1. Art History, Department of Art, Oklahoma State University (August 2009)
2. Plan for Assessment of Undergraduate Learning Outcomes
3. MISSION STATEMENT

The Bachelor of Art in Art History in the Department of Art is intended to develop in our students a solid knowledge base of art historical content, the ability to relate this content to larger cultural issues and the skills to think and write critically and analytically about these issues. This program allows students to engage multiple geographic locations, cultures, time periods and methodological perspectives. We seek to prepare students for success in graduate programs in art history, or other art-related careers including museum administration, gallery management, corporate art investment, interior design, clinical art therapy, theater, film and television production, government administration of the arts, library management, journalism and visual resources management.

Art history provides students with a rich and balanced liberal arts education. Art engages in a dialogue with society and through visual representation explores historical and political realities, religious and philosophical values, and cultural attitudes. Art history offers both a comprehensive insight into human cultural development as well as a uniquely challenging area of study that integrates rigorous analysis with creativity and interpretive thought. It is, in its broadest sense, a systematic exploration of imagination that develops in its students the capacity to identify and critically relate to issues inherent in the highest forms of human thought and expression. The practical skills that are developed in this study, particularly in research, writing, and the analysis of complex visual signs, constitute the essential components necessary in all professions and are directly applicable in a wide variety of career options.

1. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
2. Graduates will exhibit knowledge of the visual culture of a range of geographic locations, cultures, time periods as well as the methodologies of art history.
3. Graduates will be able to think critically and analytically.
4. Graduates will be able to demonstrate their skills in writing at the level expected in undergraduate work.
5. Graduates will be able to formulate an art historical thesis, accumulate evidence to substantiate that thesis, and synthesize that evidence into a viable conclusion.
6. Students will be able to present on one of their research projects in a public forum (the Art History Student Symposium) in the form of a twenty-minute talk with images.
7. ASSESSMENT METHODS
8. Graduates will exhibit knowledge of the visual culture of a range of geographic locations, cultures, time periods as well as the methodologies of art history.

Method 1: Each graduating student in Art in Context (ART 4933) will submit a paper in the spring semester. These papers may be the paper written for Art in Context or a paper written for a Writing Methods course (ART 3600). A committee of art historians will evaluate the demonstration of substantive mastery each semester based on a rubric (attached). The papers will be assessed individually and the results collated over the following summer.

Timeline 1: Papers will be collected at the end of each spring semester. A committee of art historians will conduct the assessments during the summer.

1. Graduates will be able to think analytically.

Method 2: Each graduating student in Art in Context (ART 4933) will submit a paper in the spring semester. These papers may be the paper written for Art in Context or a paper written for a Writing Methods course (ART 3600). A committee of art historians will evaluate the demonstration of analytical thinking each semester based on a rubric (attached). The papers will be assessed individually and the results collated over the following summer.

Timeline 2: Papers will be collected at the end of each spring semester. A committee of art historians will conduct the assessments during the summer.

1. Graduates will be able to demonstrate their skills in writing at the level expected in undergraduate work.

Method 3: Each graduating student in Art in Context (ART 4933) will submit a paper in the spring semester. These papers may be the paper written for Art in Context or a paper written for a Writing Methods course (ART 3600). A committee of art historians will evaluate the demonstration of writing skills each semester based on a rubric (attached). The papers will be assessed individually and the results collated over the following summer.

Timeline 3: Papers will be collected at the end of each spring semester. A committee of art historians will conduct the assessments during the summer.

1. Graduates will be able to formulate an art historical thesis, accumulate evidence to substantiate that thesis, and synthesize that evidence into a viable conclusion.

Method 4: Each graduating student in Art in Context (ART 4933) will submit a paper in the spring semester. These papers may be the paper written for Art in Context or a paper written for a Writing Methods course (ART 3600). A committee of art historians will evaluate the demonstration of these skills each semester based on a rubric (attached). The papers will be assessed individually and the results collated over the following summer.

Timeline 4: Papers will be collected at the end of each spring semester. A committee of art historians will conduct the assessments during the summer.

1. Students will be able to present on one of their research projects in a public forum (the Art History Student Symposium) in the form of a twenty-minute talk with images.

Method 5: An outside evaluator will be brought in each spring semester to evaluate the student presentations at the Art History Student Symposium. The visitor will evaluate the presentations based on a rubric (attached) and possibly also submit written comments. The art history faculty will also evaluate the presentations based on the rubric.

Timeline 5: The Art History Symposium will take place each spring semester.

1. USING RESULTS TO IMPROVE THE PROGRAM

The results of these four learning outcomes will be analyzed by the art history faculty as a whole and resulting program improvements will be submitted to the Department Head.

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF SUBSTANTIVE MASTERY

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SKILL | 1 | 2\* | 3 | 4\*\* | 5 |
| Knowledge of main art historical trends applicable to topic of paper | Significant references missing; definitions lacking, incorrect, or inadequate. |  | Most important references correctly identified & defined. |  | All important references correctly identified & defined; relationship to topic articulated. |
| Recognize and identify theories and methodologies | Theoretical framework is ignored, incorrectly stated, and/or inappropriate to the question at hand. |  | Applicable theory or theories are correctly identified but not applied or fully articulated. |  | Identification of appropriate theory or theories is complete. Relationship of identified theories to topic is clearly exposed & developed. |
| Identify key scholars and their work | Discussion of specific work in the field missing; incomplete bibliography. |  | Some writers & work correctly identified, but with significant omissions or minor errors; bibliography sufficient for topic. |  | Work in the field fully identified, including relevant controversies. No significant omissions or errors; complete bibliography included. |

\* Exhibits most characteristics of “1” and some of “3”

\*\* Exhibits most characteristics of “3” and some of “5”

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF ANALYTICAL THINKING

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CHARACTERISTIC | 1 | 2\* | 3 | 4\*\* | 5 |
| Identification Of Problem/Question At Issue | No identification |  | Main question is identified and clearly stated |  | Main question and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of a question are identified and clearly stated |
| Consideration Of Other Salient Perspectives And Positions Important To Analysis | Does not acknowledge other possible perspectives |  | Acknowledges other possible perspectives although they are not clearly stated |  | Uses other perspectives effectively |
| Consideration Of Influence of Context of the Issue (e.g., cultural, social, economic, technological, ethical, political, or personal) | Problem is not connected to other issues or placed in context |  | Context of question is provided; not clearly analyzed |  | Issue is clearly analyzed within scope and context of question. |
| Assessment And Appropriate Use Of Supporting Evidence | No supporting data/evidence |  | Evidence is used but not carefully examined. |  | Evidence is identified and carefully examined. |
| Discussion Of Conclusions, Implication, Consequences | No conclusions |  | Conclusions without discussion of implications or consequences. Some reflection. |  | Conclusions clearly stated and discussed. Implications and consequences of conclusions are thoroughly considered. |
| Presentation Of Student Perspective/Position As Related To Issue | Student’s own position relative to question is not provided.  Fact and opinion not stated or clearly distinguished |  | Student’s position is stated; some support  Facts and opinion are stated but not clearly distinguished |  | Student’s position is stated and well-supported by appropriate sources  Fact and opinions stated and clearly distinguished |

\* Exhibits most characteristics of “1” and some of “3”

\*\* Exhibits most characteristics of “3” and some of “5”

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING EFFECTIVE WRITING

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SKILL | 1 | 2\* | 3 | 4\*\* | 5 |
| CONTENT | Topic is poorly developed; support is vague or general; ideas are trite; wording is unclear, simplistic; reflects lack of understanding of topic and audience; minimally accomplishes goal of assignment |  | Topic is evident; some supporting detail; wording is general clear; reflects understanding of topic and audience; generally accomplishes goals of assignment |  | Topic/thesis clearly stated and well-developed; detail/wording is accurate, specific, appropriate for the topic and audience; evidence of effective, clear thinking; accomplishes the goals of assignment |
| ORGANIZATION | Unstructured; most paragraphs are rambling and unfocused; no clear beginning or ending paragraphs; inappropriate of missing sequence markers |  | Structured; most paragraphs are focused; discernible beginning and ending paragraphs, some appropriate sequence markers |  | Well-structured; paragraphs are clearly focused and organized around a central theme; clear beginning and ending paragraphs; appropriate, coherent sequences and sequence markers |
| STYLE (including grammar and vocabulary) | Inappropriate or inaccurate word choice; repetitive words and sentence types; inappropriate or inconsistent point of view and tone; frequent non-standard grammar, spelling and punctuation |  | Generally appropriate word choice; variety in vocabulary and sentence types; appropriate point of view and tone; some non-standard grammar, spelling and punctuation |  | Word choice appropriate for the task; precise, appropriate vocabulary; variety of sentence types; consistent and appropriate point of view and tone; standard grammar, spelling, punctuation used |
| DOCUMENTATION AND CITATION | Documentation generally inconsistent and incomplete; non-standard citation; citation information not incorporated into document |  | Documentation generally clear, consistent and complete; general use of standard citation; citation information is somewhat incorporated into document |  | Documentation clear, consistent and complete; standard citation; cited information is incorporated effectively into document |

\* Exhibits most characteristics of “1” and some of “3”

\*\* Exhibits most characteristics of “3” and some of “5”

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF ART HISTORICAL ARGUMENT DEVELOPMENT

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SKILL | 1 | 2\* | 3 | 4\*\* | 5 |
| Introduction | Poorly constructed; no identifiable thesis statement; topic not evident. |  | Adequate introduction; several possible thesis statements; some sense of the topic. |  | Excellent introduction; clearly identifiable thesis statement; parameters of topic evident. |
| Review of Pertinent Interpretations | No understanding that history is interpretive. |  | Brief and incomplete review of pertinent interpretations. No sense of where this research fits within the existing literature. |  | Clear discussion of pertinent interpretations of where this research fits within interpretive schools. |
| Evidence | No understanding of types of source. |  | Research is based on some appropriate sources. |  | Research makes effective use of a wide variety of appropriate sources. |
| Argument | No evidence presented that supports the thesis statement. |  | Some evidence presented supports the thesis statement, but the argument is not convincing. |  | The evidence presents a decisive case in support of the thesis statement. |
| Conclusion | There is no identifiable conclusion. |  | Conclusion is simply a restatement of the thesis. |  | Conclusion places the results into a larger context. |

\* Exhibits most characteristics of “1” and some of “3”

\*\* Exhibits most characteristics of “3” and some of “5”

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF PRESENTATION

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SKILL | 1 | 2\* | 3 | 4\*\* | 5 |
| Argument | Thesis poorly articulated; thesis not innovative or was excessively imitative; argument was not logical in progression; argument poorly supported |  | Thesis relatively interesting and somewhat supported; thesis was not unimaginative, though not especially innovative; argument somewhat clear and logical; argument was moderately supported. |  | Thesis was clearly articulated and interesting; thesis and argument innovative; argument was logical in progression; argument was well supported by evidence. |
| Methodology | No theory or methodology other than iconographic or formalist analysis was evident; methodology/theory did not seem to be understood or was perfunctory. |  | Theory or methodology beyond iconographic or formalist analysis was used; student had a moderate understanding of the theory/methodology; theory or methodology moderately added to the argument. |  | Theory or methodology was used and student seem to have clear understanding of it; theory or methodology added substantively to the argument. |
| Visuals | Visuals did not contribute to argument; some absent visuals undermined the argument; visual presentation not organized effectively. |  | Visuals contributed moderately to the argument; there were few instances of absent visuals; visual presentation was organized somewhat effectively. |  | Visuals contributed to the argument; there were no absent visuals; visual presentation was organized very effectively. |
| Presentation | Speed and tone undermined presentation; student was unaware of grammatical rules or appropriate pronunciation; student did not interact with visuals effectively; student struggled in question and answer session. |  | Speed and tone did not undermine presentation; student was somewhat aware of grammatical rules and attempted appropriate pronunciation; student interacted with visuals; student reacted in a fair manner in question and answer session. |  | Speed and tone were very appropriate; student presented accurate grammar and appropriate pronunciations; student interacted well with visuals; student reacted well in question and answer session. |

\* Exhibits most characteristics of “1” and some of “3”

\*\* Exhibits most characteristics of “3” and some of “5”