

Course Outcomes Guide

Course/Program Title: *ART – 232 – The History of Western Art I I* Date: 1/12/15
Course/Program Team: Joan Bontempo,

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

1. Students study vocabulary and terms unique to 2- and 3-dimensional artforms
2. Students will study the works of notable artists, and cultural styles in specific historical eras
3. Students analyze, discuss and develop writing skills that present universal human traits independent of advances in technical and scientific knowledge as expressed in works of art.
4. Students will define and correctly use terms that reference styles, materials and processes of making art

ARTS/HUMANITIES GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES:

1. Evaluate important artistic, cultural, and philosophical mechanism of cultural transmission.
2. Understand the impact of historical movements in and on the arts and humanities.

Assessment:

1. Weekly **Short Essay Assignments** encourages exploration of a work of art, artist or artistic movement covered in this course.
2. **Three Scheduled exams** will test your knowledge of material covered during class as well as from the required readings in T/F and Multiple Choice questions, **plus visual identification of important artists and works.**
3. **One term paper** on contemporary art issue – Post Modernism and Appropriation

Validation

1. We have completed a course new rubric and written paper standards for Art 231 and Art 232.
2. Instructors assess the depth of understanding of the concepts taught in the course by using the Written Paper standards and adequately addressing the issue assigned (**Instrument attached**)

Results

SP13 –

- This course is a required course for our Degree, and is instrumental in Portfolio Review that will be required for the program. Students ability to analyze, critique, discuss and develop their own theories and conclusions are assessed in each term.
- Students writings skills and critical analysis increase to see the difference in the artists' intentions through the ages by considering not only the art of each period, but discussion social developments, historical achievements and the philosophies of each time period.

SP14 -

- SO FAR the results have been positive in the graduation students Portfolio review, as they critique their work in reference to historical styles and movements.

-

Follow-up

SP 13 –

1. Heavy recruitment to the highschoools is underway with a focus on the above articulation
2. The target is increased numbers of students electing to transfer.

SP14

- Articulation agreement is being hammered out with Hood college, Shippensburg, Shepherd University to facilitate student transfer to these programs

Budget Justification:

Art 232 Term paper – Postmodernism and Appropriation

1. Approaching the Main Question

Postmodernism/Postmodernity is associated with an awareness of societal and cultural transitions after World War II and the rise of mass-mediated consumerist popular culture in the 1960s-1970s. In culture and the arts, interpreters of this era describe the kinds of cultural hybrids that emerge from mixing (or rendering inoperative) the categories of "high" and "low" cultures, and hybrids in cultural forms that have developed in regions where local identities seek definition against, or in dialog with, Western "hegemonic" cultures (the mixing of "official" cultures and those defined as "other" in modernist ideologies).

Appropriation

To appropriate is to borrow. Appropriation is the practice of creating a new work by taking a pre-existing image from another context—art history, advertising, the media—and combining that appropriated image with new ones. Or, a well-known artwork by someone else may be represented as the appropriator's own. Such borrowings can be regarded as the two-dimensional equivalent of the found object. But instead of, say, incorporating that "found" image into a new collage, the postmodern appropriator redraws, repaints, or rephotographs it. This provocative act of taking possession flouts the modernist reverence for originality.

While modern artists often tipped their hats to their art historical forebears (Edouard Manet borrowed a well-known composition from Raphael, and Pablo Picasso paid homage to Peter Paul Rubens and Diego Velázquez), they rarely put such gleanings at the intellectual center of their work. A sea change occurred when Campbell's Soup cans and Brillo boxes began to inspire artworks; Pop art was appropriation's precursor and Andy Warhol its godfather.

Like collage, appropriation is simply a technique or a method of working. As such, it is the vehicle for a variety of viewpoints about contemporary society, both celebratory and critical. In perhaps the most extreme instances of recent appropriation, Sherrie Levine rephotographed photographs by Edward Weston and made precisely rendered facsimiles of Piet Mondrian's watercolors. Her work questions conventional notions of what constitutes a masterpiece, a master, and indeed, art history itself.



The ethics and aesthetics of knockoff art are explored by Christine Bailey in paintings such as "Reconnaissance comme les enfants," (at left) which mimics fellow Baltimore artist Cara Ober's "Blue Bird (Meshuggeneh)," below.



2. Rather like scientists, the best artists run "what if" experiments. "What if I soften the contours in my figures," asked Leonardo, "so that a jaw line and the neck below it run into each other?" The result was a realist effect no one had seen before. "What if I show a scene where everything's been broken into tiny dabs of paint?" wondered Monet, while only a few decades later Duchamp tested what would happen if he showed a urinal as art.

Baltimore artist Christine Bailey tests an almost equally strange notion. **What if** one artist were to suddenly start working in the very different style of a local colleague -- not simply copying specific works, but fully inhabiting that colleague's trademark way of painting? "Christine

Bailey: New Work," on show in a corporate lobby in Baltimore, is the experiment. Its results can be seen in the tempest that it caused on the Baltimore art scene.

"I realize that, legally, there is little that can be done to punish you for committing what the art world considers one of the most unforgivable and disgusting acts -- purposefully copying someone else's art work. But . . . I have faith that your studio and endeavors are destined to fail as you choose to lower yourself to such pathetic levels," reads one e-mail sent to dealer and curator Jordan Faye Block, who placed Bailey's project in that Baltimore lobby. An e-mailer on the other side of the issue wrote: "You have breathed life into the Baltimore art scene. I hope you will always have this willingness to take on risk and the tenacity to follow through."

Block says she's happy to be in the middle: "My idea on art is that if it doesn't get you talking, it isn't working."

Everything about the show, right down to its title, manages to stir things up. Sure, the exhibition showcases new work by Bailey, the 33-year-old artist who teaches part-time at the Corcoran's art school. But the single most important thing about this new work by Bailey is that it looks as though it might be new work by Cara Ober, the very different and rather successful female painter who also lives in Baltimore, and often blogs about the city's scene.

Bailey's paintings capture all of Ober's telltale tricks and tics. Nostalgic imagery is pulled from older sources. Bird books, old encyclopedias, decorative wallpapers? Check. Tender, pastel colors -- soft washes of pale yellows, blues and pinks -- with brooding splashes of black on top? Check. Scraps of dictionary definitions, presented in old-timey fonts? Check. An overriding sense of capital-P Poetry, without ever making clear quite what that poetry's about? Check.

Mate?

"When I saw the invite for the show of your 'new work,' I felt like a mother whose children had been raped and murdered," wrote Ober in an e-mail to Bailey, when she first got wind of the project. "I see my paintings as precious babies and I love them more than you can imagine." She threatened to sue.

Since then, after a classic "full and frank exchange of views" between the two women, Ober has grown calmer. But she said in a phone interview this week she still resents the sense she gets -- probably correctly -- that her work was singled out for copying as an example of what's most sellable in art. But now she recognizes that Bailey and Block's goal wasn't simply to turn a profit from another artist's labors.

(Is there copyrighting an artistic look? Can an artist paint in Van Gogh's style without repercussions? What about artistic influence?) What about when it's one that's been out there for a decade or two already, and is shared by painters working all around the globe.

The fact of such artistic trends -- of a trademark style and its subsequent knockoffs -- is partly what Bailey's show is about. Bailey certainly wasn't interested in "stealing" Ober's style, the way a forger might. "I wasn't trying to pull the wool over anyone's eyes," she said in an interview this

week, pointing out that she signed all the works with her own name and gave herself top billing in the exhibition title.

The artist says “she was interested in the tension between fiction, which is central to most art, and deceit, which is seen as crass and unartful.”

Imitation may often be the sincerest form of flattery, but in this case it's hard to imagine that a cerebral artist such as Bailey would like Ober's work enough to want to truly claim it as her own.

Bailey's previous projects have included grabbing photographic faces off the Web, then paying craftsmen in China to do them up as oil portraits.

"I'm really interested in the idea of anonymity, and not having a brand -- moving from style to style. . . . I really enjoyed making these paintings, because I didn't have to bring anything personal to it."

Bailey says she could as easily have chosen some other local artist to imitate -- the fact that she *didn't* have much of a connection to Ober, personal or professional or aesthetic, was one reason that she chose her. Another was that *Ober herself* is happy to incorporate borrowed imagery into *her* art. So why shouldn't Bailey follow such an artistic principle to its furthest point -- to the edge-to-edge appropriation of a single artist's work?

If nothing else, Bailey has uncovered an artistic chasm: What for some viewers is an interesting experiment out near the cutting edge can come across, to others, as "one of the most unforgivable and disgusting acts." Two works of art, a Bailey and an Ober, can look nearly the same yet count as absolutely different gestures for all the different kinds of people seeing them

3. Armed with this situation and with thoughts of the development of artistic inspiration, individualism, personal style and mission that we have studied all semester the questions I would like you to address is:

Has Christine Bailey committed a stroke of genius in advancing the principles of the Post-Modernist artist, or has she committed, by using the description above, a “most unforgivable and disgusting act” – that of criminally diminishing the artistic work of another through blatant disregard for respect, originality and integrity?

To help you sort out your thoughts. Start by answering “what are the prominent characteristics of the art we are calling “Post Modern”? What are the expected rules or regulations that are ascribed to the art of our time? How has Christine Baily broken those “rules” , if there are any, or has she not, and what can Cara Ober claim – does she have any rights to creativity when she herself may be influenced by other art?

And is there a line between appropriation , stealing, influence and originality?

Thank you and I look forward to reading your conclusions. Please reference other incidents of works that are derived from other works (some artists were mentioned in the articles above, but there are many more examples) to support your stance.

Paper Standards – Visual Arts/Art History

A Papers demonstrate an excellent understanding of the theme and critical issues in the assignment or readings. The paper also provides strong evidence of critical thinking and original, creative insights. “A” papers also indicate familiarity and understanding of art terms in an analysis of the topic. The paper has a well developed introduction and organized ending with an appropriate conclusion. The paper presents evidence to support pertinent points with material quoted from research sources in a correctly attributed and punctuated method. The paper has few if any grammatical, punctuation or mechanical errors and appropriately addresses the assignment.

B Papers demonstrate good understanding of the subject and critical issues in the assignment of readings. There is some critical art analysis expressed in the paper, and it shows a good familiarity and understanding of art terms in an analysis of the topic. The paper is well organized and uses support from research sources in a correctly attributed and punctuated method. There are few errors in grammar, punctuation and mechanics, but they do not impede the meaning or understanding of the written project.

C Papers show a competent understanding of the assignment and critical issues in the assignment or readings. There is little critical thinking or originality, and the insights are standard. The paper shows some understanding and proper use of artistic terms. The organization is acceptable, but there may be lapses in content development. Artistic analysis is present, but may be lacking in appropriate attribution of supporting research sources (if applicable). There may be problems with grammar, punctuation, and mechanics, but overall the paper is readable.

D Papers demonstrate a below average understanding of the assignment or readings. There is no critical thinking or originality, and few if any insights into the artistic issue or theme assigned. The paper is disorganized and shows poor paragraph development, introduction, transitions and conclusion. There is little or no supporting research evidence (if applicable), but it is poorly presented. Grammatical, punctuation and mechanical errors seriously impede understanding and meaning.

F Papers show no understanding of the assignment. There is little or no discernable organization. The paper provides no critical thinking and may be simply a summary of the assignment. Errors are pervasive and intrusive. Outside sources for opinion or facts are not properly credited or punctuated. Any plagiarized papers or portions of the papers are automatically Fs or Os according to the instructor’s prerogative.