

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Art History
Department: Fine and Performing Arts
College/School: Arts & Sciences
Date: May 31, 2019
Primary Assessment Contact: Bradley Bailey

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

In fall 2018, we offered the course ARTH 4900 Research Methods, one of two (now three, with the addition of ARTH 2000 Art History Seminar to the curriculum last year) courses that all art history majors are required to take. The course is now offered every other academic year, and is now open to both juniors and seniors rather than seniors. Using this course, we assess student learning outcome #3: Students will be able to apply the principal methodologies of art history to analyze a work of art, an artist, a patron, a place, or a text. The rubric for student learning outcome #3 was approved recently and will be used to assess the research papers that resulted from this class.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

7 of 7 students (a total of 8 including 1 minor—minors may but are not required to take Research Methods) in the class completed the research paper assignment, and 7 of 7 students demonstrated knowledge and proper use of one or more of the principal methodologies through a written assignment. 5 of 7 students submitted their Research Methods papers for the annual SLU/UMSL Undergraduate Art History symposium, and 2 were selected from this group (the third was the minor). 2 papers were also selected to be featured at the annual SLU Senior Legacy showcase, 1 by a major, the other by the minor. Of the 7 majors, one student was in the Madrid program, and this student's paper was one of the two papers by majors to be selected for the undergraduate symposium. All 7 papers by majors have been collected and will be kept on file.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

Assessment data collected in the fall 2018 semester will be analyzed by all art history faculty who teach the Research Methods course. A rubric has been constructed for this purpose (see attached). Faculty will compare notes on the assessment of the Research Methods papers and determine if any change is necessary to the student learning outcome or the course requirements.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

The faculty have not collectively discussed all of the Research Methodology papers from fall 2018,

only those that were submitted for the undergraduate symposium. It was determined that all papers submitted were either satisfactory or excellent in demonstrating the proper use of one or more of the principal methodologies of art history. The papers that were not discussed collectively will be looked at during the summer and their levels of success will be discussed in the fall 2019.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Of the data analyzed thus far, the faculty have determined that the Research Methods course continues to be a vital signifier of the art history majors' progress through the program, as it comprises the most rigorous research project most will encounter as majors. As it is principally intended to prepare majors for the type of work they would encounter in a graduate art history program, the rigor and the length of the assignment is appropriate to the scope of the learning outcome. At this point, the results suggest that there is no need to make changes to this component of the art history curriculum.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

As part of a university-initiated plan to produce videos for promoting programs, faculty interviewed a number of current and former students about the strengths of the program, and why they chose art history at Saint Louis University. This indirect assessment was highly productive in terms of understanding what students found to be the most attractive aspects of the art history program at SLU, and will help to guide the direction of the program as we enter into a new university-wide core curriculum. It was also helpful to discuss the career paths with the former students to better understand what they are doing following graduation and how we can better prepare them for the current job market.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

ARTH 4900 Research Methodologies Grading Rubric for Paper Assignment

Format

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Did the student use the font(s), spacing, and margins specified by the instructor?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Are the works of art and other relevant images and tables discussed illustrated in the text or as an appendix?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Are the works of art and other relevant images and tables discussed illustrated with captions as specified by the instructor?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Are the reproductions legible and do they successfully illustrate the point for which they are included?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Are the works of art discussed properly italicized in the text with dates and locations included when appropriate?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Is the paper legibly printed and properly bound or, if submitted electronically, is the electronic file accessible and properly organized?	Yes	Somewhat	No

Sources and Citations

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Are the sources used for the paper properly cited according to the specifications of the instructor?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Are the sources used in the paper of an appropriate level of academic rigor? (With the understanding that certain themes and methodological approaches may also utilize non-academic resources)	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Is the number sources used appropriate to the theme and scope of the paper and/or the specifications of the instructor?	Yes	Somewhat	No
Is the number of non-English language sources used appropriate to the theme and scope of the paper and/or the specifications of the instructor?	Yes	Somewhat	No
Were footnotes/endnotes used to provide supplemental information or references to other source materials as specified by the instructor?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Were the research materials derived from a broad variety of sources (books, journal articles, newspapers, exhibition catalogues, etc.) as dictated by the scope of the	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less

paper and/or the specifications of the instructor?			

Content

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Did the student successfully implement one or more of the approved research methodologies of the discipline?	The student implemented one or more of the approved research methodologies successfully	The student implemented one or more approved research methodologies with varying degrees of success	The student did not implement one or more of the approved research methodologies, or implemented one or more of the approved research methodologies unsuccessfully
Is the paper the appropriate length to address the scope of the thesis and/or as specified by the instructor?	Yes	Somewhat	No
Did the student utilize proper grammar and spelling consistently throughout the paper? (This includes typographical errors, run-on sentences, paragraph indentations, and other typical proofreading issues)	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Did the student use the terminology of the discipline when appropriate?	Nearly always or more	Usually	Infrequently or less
Was the student successful in developing and stating a cogent thesis?	Very successful	Somewhat successful	Less or unsuccessful
Is the thesis an original contribution to the field of art history or another discipline?	Yes	Somewhat	No

Was the student successful in developing a thesis that is appropriate to the scope of the assignment?	Very successful	Somewhat successful	Less or unsuccessful
Was the student successful in defending the thesis clearly and effectively?	Very successful	Somewhat successful	Less or unsuccessful
Was the student successful in organizing the paper so the progression of ideas flows in an organized and coherent manner?	Very successful	Somewhat successful	Less or unsuccessful