the instructor should also within that time clarify for students the level of performance which will be expected under the grading system(s) being used.

II. Programs and Fields of Study.

- (1) At least 2/3rds of the credit hours contained in any student's official program for the degree must involve grades given on an A-N basis. Exceptions to this rule may be granted by action of the graduate school. It is understood that, within the constraints of Rule I,2, the student is to be free to select which among her/his program's courses, he/she will choose to meet this proportion.

Office of the Dean

GRADUATE SCHOOL POLICY ON GRADING

Effective Fall Quarter, 1973

The following is the final grading policy of the Graduate School, as approved by the Executive Committee, May 22, 1973. It utilizes the two grading systems adopted by the University Committee on Grading in 1972, and replaces the interim policy used by the Graduate School during academic year 1972-73 and summer 1973.

I. Courses.

- (1) Each and every course offered for graduate credit will be available on both an A-N and an S-N basis, except for courses at the 8-level in which one grading system may be approved by departmental and graduate school action. In exceptional cases, this requirement may be waived for courses at the 5-level if requested by the department offering the course and approved by the Graduate School.
- (2) The individual student will have the option (as to the basis upon which he/she is to be graded), except as restricted in 8-level courses by action of the department offering the course with the approval of the graduate school, or as restricted in 5-level courses by special exception under Rule I, 1. (For example, the department may choose to require one basis of grading for all its 8-level courses.)

The student should make his/her arrangements with the instructor early in the term (within the first two weeks), and the instructor should also within that time clarify for students the level of performance which will be expected under the grading system(s) being used, particularly the level which will be expected for the S grade.

II. Programs and Fields of Study.

- (1) At least 2/3rds of the credit hours contained in any student's official program for the degree must involve grades given on an A-N basis. Exceptions to this rule may be granted by action of the graduate school. It is understood that, within the constraints of Rule I, 2, the student is to be free to select which among his/her program's courses, he/she will choose to meet this proportion.

Office of the Dean

August 1, 1973

MEMO TO: Department Heads, Directors of Graduate Study and Members
of the Graduate Faculty

FROM: May Brodbeck *M. B.*

RE: New Graduate School Grading Policy
Effective Fall Term, 1973

As many of you are aware, discussions about the possibility of altering the University's grading systems were carried on for a period of many years beginning in about 1967, and culminated in the adoption of the recommendations of a joint committee on grading of the University Senate and the Twin Cities Assembly (the Page Committee). The complete recommendations, which were adopted at the April 27, 1972 meeting of the Assembly, are contained in the minutes of that meeting. In brief, the legislation permitted the use of two grading systems, the A/N or letter-grade system and the S/N or bipolar satisfactory/no credit system.

The recommendations addressed themselves both to the actual grading systems to be used, and to the manner in which permanent transcripts would be maintained (what work would not appear on the permanent record, etc.) once the University has completed its move to a computer produced record.

The recommendations also delegated to the individual collegiate units the authority to determine to "...what extent and under what conditions each system may be available to its students and its faculty." Accordingly the Graduate School adopted an interim policy which was employed during the 1972-73 academic year, and appointed an ad hoc committee of faculty and students which submitted in the spring of 1973 final recommendations for a permanent policy to be effective with the fall of 1973. These recommendations with minor changes were approved by the Executive Committee of the Graduate School on May 22, 1973. A copy of the new policies is attached.

It should be noted that if the grading for graduate students in a given course is to be restricted to one of the two available systems, prior approval by the department and the Graduate School must be obtained. An outline of the procedures departments should use in submitting such recommendations for Graduate School approval is being distributed to department chairmen and directors of graduate study.

If you should have any questions regarding the new policies or procedures please feel free to call. Beverly Miller at 3-5530 will be happy to answer your questions.

MB/bs

Office of the Dean

August 1, 1973

MEMO TO: Department Heads and Directors of Graduate Study

FROM: May Brodbeck *M.B.*

RE: The Restriction of Grading Options for Graduate Students in
Graduate-Level Courses

Under separate cover you will have received a copy of the Graduate School's new policies on grading which have been approved by the Executive Committee of the Graduate School. In order to assure that in general students have the option to select either the A/N or the S/N grading system, the new policies require that both a department offering a course and the Graduate School approve any proposal to restrict the grading of graduate students in a graduate-level course to one of the two systems which have been adopted for use by the University. The procedures a department should use if it wishes to restrict the grading to one system or the other are outlined below:

1. In the absence of a specific request to restrict grading in a course, it will be assumed that both systems are available at the option of the student.
2. Requests to restrict grading will be handled differently at the two graduate levels (a copy of the form to be used for this purpose is attached; supplies may be requested from Jeannette Lazan, 3-7368):

8-level: The department, number, title and grading system to be used should be listed, and the list submitted to the Dean. Requests at the 8-level will be handled administratively in the Graduate School Office.

5-level: In general we would suggest that restriction of the grading systems in 5-level courses apply if possible only to students majoring in the field concerned. All requests should list the department, number, title and grading system to be used; the reasons for restricting the grading for graduate students in each course to one system or the other should be given; and the list should be submitted to the dean. Requests at this level will be sent for review to the appropriate Policy and Review Committee.

3. Decisions on these requests will be reported to the departments offering the courses. A photocopy of the request with the action taken by the Graduate School will be returned.

Memo to Department Heads and Directors of Graduate Study

Page 2

4. The grading system to be employed will not be a part of the Graduate School Bulletin course description but a copy of the requests for restriction of grading systems will be maintained by the bulletin editor as part of the course proposal files.

If you have any questions about these procedures please call Beverly Miller at 3-5530.

MB/db

Request to Restrict the Grading System for Graduate Students
in Graduate Level Courses

Dept	Number	Title	Grading System To Be Used	Reason For The Restriction
------	--------	-------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

June 11, 1973

Professor Melvin Waldfoegel
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Art History
106 Jones Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Professor Waldfoegel:

Following recommendation by the Language, Literature, and Art Policy and Review Committee, the Graduate School Executive Committee approved the modification in the Master of Arts in Art History at the meeting of May 22, 1973. This approval is recorded in the official minutes of that meeting and a copy of the proposal is bound with the permanent file of the minutes.

Sincerely yours,

Shirley A. McDonald
Principal Executive Secretary

SD:dg

cc: Professor Carl Sheppard
Carole Lindstrom



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Art History
108 Jones Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

27 February 1973

TO: Professor Betty Robinett, Chairman, Policy and Review Committee, 152 KlacT
FROM: Professor Melvin Waldfogel, Director of Graduate Studies, Art History, 106 Jones
SUBJECT: Proposed M.A. Program in Art History
ENCLOSURES: Proposed M.A. Program, Present M.A. Program, New M.A. Examination

The intent of the changes in the proposed Master of Arts Program in art history is twofold:

1. To make the program more accessible to applicants with demonstrated academic potential in the liberal arts but whose experience with art history is limited either because the discipline was not offered in depth at their undergraduate college or because it was a late discovery.
2. To provide a two-track movement:
 - (1) broad distribution and comprehensiveness for the less experienced student and the terminal M.A. who will probably seek employment at the Junior College level.
 - (2) or a degree of specialization, relative to the student's background in art history, in order to enable the more proficient to advance more rapidly towards the Ph.D. At present, every M.A. candidate, regardless of undergraduate coverage in art history, must take four courses in specified sub-fields (see DISTRIBUTION below), resulting in many cases in redundant programs. Under the PROPOSED program a candidate may specialize to the extent that he can qualify out of the distribution requirement - now increased to five courses - on the basis of the undergraduate transcript. For instance, a student with a strong interest in Asian culture could complete 7 courses in Chinese, Indian or Japanese art, 2 to 3 courses in related history, and probably acquire reading ability in the language of cultural concentration.

The new art history M.A. examination takes into account both tracks, the comprehensive and the specialized, and requires that the student, regardless of the track he has elected, show competence in both. The "specialist" must demonstrate a grasp of broad issues in art history and the "comprehensivist" a less detailed but nevertheless adequate understanding of the nature of the special problem and its methodology. Both may proceed to the Ph.D. but at somewhat different rates. For the "specialist" we envision a four-year program (two years beyond the M.A.); for the "comprehensivist" probably five years.

(A copy of the new M.A. examination which has passed the Department's Committee on Graduate Studies is included.)

What follows is a point-by-point comparison of the PRESENT and the PROPOSED M.A. program.

ADMISSION

PRESENT: Undergraduate preparation of approximately 27 Upper Division credits in the history of art or their equivalent. In some cases prerequisites can be completed with graduate work.

PROPOSED: A bachelor's degree and evidence of excellence, preferably in art history

LANGUAGE

PRESENT: A reading knowledge of one foreign language: French or German.

PROPOSED: A reading knowledge of one foreign language: French, German, or another language, by petition, appropriate to the student's program.

DISTRIBUTION

PRESENT: One course in each of the following sub-fields in fulfillment of the major for the M.A. degree: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, Modern

PROPOSED: One advanced course*, during or prior to enrollment in graduate school, in each of the following distribution sub-fields: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, Modern, Non-Western (East and South Asian).
* For examples, see art history listings in the University of Minnesota Graduate Bulletin.

CREDITS

PRESENT: 48

--minimum, including major and related fields.

PROPOSED: 45

MAJOR

PRESENT: 30 credits in art history, including one in each of the four sub-fields, listed under DISTRIBUTION above.

PROPOSED: Seven courses (minimum 25 credits), three of which must be in one sub-field*. Courses in the sub-field of concentration must be approved by the corresponding specialist and the program as a whole by the director of graduate studies. Substitution of a course in the sub-field of concentration for another sub-field may be made under unusual circumstances by petition to the director of graduate studies.
*Sub-fields: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, Modern, East Asian, South Asian, American, Scandinavian.

RELATED FIELDS

PRESENT: Of the 18 credits in related fields required by the Graduate School, 12 may be taken in courses in art history selected from any of the following sub-fields not included in the student's major: American, Scandinavian, East Asian, South Asian, methodology-bibliography.

Recommended related fields outside the department are anthropology, classics, English, foreign languages and literatures, history, studio arts.

A minimum of 6 credits is required in each of two related fields or sub-fields.

PROPOSED: Same as above except sub-fields in art history are not specified.

METHODOLOGY No change

SEMINARS No change

STARRED PAPERS

PRESENT: The three starred papers will be from three different professors and from at least two sub-fields.

PROPOSED: Three, from at least two different sub-fields, one of which must be the sub-field of concentration. One of the papers may be from a related field outside the department, with the approval of an art history staff member.

Master of Arts Program -- Art History

REQUIREMENTS:Admission

A bachelor's degree and evidence of academic excellence, preferably in Art History.

Language

A reading knowledge of one foreign language: French, German, or another language appropriate to the student's program, by petition.

Distribution

One advanced course*, during or prior to enrollment in graduate school, in each of the following distribution sub-fields: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, Modern, ~~Non-Western, Asian~~

*For examples, see Art History listings in U. of M. Graduate Bulletin.

Credits

A minimum of 45 credits, including major and minor or related fields.

Major

Seven courses (minimum 25 credits), three of which must be in one sub-field.* Courses in the sub-field of concentration must be approved by the corresponding specialist and the program as a whole by the director of graduate studies. Substitution of a course in the sub-field of concentration for another sub-field may be made under unusual circumstances by petition to the director of graduate studies.

*Sub-fields: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, Modern, American, Scandinavian, ~~East Asian, South Asian~~

Related Fields

Of the 18 credits required by the Graduate School, 12 may be taken in courses in Art History but in sub-fields other than those taken for the major.

Six credits in a related field outside the department, preferably in anthropology, classics, English, foreign languages and literatures, history and studio arts.

Methodology

One course, if not taken prior to entrance in master's program.

Seminars

Two from different faculty members must be included in the Art History courses entered on the program.

Starred Papers

Three, from at least two different sub-fields, one of which must be the sub-field of concentration. One of the papers may be from a related field outside the department, with the approval of an Art History staff member.

Master's Program in Art History

I. Purpose

The purpose of the Master's Program is to ensure for the student a broad coverage of the History of Art and related fields as well as an acquaintance with its methodology and an awareness of the problems of connoisseurship.

II. The Degree Program

A. The Department offers only Plan B. For the Graduate School requirements consult the Graduate Bulletin.

B. Requirements for the Major: A minimum of 30 credits in Art History including one course in each of the following sub-fields: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, 19th and 20th Centuries (identified by the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 as the second digit in the course number).

C. Related Fields: Of the 18 credits in related fields required by the Graduate School, 12 may be taken in courses in Art History selected from any of the following sub-fields not included in the student's major: American, Scandinavian, East Asian, South Asian, Methodology-Bibliography (identified by the numbers 5, 6, 7 and 8 as the second digit in the course number). Recommended related fields outside the department are: anthropology, classics, English, foreign languages and literatures, history, studio arts. A minimum of six credits is required in each of two related fields or sub-fields.

D. Methodology: Students who do not have a course in the methodology of Art History on their entrance record must include one on their Master's Program.

E. Seminars: The Art History courses on the program must include two seminars on different topics and from different professors.

F. Starred Papers: The three starred papers will be for three different professors and from at least two sub-fields.

PURPOSE

To insure, together with the distribution requirement, a comprehensive knowledge of the history of art. Unlike course examination questions which usually focus on a single stylistic or chronological period, the M.A. Examination is designed to test, through slides, visual understanding of the major sub-fields and, through essays, the student's comprehension of broad problems, extending through a sub-field.

Slides - 2 1/2 hours. Twenty will be shown, four from each of the distribution sub-fields (Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance/Baroque, Modern, Non-Western). The student has the option of eliminating four slides either at random or which together constitute a single sub-field. Slides will be typical of major artists and periods stylistically but may include lesser known works. The grade will be based on the student's ability to attribute the work by relating it to significant works or an established development, rather than on identification.

In order to facilitate choice, all 20 slides will be shown first in quick succession and then again at the rate of seven minutes each.

Slight changes in the number of slides and the time allotted may be made by the Committee.

Concentration Sub-Field Essay - Three hours maximum. One question. Choice.

Elective Sub-Fields Essays - Three hours maximum. Two questions, one from each of two sub-fields, other than the sub-field of concentration, elected by the candidate and designated on the application to take the examination. Choice.

A list of relevant, but not necessarily all-inclusive, sub-field texts will be made available.

ESSAY QUESTIONS

No distinction in kind will be made between the questions used for the concentration or elective essays; in fact, both will be drawn from a common question bank. Conceivably, the same question could appear in both essay parts of the same examination. However, the concentration essay should demonstrate a more detailed knowledge of the sub-field, including bibliography, the current direction of scholarship and, where applicable, historiography.

Sample sub-field questions will be available to M.A. candidates.

EXAMINATION FORM

Candidates are required to type their answers. They will write them by hand on 8 x 11 paper during the examination and present an exact (word for word, spelling for spelling) typewritten copy within 72 hours of the completion of the examination. The Department will retain the carbon copies of the original manuscript.

SCHEDULING APPLICATION AND GRADING

The examination will be given three times a year, in the fourth week of F,W,S, quarters. Written application to take the examination must be given to the Director of Graduate Studies by the end of the first week of the quarter in which the examination is to be taken. Both the concentration and the two elective sub-fields must be indicated on the application.

The examination will be prepared, administered and evaluated by the Committee on Graduate Studies in consultation with the concentration adviser and the relevant sub-field specialists. The results will be made known to the candidates during the sixth week of the quarter by letter from the Department Chairman.