

<NAME OF YOUR PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT/MAJOR OR MINOR>

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018
REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated.

Note: Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- ceschwabenland@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Karen Fraser (kfraser2@usfca.edu), Faculty Assessment Coordinator for ARTM

Kate Lusheck (chlusheck@usfca.edu), ARTM Program Director

****PLEASE NOTE:** Due to the very low number of ARTM minors, we will assess the minor on a 3 year cycle, with the next submission in Fall 2020.

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

Yes (we did not have a mission statement separate from A+A in last cycle):

The ARTM mission is to train students in the history, visual literacy, critical thinking, research, and communication skills necessary to become ethical, forward-thinking leaders in the art world and beyond.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

Yes: we are about to submit revised PLOs. We realized it was problematic for us to assess the old PLO #2, so we merged the former PLO 1 and 2 into a single more effective PLO.

New PLOs:

1. Analyze a broad range of works of visual art and architecture in their aesthetic, historical, and/or cultural contexts.
2. Develop persuasive art historical arguments in oral or written form using common disciplinary methodologies.
3. Articulate critical roles that arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.

Former PLOs:

1. Analyze a broad range of works of visual art and architecture in their historical and cultural contexts.
2. Create original works of art based on an understanding of basic visual principles and concepts.
3. Develop persuasive art historical arguments in oral and written form using common disciplinary methodologies.
4. Articulate critical roles that arts institutions can play in considering ethical issues and effecting positive social change.

4. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

PLO 2. Develop persuasive art historical arguments in oral or written form using common disciplinary methodologies.

II. METHODOLOGY

5. Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, "the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions."

Important: Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.

The method used was direct assessment of student work. Faculty evaluated assignments completed by ARTM majors from four different classes, one introductory; two intermediate; and one advanced level. The classes and assignments were:

- ART 101/Survey of Western Art I (Introductory): A paper requiring correct application and analysis of field-specific terminology (7 papers)

- ART 214/Islamic Art (Intermediate): An exam essay question requiring students to engage in contextual and formal analysis (4 essays)
- ART 307/Asian Art (Intermediate): An exam comparison essay question requiring students to engage in contextual and formal analysis (6 essays)
- ART 352/East-West Encounters (Advanced): A formal research paper (6 papers)

(**Two intermediate classes were chosen to evaluate the Intermediate level as the course initially designated, ART 214, had only 4 student exams to evaluate). Evaluators included faculty teaching the course and faculty who did not teach the course.

III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,
- any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and
- the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Outcomes Across All Levels	Percentage of Students
Mastery	30.5%
Competence	56.5%
Developing	13%
Beginning	0%

Summaries of overall results are as follows:

- At the Introductory level (ART 101):
 - Developing: 14%
 - Competent: 86%
- At the Intermediate level (ART 214, ART 307):
 - Developing: 20%
 - Competent: 50%
 - Mastery: 30%
- At the Advanced level (ART 352):

- Competent: 33%
- Mastery: 67%

The results for this year's assessment seem to be consistent with last year's results in indicating that the students are generally learning the breadth and depth of skills, subject knowledge, and methods of analysis that our program is aiming to teach them. At the introductory level they are successfully acquiring the ability to use disciplinary terminology to describe and analyze specific works of art, effectively using the method of formal analysis. At the intermediate level they are expanding that knowledge and applying it to contexts outside the western tradition, with fully half doing this at a "Competent" level. The students who performed at a level of "Mastery" at the Intermediate course level tended to be graduating seniors, so it is not unexpected that their analyses would be more sophisticated than the students taking those courses on the intended timeline of sophomore or early junior year. At the advanced level students (mostly seniors) are engaging in significant research projects and are successfully producing sophisticated methodological analyses of works of art that draw on visual and textual materials. At each level the students are performing at or above expectations. Our data set is small, as we don't have that many students, and that provides something of a challenge.

IV. CLOSING THE LOOP

- 7. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.**

We have several issues to try and address in the coming year. One is that we have not actually discussed the levels we are hoping to achieve across these different courses. It would be beneficial to come to a consensus about whether we are expecting "Mastery" or "Competence" for most students at the Intermediate and Advanced level classes in particular. A second issue is to try to have more consistency in the types of assignments required by different faculty especially at the Introductory and Intermediate levels (where we have a number of adjunct faculty, too), to ensure that we have a consistent scaffolding of assignments and skills that is serving our students well. In general our biggest challenge is in our small student numbers. Though our program enrollment is stable, many students deviate from the order of classes we envision, due to a combination of factors: coming in with test credits, transferring in from other universities, changing to the major (somewhat late), and taking classes abroad, which are often not as rigorous as ours. So we plan to engage in discussion to try to address some of the issues arising from this set of challenges. We also expect to continue to refine our PLOs and our assessment rubrics.

8. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

The most useful feedback was clarification regarding how to improve the rubric used, which we were able to apply for this year's rubric.

We were somewhat confused by this part of the feedback: "However, you are assessing courses that deal with the PLO at all levels, from introductory to mastery, and that will lead to lower results than if you were just assessing the *outcome*, as in what students leaving the program leave with. In other words, if you are interested in seeing the development of the students (which is a perfectly appropriate thing to do) then this is the way to go. You might also try to only assess the outcome with the various courses where the PLO is mastered, and perhaps retool in part the rubric (see below) so that you list on the first column the level at which the ideal student would be at the end," as we understood that what we are supposed to be assessing is precisely the *outcome*. So we'd love clarification if that is also part of the feedback received this year.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

PL0 2	Mastery	Clear, focused, manageable topic or issue, described comprehensively, addresses significant aspects of topic	Issue or topic is stated and described, scope is focused and manageable for the assignment	Utilizes a standard art historical methodology, effectively applying it to develop an acceptable, error-free interpretation of the topic; may benefit from more in-depth application and analysis	Effectively develops a strong, logical, and coherent argument, convincingly supports a core thesis or idea	Synthesizes, evaluates, and analyzes in-depth information from various sources; questions perspectives or approaches; sources; acknowledges varying limited interpretation or analysis; does not question source, information, or assumptions; limited use of citations (may struggle to distinguish how and when to cite information appropriately; uses specific citation style but makes consistent errors)	Use of evidence, research (visual and textual) <i>Note: citations and research are not required for all assignments</i> Synthesizes, evaluates, and analyzes in-depth information from various sources; questions perspectives or approaches; incorporates analysis and/or synthesis of information; mostly correct use of citations with minor errors (mostly appropriate use of paraphrasing and direct quotations, distinguishing between common knowledge and info requiring citation, and into requiring accurate citation style)	Organization and written or verbal expression Organization and writing or speech effectively supports thesis and purpose, with fully effective transitions, well organized information, clear writing/speaking style	Analysis and Interpretation Effectively organizes and analyzes evidence to reveal key patterns, differences, similarities	Effectively organizes and analyzes evidence to reveal key patterns, differences, similarities	Conclusion is sophisticated and logical, emerges from informed evaluation, analysis, and synthesis of appropriate evidence
Competent	Issue or topic is stated and described, scope is focused and manageable for the assignment	Utilizes a standard art historical methodology, applying it to develop an acceptable, error-free interpretation of the topic; may benefit from more in-depth application and analysis	Effectively develops a main argument, supporting a core thesis or idea	Presents information from relevant sources; acknowledges varying limited interpretation or analysis; does not question source, information, or assumptions; limited use of citations (may struggle to distinguish how and when to cite information appropriately; uses specific citation style but makes consistent errors)	Presents relevant info with limited interpretation or analysis; does not question source, information, or assumptions; limited use of citations (may struggle to distinguish how and when to cite information appropriately; uses specific citation style but makes consistent errors)	Presents relevant info, uses info without any interpretation or analysis; does not accurately cite information	Use of evidence, research (visual and textual) <i>Note: citations and research are not required for all assignments</i> Synthesizes, evaluates, and analyzes in-depth information from various sources; questions perspectives or approaches; incorporates analysis and/or synthesis of information; mostly correct use of citations with minor errors (mostly appropriate use of paraphrasing and direct quotations, distinguishing between common knowledge and info requiring accurate citation, and into requiring accurate citation style)	Organization and written or verbal expression Organization and writing or speech adequately supports a simple thesis or purpose, some adjustments could improve flow of ideas	Lists and organizes evidence, but doesn't effectively consider important patterns, differences, similarities	Organizes and analyzes evidence to reveal key patterns, differences, similarities	Conclusion is more complex, arises from and responds inquiry and analysis presented
Developing	Issue or topic stated but with some ambiguity, relevant aspects not explained	Utilizes a standard art historical methodology, but application, analysis, and interpretation reveals some incorrect notions about applicable use	States a main idea or thesis, but struggles to effectively argue for its interpretation	Presents relevant info with limited interpretation or analysis; does not question source, information, or assumptions; limited use of citations (may struggle to distinguish how and when to cite information appropriately; uses specific citation style but makes consistent errors)	Presents relevant info with limited interpretation or analysis; does not question source, information, or assumptions; limited use of citations (may struggle to distinguish how and when to cite information appropriately; uses specific citation style but makes consistent errors)	Weak or unclear organization and writing or speech, abrupt shifts in logic or flow of ideas	Use of evidence, research (visual and textual) <i>Note: citations and research are not required for all assignments</i> Synthesizes, evaluates, and analyzes in-depth information from various sources; questions perspectives or approaches; incorporates analysis and/or synthesis of information; mostly correct use of citations with minor errors (mostly appropriate use of paraphrasing and direct quotations, distinguishing between common knowledge and info requiring accurate citation, and into requiring accurate citation style)	Organization and written or verbal expression Weak or unclear organization and writing or speech, abrupt shifts in logic or flow of ideas	Lists and organizes evidence, but doesn't effectively consider important patterns, differences, similarities	Organizes and analyzes evidence to reveal key patterns, differences, similarities	Conclusion is general, or is logical because information has been chosen to fit the desired conclusion
Beginning	Topic too general to be effectively addressed, issue not stated or stated w/o explanation	Does not use a standard methodology, or has significant oversights or errors in applying the methodology	Fails to present an argument	Presents irrelevant info, uses info without any interpretation or analysis; does not accurately cite information	Presents irrelevant info, uses info without any interpretation or analysis; does not accurately cite information	Misses evidence, or lists evidence with minimal interpretation	Use of evidence, research (visual and textual) <i>Note: citations and research are not required for all assignments</i> Synthesizes, evaluates, and analyzes in-depth information from various sources; questions perspectives or approaches; incorporates analysis and/or synthesis of information; mostly correct use of citations with minor errors (mostly appropriate use of paraphrasing and direct quotations, distinguishing between common knowledge and info requiring accurate citation, and into requiring accurate citation style)	Organization and written or verbal expression Weak or unclear organization and writing or speech, abrupt shifts in logic or flow of ideas	Lists and organizes evidence, but doesn't effectively consider important patterns, differences, similarities	Organizes and analyzes evidence to reveal key patterns, differences, similarities	Conclusion is absent or is ambiguous, illogical, unsupported, or inconsistent

Rubric for ARTM PL0 2: Develop persuasive art historical arguments in oral or written form using common disciplinary methodologies.