**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-21 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: Art and Design/Art History Degree: BA

Assessment Coordinator: Dr. Keith Jordan

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

SLO 2.1: Students will explain the meaning and function of both individual artworks and broader art styles within their historical context

SLO 3.1: Students will describe and critically evaluate artworks in writing employing terminology appropriate to the discipline of Art History

SLO 3.2: Students will analyze artworks in writing providing visual and contextual evidence

SLO 3.3: Students will demonstrate critical understanding of the strengths and limitations of various methods of art historical research (such as documentary research, formal analysis, archaeology, etc.)

SLO 4.1: Students will recognize the formal elements (such as space, color, line, and texture) and explain how they are used in both individual artworks and broader art styles

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

Sample for assessment: 12 museum research papers from students in ARTH 175 (Pre-Columbian Andes), Fall 2020 (see the Appendix of this report)

Description of original assignment from the syllabus: “For the research paper, since the Fresno Art Museum and the De Young Museum of Fine Arts in San Francisco are closed due to the pandemic, you will need to make use of the electronic resources of the De Young (<https://deyoung.famsf.org/collections>), which has a small but good Andean collection. Click on “Collections,” then “Search the Collections” and enter the name of an Andean culture that interests you (Chavin, Paracas, Nazca, Moche, Recuay, Wari, Tiwanaku, Chimu, Chancay, Inca) into “keywords.” This will bring up a series of images of works in the museum’s collection. Click on the images for more information about each. Select one object from the collection that interests or appeals to you or arouses your curiosity. When you have chosen your object, please let me know by the date indicated on the course schedule and I will provide you with a starter bibliography of a few basic references (books and journal articles) to help you begin your research. Your paper can be about just that specific type of object and its possible meanings, uses, and contexts, or if you are more ambitious, you can use it to write more generally about the art of the specific culture or ethnic group that created it. You should use at least five sources (again, books or journal articles) for this paper—no internet sources permitted unless you check with me first (there’s lots of bad information out there in cyberspace). The paper should be 7-10 pages.”

Criteria for assessment**:**

The desired result indicating understanding and achievement of the five specified art history SLOs was defined as a research paper score of 3 using the following rubric:

**4**: Clearly explains the meaning and/or function of individual works of art and/or broader art styles/object types within their historical and cultural context. Provides visual and contextual evidence for these explanations. In cases of disputed or hypothetical interpretations as is common with materials known only through archaeology, clearly distinguishes between facts and interpretations, and shows critical thinking and logical arguments in evaluating proposed interpretations. Demonstrates clear awareness of the limitations of both research methodologies and the archaeological record of the Central Andes for making all interpretations. Avoids interpretations of form and function that are based on ignorance of cultural context, especially the pop cultural variety (“aliens built Tiwanaku”). Employs relevant terminology from the disciplines of art history and archaeology correctly and appropriately. Cites sources appropriately. Contains no significant factual errors.

**3**: Clearly explains the meaning and/or function of individual artworks and/or broader art styles/object types within their historical and cultural context, but may display minor omissions of relevant evidence for these interpretations. In cases of disputed or hypothetical interpretations as is common with materials known only through archaeology, demonstrates minor confusion/circular arguments in distinguishing between facts and interpretations, but generally shows critical thinking and logical argument in evaluating proposed interpretations. Avoids interpretations of form and function that are based on ignorance of cultural context, especially the pop cultural variety (“aliens built Tiwanaku”). While generally accurate, complete, and solidly argued, may contain several minor factual errors and/or omissions of major proposed interpretations, but still reasonably complete, accurate, and solidly argued work. Positions are supported with reasoned argument and factual data. Employs relevant terminology from the disciplines of art history and archaeology correctly and appropriately. Cites sources properly. Avoids confusion between specific cultures.

**2**. Though not completely inaccurate, paper shows insufficiency/lack of clarity in explaining the meaning and/or function of individual artworks and/or broader art styles/object types within their historical and cultural context. Fails to support interpretations of meaning/function with visual and contextual evidence, stating or negating interpretations without evidence on a seemingly subjective or arbitrary basis. Demonstrates failure to distinguish between facts and interpretations and lack of critical thinking, e.g. as evidenced by appeals to the authority of specific scholars without at least briefly addressing the reasons for their opinions. Shows failure to grasp the limitations of research methodologies and evidence, e.g., in dogmatic assertions unsupported by evidence. Interpretations are not supported by logical arguments. Does not use art historical and archaeological terminology consistently correctly or appropriately. Paper suffers from significant numbers of factual errors and/or use of sources that are not cited or properly quoted and/or significant lack of clarity or organization. While reflecting a broadly correct understanding of the material, may confuse specific civilizations, styles, sites, monuments, etc.

**1**. Either an honest attempt was made to answer the question but the response fails entirely to situate the meaning/function of individual works of art and/or broader art styles/object types within their historical and cultural context (e.g., limits treatment of works of art to just description). Completely ignores visual/contextual evidence for interpretations. May suggest arbitrary and subjective interpretations of Andean art without any understanding of context. Fails completely to distinguish between facts and interpretations, and to employ critical thinking and logical argument in assessment of proposed interpretations. May repeat unfounded popular pseudo-archaeological claims that are based on ignorance of cultural context, like the Nazca lines were alien airport runways. Does not employs relevant terminology from the disciplines of art history and archaeology correctly and appropriately, or at all. Paper suffers from severe inaccuracies (e.g., completely confuses cultures, periods and works of art). May fail to cite any sources at all or plagiarize.

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.

The scores for the 12 research papers assessed using the rubric reproduced in the previous section were as follows:

1. (ST): 4. (Note: This is a MA-level graduate student taking this undergraduate class and performed here as in most of her work more on a doctoral level.)
2. (MG): 4
3. (SJ): 3
4. (TL): 2
5. (NB): 3
6. (AT): 3
7. (AH): 4
8. (GW): 4
9. (NY): 2
10. (JP): 3
11. (VM): 4
12. (AJ): 4

The numbers and percentages for each score were:

 4: 6 (50%)

 3: 4 (33.33%)

 2: 2 (16.66%)

Ten out of twelve students (83.5%) scored a 3 or higher and were judged as proficient.

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

As an overwhelming number (83.5%) of the student sample evidenced proficiency in the art history outcomes assessed, no changes are indicated at this time.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

In the last annual assessment of the Art History BA (2018-2019), we reported that one strategy the Art History faculty was working to implement in the course ARTH 11 (which Formal Analysis essay was assessed then) was introducing new in-class activities and mobile tools/technology, as part of the DISCOVERe program, for students to identify, describe and interpret formal elements in a more dynamic, interactive, engaging, and comprehensive way. ARTH 11 was also then in the process to transition to a DISCOVERe course. Since this last report, new educational tools have been implemented in the ARTH 11 course, partly as a consequence of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic that forced us all (instructors and students) to adapt to a virtual format. Also, the course was part of the DISCOVERe program during the Spring 2020 and the Fall 2021 semesters. All the assigned readings are free and available online as Open Educational Resources. Students are required to complete readings, watch videos, and listen to Podcasts produced by a variety of educational institutions, such as Smarthistory/Khan Academy, The Met Museum’s Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History, and Google Arts and Culture, among others. Online discussion boards, posted on Canvas almost every week, have also been introduced in the course ARTH 11, to strengthen the students’ understanding of the course material and to engage in a productive debate with classmates, prior to our weekly meetings. Often during the semester, students are also asked to respond to a couple of short multiple-choice questions using the poll tool in Zoom, or game-based learning platforms such as Kahoot! Other course assignments (formal analysis paper and iconographic analysis paper), are submitted to Canvas in a digital copy using Turnitin, allowing the instructor to provide feedback online in a timely manner.

1. What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?

Using a sample of research essays, we will assess the following SLOS:

SLO 1.1: Students will identify the features that distinguish styles by period, region, and (when applicable) individual artist or movement

SLO 1.2: Students will describe how art styles develop and undergo transformation within a specific cultural and historical context

SLO 2.1: Students will explain the meaning and function of both individual artworks and broader art styles within their historical context

SLO 3.3: Students will demonstrate critical understanding of the strengths and limitations of various methods of art historical research (such as documentary research, formal analysis, archaeology, etc.)

1. Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.

# The BA in Art History was introduced in the AY 2018-19. The first program review is scheduled for 2023-2024.