Assurance of Student Learning 2018-2019	
PCAL	ART
613: BA Art History	

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.			
Student Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate comprehension of major art historical movements and theories			
Instrument 1	Direct: Capstone research paper		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		**Met**	Not Met
Student Learning Outcome 2: Effectively apply research methods appropriate to the field			
Instrument 1	Direct: Capstone research paper		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.		**Met**	Not Met
Student Learning Outcome 3: Craft a well-articulated argument using correct guidelines of style and grammar			
Instrument 1	Direct: Capstone research paper		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.		**Met**	Not Met
Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)			
Overall, results from this assessment indicate all SLO targets were met. While SLO 1 and SLO 3 were exceeded, SLO 2, focusing on research methods, was only met at target. This result indicates that while students are adept at basic writing (SLO 3) and more complex anaylsis (SLO 1), projects focusing on research methodology and process should be further integrated into core courses to ensure graduates of the program are also developing appropriate research methodologies. Addendum: Included rubric will be revised and aligned more closely with Student Learning Outcomes.			

Student Learning Outcome 1	
Student Learning Outcome	**Comprehend and analyze major art historical movements and theories**
Measurement Instrument 1	**Direct: Capstone research paper** All students in the required Art History program capstone course, the Art History Seminar (ART 494), wrote a 3,000 – 3,500 word research paper, using correct citations, on a topic they selected from areas covered by the course, in which they analyzed and incorporated major art historical movements and theories. To evaluate SLO 1, students were evaluated on their understanding of art historical movements and theories.
Criteria for Student Success	By the end of the program students should be scoring at least a 2.5 out of 4 on the art history rubric.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	75%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	75%

Methods	Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course (N = 8) were assessed by two readers using the attached rubric. The SLO was evaluated on a scale of 1 – 4 by each reader, with a final score as an average of the scores of both readers. Readers were departmental faculty, but not the instructor for the course. Scores between 2.5 and 4 were counted as achieving the target.

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	**Met**	**Not Met**

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

Based on knowledge gained through the CAPE process, our AY 2018-2019 Program Learning Outcomes were updated and made more specific. The rubric used to assess each SLO was edited and refined.

However, work still needs to be done to ensure: 1. all SLOs a) represent the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating; b) these SLOs are measurable; c) our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. Once that work is done, we can 2. create curricular maps to ensure we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know. Finally, we can 3. develop a more effective strategy of evaluating whether or not we are meeting our SLOs.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

This year we will work to ensure: 1. all SLOs a) represent the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating; b) these SLOs are measurable; c) our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. We need a solid baseline and to understand where we are to know in what ways we need to improve.

Student Learning Outcome 2	
Student Learning Outcome	**Effectively apply research methods appropriate to the field**
Measurement Instrument 1	**Direct: Capstone research paper** All students in the required Art History program capstone course, the Art History Seminar (ART 494), wrote a 3,000 – 3,500 word research paper, using correct citations, on a topic they selected from areas covered by the course, in which they analyzed and incorporated major art historical movements and theories. To evaluate SLO 2, students were evaluated on their ability to present a focused research topic, appropriate choice of sources, and correctness of citations and style usage.
Criteria for Student Success	By the end of the program students should be scoring at least a 2.5 out of 4 on the art history rubric.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	75%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	75%

Methods	Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course (N = 8) were assessed by two readers using the attached rubric. The SLO was evaluated on a scale of 1 – 4 by each reader, with a final score as an average of the scores of both readers. Readers were departmental faculty, but not the instructor for the course. Scores between 2.5 and 4 were counted as achieving the target.

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	**Met**	**Not Met**

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

Based on knowledge gained through the CAPE process, our AY 2018-2019 Program Learning Outcomes were updated and made more specific. The rubric used to assess each SLO was edited and refined.

However, work still needs to be done to ensure: 1. all SLOs a) represent the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating; b) these SLOs are measurable; c) our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. Once that work is done, we can 2. create curricular maps to ensure we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know. Finally, we can 3. develop a more effective strategy of evaluating whether or not we are meeting our SLOs.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

This year we will work to ensure: 1. all SLOs a) represent the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating; b) these SLOs are measurable; c) our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. We need a solid baseline and to understand where we are to know in what ways we need to improve.

	Student Learning Outcome 3
Student Learning Outcome	**Craft a well-articulated argument using correct guidelines of style and grammar**
Measurement Instrument 1	**Direct: Capstone research paper** All students in the required Art History program capstone course, the Art History Seminar (ART 494), wrote a 3,000 – 3,500 word research paper, using correct citations, on a topic they selected from areas covered by the course, in which they analyzed and incorporated major art historical movements and theories. To evaluate SLO 3, students were evaluated on correctness and clarity of writing style and grammar.
Criteria for Student Success	By the end of the program students should be scoring above average for this outcome.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	75%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	75%

Methods	Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course (N = 8) were assessed by two readers using the attached rubric. The SLO was evaluated on a scale of 1 – 4 by each reader, with a final score as an average of the scores of both readers. Readers were departmental faculty, but not the instructor for the course. Scores between 2.5 and 4 were counted as achieving the target.

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	**Met**	**Not Met**

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

Based on knowledge gained through the CAPE process, our AY 2018-2019 Program Learning Outcomes were updated and made more specific. The rubric used to assess each SLO was edited and refined.

However, work still needs to be done to ensure: 1. all SLOs a) represent the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating; b) these SLOs are measurable; c) our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. Once that work is done, we can 2. create curricular maps to ensure we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know. Finally, we can 3. develop a more effective strategy of evaluating whether or not we are meeting our SLOs.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

This year we will work to ensure: 1. all SLOs a) represent the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating; b) these SLOs are measurable; c) our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring. We need a solid baseline and to understand where we are to know in what ways we need to improve.

See included Art History Rubric