|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2020-2021** | |
| PCAL | Art & Design |
| 613: BA Art History | |
| Yvonne Petkus, Acting Co-Department Head | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***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 the ability to comprehend and analyze major art historical movements and theories. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Direct: Capstone Research Paper | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **X 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, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **X 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, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **X 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 that two of our three SLO targets for this Program were met. It is very likely that the small sample size (*N*=2) makes the results less reliable and may account for SLO 3 not being met.    An outdated rubric was used in last year's assessment, so program SLOs for AY 2020-2021 were revised and increased to three to be sure the rubric matches our assessment mechanism, accurately represents the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating, and is measurable.  Recent efforts to integrate a focus on research methodology and process (SLO 2) into core courses has worked to ensure graduates of the program are developing appropriate research methodologies alongside more complex comprehension and anaylsis (SLO 1). The correctness and clarity of writing style and grammar (SLO 3) needs to be addressed though the small sample size (*N*=2) may have skewed the results in this year's assessment for SLO 3 where one student received 4 out of 5 and one student received 3 out of 5, bringing the percentage for SLO 3 quickly down to 50%.  A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know. This will ensure we have a solid baseline from which to evaluate changes to the program itself in future years. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and analyze major art historical movements and theories** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT MEASURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: 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 and analysis of art historical movements and theories. | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Success is defined as 3.5 / 5 or higher on this outcome. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% | |
| **Methods** | Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course who graduated in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 (*N* = 2) were assessed by two readers using the art history rubric (attached). The SLO was evaluated on a scale of 1 – 5 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 3.5 and 5 were counted as achieving the target. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | **X Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| Based on last year’s assessment, this SLO was developed and added as a third SLO to assess students’ ability to demonstrate comprehension and analysis of major art historical movement(s) and / or theory(ies) and / or objects.  All three SLOs now match the rubric used by evaluators and SLO 1 exceeds its target for success. It is very likely, however, that the small sample size (*N*=2) makes the results less reliable.  Work has been done, and this will continue to be examined, to ensure this SLO represents the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating and that this SLO is measurable. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| We still need to ensure our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring and will continue looking for ways to improve our SLOs, rubric, and process, as needed.  A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know.  New state and university assessment processes that are currently in development will be included in our re-assessment of our SLOs and process. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | |
| The work described above, to create curricular maps and reassess our SLOs for this program, and refine where needed, will be examined throughout this coming academic year by the Department Head and faculty.  Examining and developing these tools should take a year, but effective norming likely will take several evaluation cycles. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Effectively apply research methods appropriate to the field.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT MEASURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: 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** | Success is defined as 3.5 / 5 or higher on this outcome. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% | |
| **Methods** | Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course who graduated in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 (*N* = 2) were assessed by two readers using the art history rubric (attached). The SLO was evaluated on a scale of 1 – 5 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 3.5 and 5 were counted as achieving the target. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | **X Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| All three SLOs now match the rubric used by evaluators and SLO 2 exceeds its target for success. It is very likely, however, that the small sample size (*N*=2) makes the results less reliable.  Recent efforts to integrate a focus on research methodology and process (SLO 2) into core courses has worked to ensure graduates of the program are developing appropriate research methodologies alongside more complex comprehension and anaylsis (SLO 1).  Work has been done, and this will continue to be examined, to ensure this SLO represents the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating and that this SLO is measurable. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| We still need to ensure our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring and will continue looking for ways to improve our SLOs, rubric, and process, as needed.  A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know.  New state and university assessment processes that are currently in development will be included in our re-assessment of our SLOs and process. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | |
| The work described above, to create curricular maps and reassess our SLOs for this program, and refine where needed, will be examined throughout this coming academic year by the Department Head and faculty.  Examining and developing these tools should take a year, but effective norming likely will take several evaluation cycles. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Craft a well-articulated argument using correct guidelines of style and grammar.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT MEASURE OF STUDENT LEARNING: 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** | Success is defined as 3.5 / 5 or higher on this outcome. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 50% | |
| **Methods** | Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course who graduated in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 (*N* = 2) were assessed by two readers using the art history rubric (attached). The SLO was evaluated on a scale of 1 – 5 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 3.5 and 5 were counted as achieving the target. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | **Met** | **X Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| All three SLOs now match the rubric used by evaluators. SLO 3 did not meet its target for success.  The correctness and clarity of writing style and grammar measured in SLO 3 will need to be addressed though the small sample size (*N*=2) may have skewed the results in this year's assessment for this SLO, where one student received 4 out of 5 and one student received 3 out of 5, bringing the percentage for SLO 3 quickly down to 50%.  Work has been done, and this will continue to be examined, to ensure this SLO represents the skills, knowledge, and experience we want our students to master upon graduating and that this SLO is measurable. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| We need to ensure our tools are designed to measure what we say we are measuring and will continue looking for ways to improve our SLOs, rubric, and process, as needed.  This includes re-examining SLO 3 for opportunities to meet our target for success in the correctness and clarity of writing style and grammar within the Capstone Research Papers and in looking for ways to increase the pool of students evaluated.  A goal for this year is to begin to create curricular maps to identify the courses in which we are teaching those things we say we want our students to know.  New state and university assessment processes that are currently in development will be included in our re-assessment of our SLOs and process. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | |
| The work described above, to create curricular maps and reassess our SLOs for this program, and refine where needed, will be examined throughout this coming academic year by the Department Head and faculty.  Examining and developing these tools should take a year, but effective norming likely will take several evaluation cycles. | | | | | |

