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| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2022-2023** | |
| PCAL | Art & Design |
| 613: BA Art History | |
| Kristina Arnold, Dept Chair | |

***Is this an online program***?  Yes  No

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***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.** | | **Met** | **X 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.** | | **Met** | **X 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.)** | | | |
| Results from our assessments show that all three of our SLO targets were narrowly missed - all three showed 66% of students meeting target, where 75% was our goal. It is possible that the small sample size affected reliability for this outcome.  As we have been using an outdated and mis-matched rubric, we re-developed and used a revised rubric this year; it is also possible the change in assessment tool contributed to these results, and we will continue to fine-tune and norm our rubric.  We continue to develop recent efforts to integrate a focus on research methodology and process (SLO 2) into core courses to ensure graduates of the program continue to develop appropriate research methodologies alongside more complex comprehension and anaylsis (SLO 1).  As we look towards disciplinary re-accreditation (NASAD) in Spring 2025, this coming academic year the Department Head and program faculty will focus on creating curricular maps and reassessing our SLOs for this program, refining where needed. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 / 4 or higher on this outcome. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 66.6% | |
| **Methods** | Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course who graduated in Spring 2023 (*N* = 3) were assessed by two readers using the art history rubric (attached). 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 3 and 4 were counted as achieving the target. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | **Met** | **X  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| Based on recent assessments, this SLO was developed last year 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 – the critical content learning outcome for the major.  This year, we modified the rubric (rating students on a scale of 1 – 4 instead of 1 – 5) to more closely align with rubrics used for Colonnade assessments.  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.  As we did not quite achieve our target goal for this assessment, we will continue to ensure our students are developing the content knowledge – and the ability to communicate this knowledge through writing – necessary for success. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| 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) | | | | | |
| As we look towards disciplinary re-accreditation (NASAD) in Spring 2025, this coming academic year the Department Head and program faculty will focus on creating curricular maps and reassessing our SLOs for this program, refining where needed.  This process will continue over at least the next two 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 / 4 or higher on this outcome. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 66.6% | |
| **Methods** | Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course who graduated in Spring 2023 (*N* = 3) were assessed by two readers using the art history rubric (attached). 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 3 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** | **X**  **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| This year, we modified the rubric (rating students on a scale of 1 – 4 instead of 1 – 5) to more closely align with rubrics used for Colonnade assessments.  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). Though we met this goal last year, we did not quite achieve our target goal for this assessment this year, so we will continue our efforts to ensure our students are developing the research skills and methodologies expected for success in the discipline. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| 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) | | | | | |
| As we look towards disciplinary re-accreditation (NASAD) in Spring 2025, this coming academic year the Department Head and program faculty will focus on creating curricular maps and reassessing our SLOs for this program, refining where needed.  This process will continue over at least the next two 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 / 4 or higher on this outcome. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 66.6% | |
| **Methods** | Papers were stripped of identifying information. All art history majors in the course who graduated in Spring 2023 (*N* = 3) were assessed by two readers using the art history rubric (attached). 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 3 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** | **X Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| This year, we modified the rubric (rating students on a scale of 1 – 4 instead of 1 – 5) to more closely align with rubrics used for Colonnade assessments.  The correctness and clarity of writing style and grammar measured in SLO 3 will need to be addressed though the small sample size (*N*=3) may have skewed the results in this year's assessment for this SLO. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| 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) | | | | | |
| As we look towards disciplinary re-accreditation (NASAD) in Spring 2025, this coming academic year the Department Head and program faculty will focus on creating curricular maps and reassessing our SLOs for this program, refining where needed.  This process will continue over at least the next two evaluation cycles. | | | | | |

