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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Curriculum Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</em></td>
<td><em>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</em></td>
<td><em>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</em></td>
<td><em>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and “close the loop” to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the significance of the cultural, social, and historical contexts of art through written exams or assignments.

All ARTH Courses at all levels.

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the various contexts through embedded questions in exams or written assignments, which will be collected and evaluated. These questions/assignments will be evaluated by the program faculty using a rubric that defines the criteria for achieving this outcome. This will be a direct assessment instrument.

The percentage of students successfully achieving this outcome will be tabulated and compared with the target goal percentage established by the program faculty. The faculty will then use this information to gauge the overall efficacy of the course content, program level decisions, and pedagogical methods used to teach the significance of these contexts—also. The data will be shared following collection with all members of the program faculty by the Chair of the Assessment Committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students at the 1000-2000 level will be able to demonstrate the ability to conduct research and critically analyze source materials at a basic level. Students at the 3000-4000 level will be able to demonstrate the ability to conduct research and critically analyze source materials at an advanced level.</th>
<th>The ability to conduct research and critically analyze source materials at a basic level can be assessed in all ARTH courses at the 1000-2000 level. The ability to conduct research and critically analyze source materials at an advanced level can be assessed in all ARTH courses at the 3000-4000 level.</th>
<th>Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct research at the appropriate levels through written assignments, which will be collected and evaluated by the program faculty using a rubric that defines the criteria for achieving this outcome. The faculty will also maintain a portfolio of writing for each major, which will consist of writing samples representing each level of study (1000-4000). This will be a direct assessment instrument.</th>
<th>The percentage of students successfully achieving this outcome will be tabulated and compared with the target goal percentage established by the program faculty. The faculty will then use this information to gauge the overall efficacy of the course content, program level decisions, and pedagogical methods used to teach how to do research and analyze artwork critically. The data will be shared following collection with all members of the program faculty by the Chair of the Assessment Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students at the 1000-2000 level will be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge of 1 or 2 methodologies through oral or written assignments. Students at the 3000-4000 level will be able to demonstrate an advanced knowledge of 3 or 4 methodologies through oral or written assignments.</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate a basic knowledge of 1 or 2 methodologies can be assessed in all ARTH courses at the 1000-2000 level. The ability to demonstrate an advanced knowledge of 3 or 4 methodologies can be assessed in all ARTH courses at the 3000-4000 level.</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of methodologies at the appropriate levels through written or oral assignments, which will be collected or observed and evaluated by the program faculty using a rubric that defines the criteria for achieving this outcome. This will be a direct assessment instrument.</td>
<td>The percentage of students successfully achieving this outcome will be tabulated and compared with the target goal percentage established by the program faculty. The faculty will then use this information to gauge the overall efficacy of the course content, program level decisions, and pedagogical methods used to teach the methodologies. The data will be shared following collection with all members of the program faculty by the Chair of the Assessment Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students will utilize, under faculty direction, resources beyond the classroom.

All ARTH Courses at all levels.

Students will be required by program faculty to utilize resources beyond the classroom as part of their curriculum. Syllabi will be collected to ensure that this requirement is consistently implemented. Students will demonstrate use of external resources through attendance at museums, lectures, libraries, archives, and other resources, evidence of which will be collected and evaluated to ensure that this outcome is achieved. This will be an indirect assessment instrument.

Syllabi and evidence of student use of external resources will be evaluated by the program faculty. Instances in which student use of external resources is not required will require further justification by the instructor. The data will be shared following collection with all members of the program faculty by the Chair of the Assessment Committee.

Students will have opportunities to participate in and be exposed to career and educational opportunities through visiting scholars, curators, workshops, internships, and customized mentoring.

Through student participation in internships, attendance at appropriate lectures and graduate school and professional preparatory workshops, field trips, and meetings with faculty.

The program faculty will document the numbers of opportunities available in a given semester and the total student participation in these opportunities. This will be an indirect assessment instrument.

The data will be evaluated in accordance with standards set by the program faculty to gauge the success of this outcome. The data will be shared following collection with all members of the program faculty by the Chair of the Assessment Committee.

1. **It is not recommended** to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.

Two outcomes will be assessed per semester, one direct (1-3) and one indirect (4 & 5). The assessment duties will be rotated through the faculty so that the responsibility is shared evenly. Data collected will be forwarded to the program’s representative on the assessment committee, who will share it with the department assessment chair.

2. **Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?**
As the Madrid campus now offers a major in art history, it is vital that their courses are part of the assessment rotation in some manner. We have been working with the Madrid campus to offer sufficient incentive for them to participate. Currently, only the performance of Madrid students enrolled in the Research Methods course (ART 4950) is being assessed.

3. **The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:**

   a. **Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)**
      
      Initially, while rubrics are being developed, review and revisions will be ongoing. Afterward, every 2 to 3 years.

   b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.
      
      Students were not included in the process. Plans are being made to include students in rubric building.

   c. **What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?**
      
      Accreditation standards in the NASAD document were consulted.

   d. **Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel**
      
      In Madrid, the burden of course assessment would falls on faculty with short-term contracts whose contracts do not enforce the collection of assessment data.