

# SRJC 5-Row Learning Assessment Project Form

*Use this form for both proposals AND final reports.*

Department: Art Program or Course: Art 2.1 Art History

Team Members: Alison Hinnenberg, Heidi Saleh Team Contact Email ahinneberg@santarosa.edu

**Project purpose, goal or research question:** To determine what could be done to improve the students' retention of material for Art History course so that the SLOs could be achieved.

|          |  |                                       |  |
|----------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Student Learning Outcome Statements</b>   | <b>Date</b><br><br><b>Fall 2006</b>   | <p>The student learning outcomes as stated in all the Art History course outlines are as follows:</p> <p>Upon completion of this course students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Place a work of art in its historical, cultural and stylistic context.</li> <li>2. Perform visual and critical analysis of a work of art using specialized vocabulary.</li> </ol> <p>The course chosen for the assessment project was Art 2.1 Prehistoric to Gothic Art History. As the majority of faculty teaching this course give objective exams as part of the requirements, a quantitative assessment project was developed which could be scored numerically. The intention was to determine what could be done to improve the students' retention of material so that the SLOs could be achieved.</p>   |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Assessment Method &amp; Criteria for Success (Attach copies of instruments, rubric, etc. if available.)</b> | <b>Date</b><br><br><b>Spring 2007</b> | <p>A random sample of 20 students was selected and each was given two writing assignments which were then compared. The project was given over two semesters.</p> <p>Semester 1:</p> <p>On the first day of class, all the students were shown an image of an Egyptian work of art and with no instructions were told to write about it for 10 minutes. Egyptian art was chosen because we felt that it was more likely that students may have seen some Egyptian art than the art of many other ancient civilizations. The students had had no lectures and were given no directions, other than to write whatever they could about the image. This was to establish a basis for later comparison. The students wrote their names on the paper so that it could be compared to a second analysis. The sample was random given that the instructor didn't know any of the students on the first day of class.</p> <p>Later in the semester, after covering Egyptian art in 4 lectures, the students were shown the same image and told to write about it again based on the kind of analysis done in class. The image itself had not been discussed in</p> |

|                 |                                      |  |   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|                 |                                      | <p><b>Fall<br/>2007</b></p>            | <p>class, so it still wasn't identified by the instructor. Again, no specific directions were given on what to address, so the student had to decide what to cover.</p> <p>These two writing samples were then compared to determine what the students had absorbed in terms of important facts and methods of analysis using specialized vocabulary.</p> <p>Semester 2:</p> <p>On the first day of class a new group of students was shown the same Egyptian work of art and told to write about it for 10 minutes, without any further directions. This was exactly the same procedure as in the first semester. Once again a sampling of 20 student papers was selected, to be compared with a second writing. This time, instead of having the students write their second analysis immediately after the lectures on Egyptian art, they had to wait until the end of the semester, some 12-13 weeks later. This time they were given a rubric with specific directions on what to address in their discussion. A sample of the question sheet is included in this report.</p> <p>The intention was to determine whether the students had benefitted from being given a rubric, and whether this had enabled them to remember the material more thoroughly and in turn improve their written analyses.</p>  |
| <p><b>3</b></p> | <p><b>Assessment<br/>Results</b></p> | <p><b>Date<br/>Spring<br/>2008</b></p> | <p>Semester 1:</p> <p>The chart titled Semester 1, included with this report, shows the scores of both writing samples. A total of 10 possible points were allocated to the analysis. The Descriptive Analysis breakdown is included in this report. At the first attempt, the students were not expected to score high as they had just begun the course. The average score was 3.5 points. After the second attempt the average was 5.35 points. Each student's two writing samples were compared to determine how many points difference there was. Most students demonstrated an increase in points after the lectures had been given. The average increase was 2.12 points. Minimum competency was established at 6 points, which would give a satisfactory grade. At the first attempt only 5% of the sample achieved this. At the second attempt, 45% of the sample achieved minimum competency.</p> <p>Semester 2:</p> <p>The chart for Semester 2 is included in this report. As with the first semester, students were not expected to score high on the first attempt. The average number of points was 2.75. However, at the second attempt with the rubric, the average score was significantly higher than that of the first semester, with an average of 7.67 points. The average increase was 5.00 points, more than double the average of the first semester. The minimum competency level of 6 points was achieved by 10% of the sample at the first attempt, but with the rubric, even though the students had had to retain the material far longer than in the first semester, 95% of the students achieved at least minimum competency.</p> |

|   |  |                                 |   |
|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| 4 | <b>Changes/<br/>Improvements<br/>Implemented</b> | <b>Date<br/>Fall<br/>2008</b>   | The quantitative results suggest that the use of a rubric for aesthetic analysis is of great benefit to the students. Not only are they able to write in a more focused and detailed manner, they appear to retain the material for longer periods of time. The prompting of a rubric allows the student to focus more clearly and demonstrate the student learning outcomes stated at the beginning of this report. The use of a rubric prompts memory, which may have been inhibited during the first semester assessment, when no directions were given. |
| 5 | <b>Results of Follow-<br/>Up Assessment</b>      | <b>Date<br/>Spring<br/>2009</b> | The members of this team now routinely give rubrics to the students and other members of the faculty have been encouraged to do the same. Although the specifics of the rubric will differ for each instructor, depending on teaching style, the goal remains the same: to increase student success in achieving learning outcomes.   |

### **Descriptive Analysis of Image used for SLO Assessment Project**

Who?: King Tutankhamen =1pt  
 What?: Painted chest = ½ pt  
 Where?: Egypt = ½ pt  
 When?: New Kingdom period = ½ pt  
 Why?: Tomb object, for storage = ½ pt

Details: significant profile =1pt  
 hierarchic order =1pt  
 heraldic motif =1pt  
 chariot and horse: New Kingdom =1pt  
 ankh: blessing from gods =1pt  
 cartouche: containing name =1pt  
 hieroglyphs: Egyptian picture writing =1pt

Total points = 10