



Editors' Notes to Volume 3

Virginia Spivey

Renee McGarry
New York University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Spivey, Virginia and Renee McGarry. . "Editors' Notes to Volume 3." *Art History Pedagogy & Practice* 3, (1).
<https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp/vol3/iss1/1>

Art History Pedagogy and Practice is published biannually by Art History Teaching Resources (AHTR) in partnership with the Office of Library Services of the City University of New York and the Graduate Center at the City University of New York. For more information, please contact info@arthistorypp.org.

Editors' Notes to Volume 3

This issue of *Art History Pedagogy and Practice* calls attention to changes taking place throughout art history today. These changes raise important questions about the discipline's future: should art history be more socially engaged given a growing climate of anxiety, fear, and political unrest? Are our institutions adequately preparing students to face the uncertainty of a rapidly changing world? They also reflect the evolution in scholarly thinking that is expected in humanistic inquiry: What are the limitations and biases of art history's current methods? What alternative approaches to research and interpretation are best suited to contribute to emerging conversations in the field? The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Art History (SoTL-AH) is itself one of these developments, highlighting the need for critical examination of teaching and learning practice and its broader impact on the field. The authors here have taken important steps to advance that process. Their work shows how disciplinary change allows us to rethink established pedagogies and our existing goals for art historical study at both introductory and advanced learning levels.

In “Creativity-Integrated Art History: A Pedagogical Framework,” Alysha Meloche and Jen Katz-Buonincontro suggest, that at a time when art historians (and others) question what students can gain from art historical study, we might consider untapped areas for student learning. They argue that instructional methods that focus on artistic products and individuals emphasize “Big-C creativity,” overlooking the potential of art history to cultivate skills of creative thinking and problem-solving. Drawing on principles of design thinking, they propose a pedagogical framework to develop this important skill set through greater emphasis on “mini-c creativity”—the complex processes essential to any creative output—inherent in the discipline's core content.

Nadine Oberste-Hetbleck examines teaching advanced skills in art history in “A Didactic Teaching and Learning Project in Art Market Research: Researching and Publishing the History of Commercial Art Dealing.” Here, she details her work to engage upper level and post-graduate students in developing scholarly skills through a sustained research project, which culminated in *Zur Geschichte des Düsseldorfer Kunsthandels* (A History of Commercial Art Dealing in Düsseldorf), published in 2014 by Düsseldorf University Press. Organized in multiple seminars, and involving students at different academic levels with varied backgrounds in art history, this project gave participants real-world experience conducting research on the city's contemporary art market. Students developed and revised written contributions toward final publication through structured feedback and extensive workshopping, which provides a projects-based model for embedding advanced writing instruction in upper level art history courses.

In “Multisensory and Active Learning Approaches to Teaching Medieval Art,” Marice Rose and Tera Lee Hedrick offer an engaging analysis of their work to deepen students' interest in medieval art history. Their approach builds on the “sensory turn” of recent scholarship to explore

how the experience of objects and monuments involves all five senses, alongside research exploring the potential for active and experiential learning models to improve student understanding. The authors demonstrate the success of this strategy through a descriptive methodological model, that—while focused on art history pedagogy and recent museum practices—supports a broader critique of the privileging of sight and visual experience common to art history.

Likewise Jennifer Borland and Louise Siddons contribute to the growing literature on active learning in art history in “Yay or Neigh? Frederic Remington’s *Bronco Buster*, Public Art, and Socially-Engaged Art History Pedagogy.” Inspired by their city’s installation of a new work of public art, they saw a way to take their students out of the classroom and combine active learning methods with their goals for art history’s engagement and social activism. Their study details their initial planning and evolution of the project to have students explore questions of art history, civic identity, community education and outreach through the lens of social response to public art.

As with every issue of *Art History Pedagogy and Practice*, we appreciate the work of these authors and are excited to share their contributions to SoTL-AH. We hope they inspire readers to think critically about their own classroom experiences, and the ways that teaching and learning in art history can reflect, reinforce, and shape ideas held throughout the discipline. We want to thank [our team at AHTR](#), especially Kathleen Wentrack for her invaluable work in copyediting the present issue. We also want to thank the members of [AHPP’s Advisory Board](#) who provided support and useful guidance for this publication over the last three years.

Virginia Spivey and Renee McGarry
Co-founding Editors, *AHPP*