Media in Practice: The Art Museum as Humanities Classroom

By Prof. Thora Brylowe

Humanities classes are often taught in a lecture/discussion format. This redesign replaces that format with project-based components that engage active student participation by asking them to collaboratively produce a public exhibit. In this portfolio, I show how humanities undergraduates of all levels worked together to design a media-focused exhibit for an audience outside the classroom and university. Students in Introduction to Media Theory in the Humanities created an exhibit they titled Narrative Im[press]ions: 200 Years of Printed Illustrations for the Colorado University Art Museum, a free-admission public museum located on the campus of the University of Colorado at Boulder. Co-teaching with the library and museum staff modeled the technological, research and collaborative interactions expected of students. I designed assessment tools that took me almost entirely out of the role of student evaluator. In addition to peer and self-evolutions, students designed their own assessment for the finished exhibit, which assessed by a jury consisting of the CU community outside the classroom.

Background

This portfolio consists of four sections. The Background contains a description of the course as it was traditionally conceived as well as my plan for the project-based redesign. It contains a statement of my goals for the course and the particular project (an exhibit at a public museum) that this portfolio addresses. It is important to note that this portfolio is not so much about a course as it is a particular project that is transportable to other humanities courses. To that end, I aim in my future research to answer a series of questions, the answers to which could offer a research-based rationale for a pedagogy of practice-based humanities classes.

Implementation

Implementation provides a detailed account of the project and rationale. It also offers a rationale for instructors of record staying out of course assessment. For this course, I implemented alternative assessment strategies, including self-assessments, peer assessments, group-dynamic assessments, and student-authored assessments administered by a jury of university officials. I also include a list of my forms of data collection and a brief statement about student objections to this method.

Student Work

Student Work contains some photos of the finished exhibit as well as a sample of the exhibit labels in an early and a late form. These labels went through many drafts. All of the work for this project was co-authored and edited by multiple students. The labels, because of the institutional requirements of CUAM, were also edited by the instructors and museum staff members. This

section also details a longer piece of supplementary writing that students co-authored with little intervention. Currently those pieces are with the exhibit. Once they are available, I will work more extensively with them.

Reflections

Finally, I have written a short essay on my overall impressions of this project and its value (both to the students and to me) in the Reflections section.

Background

It is difficult to pick a target course because I don't generally teach a course over again. In this portfolio, I will describe a general education course that includes my first iteration of this project-based learning project. However, the project is transportable to all levels of course and student. This year I will be teaching a first-year seminar using an expanded model of this project. I hope to adapt it for graduate students in the near future. For now, however, I describe the ENGL 2036 Introduction to Media Theory in the Humanities I taught Fall 2016 (syllabus at end of document). The class is capped at 35, and generally one section runs each academic year. Historically, it has been taught in a lecture-discussion format. As an elective, it has no formalized place in the English major; however, there is an advanced version of the same course. Students could take these two courses in an arc if they were so inclined. The department is working on dismantling prerequisites and other requirements because of declining enrollments, and students need not take 2036 to take the advanced course. 2036 generally enrolls well, largely because students assume they will be studying materials very familiar to them. It is sometimes cross-listed with ATLAS. Students may come from all majors and all years. In this particular case, the class makeup was as follows:

- 3 First-Year Students
- 10 Sophomores
- 4 Juniors
- 6 Seniors

Of those 24 students, 22 finished the course. 18 were English majors. Others came from Communication, Advertising and Asian Studies.

Our department asks us to write semester-specific course descriptions. View the bare-bones [course catalogue description](#).

This is my much more [specific description](#).

One problem I faced in implementation was the fact that students tend not to seek out the department course descriptions. As a result my class, which was full at 35 on the first day, only retained a self-selecting group of 24. One student came to my office hours and apologized for

dropping the class. She explained that as a first-year student, she did not feel equipped to face such a "nontraditional" course.

Despite some hurdles, the course was profiled both in our [School of Arts & Science Gazette](#) on the University homepage.

Course Goals

I am an 18th-centuryist and a print historian. The goal of my course was to ask students to think beyond contemporary forms of mediation and recognize the labor and materials required to circulate ideas before the advent of digital technology and other forms of mediation they are most familiar with. I hope this defamiliarizing will help student to consider their own media milieu with fresh analytical eyes. Mass media is only "transparent" or "dematerialized" because of the labor that makes it appear that way. As with all media theory courses, I wanted to complicate the sender-receiver-message communications circuit by introducing the idea that mediation is both material and is critical to all communication. However, I also wanted students to have a first-hand understanding of mediation rather a textbook understanding. I wanted to facilitate discovery and to model academic archival research for students who had never before encountered primary materials from my period. Finally, I wanted them to be able to point to an artifact they made as documented evidence of their learning.

Teaching Questions

As this project unfolds, here are some of the questions I hope to answer with evidence past the baseline attempt at implementing this project:

- Does modeling collaboration produce better collaborations in student learners?
- How does a public audience outside the classroom affect student writing?
- What shifts in the student-teaching relationship occur when the instructor of record is not responsible for the student's grade?
- What is the best way for students to design their own assessment tools?
- What are best practices for peer evaluation?
- What is the effect of using self- and peer evaluation as part of the grading process?
- Do students gain anything by tracking the exact amount of outside time they put into a course? What is the effect of making "time served" part of the official grading process?
- How do students react to project-based learning in official and unofficial course evaluations?
- Can this project operate as a model for classroom/institutional collaborations in other humanities disciplines?

Implementation

There are two basic parts to this project, one is the project design and the other is shift away from instructor-based assessment. First, I should say that there was a tremendous amount of planning and grant-writing that went into this pilot. I also had the full cooperation of the museum's head curator, Hope Saska, who helped me develop the assignments. I knew I could not run this class the first time as an assistant professor with a full research, teaching and service load without help. I wrote grants for a TA and for equipment and access to facilities. I received generous support from ASSETT, FTEP and Continuing Education.

For ENGL 2036, I implemented a fully project-based course. By researching and writing in teams, students gained sustained access to discussion partners, editors, and research assistants. The expectation that the team operated both inside and outside classroom reinforced the serious nature of an endeavor that is designed for a public audience of museum-goers. In this particular project—one of three—students were asked to work together to produce an exhibit based on an unresearched collection of loose prints dating from around 1600 to around 1850. Some had been cut from books; others had been made for a framing market. Many of the prints had been pasted into a scrapbook and then removed.

The students chose prints from a selection of about 40 items culled by the curator and me. They researched provenance and technique. In order to produce an exhibit, they had to develop a cohesive narrative around the selections they made. Next they had to title their exhibit and write exhibit labels for each of the items they chose. They also had to write a longer text describing their chosen print or prints in more detail. Two students opted to borrow related books from Special Collections in the library. We met with the framer, who explained to them the framing process ad demonstrated some of his techniques. The exhibit wall ultimately housed about 15 items, plus a glass bookstand holding two others. Each item had an exhibit label consisting of the author, date and a brief explanatory text of 100 or so words. On the wall, there was a plastic pocket that contained laminated one-page single-spaced documents offering more information on each piece.

I simulated a workplace environment by assigning teams and offering hard deadlines. Students were accountable to outside members of the campus community (museum curators and staff and Special Collections librarians). Our routines were carefully scheduled but largely unstructured. In class, my TA, Deven Parker, and I did a lot of one-on-one consulting with groups or individuals. A typical week involved some classroom Q&A, possibly a planning session for smaller groups to work on proposals to the whole class, and a trip to the study room at the museum. Students were expected to continue their work outside of class.

I planned a catered opening and invited all members of my department, the students' friends and family, and the three jurors responsible for evaluating the exhibit. Before the opening, I made a slideshow of photos that narrated the students' work over the course of the semester, which played on repeat on a monitor outside the gallery. At the opening, I stayed out of the gallery while the students acted as guides and explained their work.

As for the assessment, I worked with instructional designer Jacie Moryama in ASSETT to develop four confidential Google forms. I asked students to track their time and narrate their

activities. Students completed self- and peer evaluations as well as evaluations of group dynamics and functionality, also in confidential Google forms.

Each project completed in 2036 was evaluated in its final form by an outside panel of judges who had nothing to do with the process and saw the product for the first time at the exhibit. The jury for the art exhibit consisted of two members of upper administration and a program director. They evaluated the exhibit by filling out a criterion sheet devised and written by the students. Ultimately they settled on a criteria sheet consisting of 5 categories rated 1-10.

In other words, evaluation was out of my hands. The students were in a position to determine what was outstanding about their exhibit and they had to strategically devise evaluation criteria that would best highlight the exhibit strengths and minimize its weaknesses. (This was a rewarding discussion to facilitate.) In terms of assessment, however, it meant my role was facilitator and helper rather than grader. In shifting to this role, I hoped to make students engage in risk-taking and inquiry they might not otherwise engage in, and I hoped they would not be afraid to ask what they didn't understand. I also hoped they would view me as a collaborator and expert, one member of a team that also consisted of 22 undergraduate research writers, a curator, an exhibit planner, an exhibition manager, a framer, a professional copy editor, a graduate TA.

Of course collaborations are often uneven. To register these differences, I included self- and peer evaluations as part of the grade. I did not include the group evaluations in the grading, but I read them carefully and checked in with groups that appeared to be particularly dysfunctional (there were two and the troubled student withdrew from the course in both cases).

Student Performance Data

As this is the first time I implemented this project, I have several ways of measuring baseline student performance, but I do not as yet have data to compare. The baseline data consists of the following:

- Student Work Logs
- Student Self-Evaluations
- Student Peer Evaluations
- Student Team Evaluations
- Student-Authored Rubrics Filled in by Jurors
- Course Evaluation Forms (FCQs)
- Voluntary Student Questionnaires, authored by Deven Parker

While I have not had time to do much with the data I collected, I can say that written student feedback was mostly positive or constructive, both on the FCQ and on my in-class or online Student Questionnaire (which was optional and which I told students I might quote in this document). The student numerical ratings in most FCQ categories, however, were somewhat below the department average. Constructive negative feedback consistently registered a feeling of confusion or not knowing where the course was going. Some students felt the course was too chaotic or unorganized, as both FCQ comments and my own Student Questionnaires indicate.

"The choice of the projects had confusing overlap. I felt that I was spending most of my time working out the logistics of remembering what 'object descriptions' and 'artifacts' referred to, and trying to work with three different teams provided challenges I felt that were unnecessary. Using classes to teach logistics and strategic communication is great and I totally support group project work, but the unnecessary intermingling of projects we did seemed too much."

The same (really excellent) student noted:

"My favorite class this semester was with Thora lectured about Blake. Hearing an expert explain what his words meant and their genius was inspiring. It is one of the things I will be taking away from this class."

What research I have done suggests that these reactions are common. This course was far more carefully organized than my typical lecture/discussion course, but groups were often left to their own devices while I floated around the room as people had questions. I tried not to prioritize tasks or make any decisions that would affect the project's outcome. Problem-solving in a group is chaotic and asymmetrical. I am not yet sure how to make it clear that my letting go of control over content is not the same as being unorganized. Ironically, it takes a ton of organization. And a lot of control.

Official Grading Criteria

The juried exhibit was 20% of the overall grade for ENGL 2036. The entire grade breakdown for the semester-long course was as follows:

- Total of 4 self-assessments: 10%
- Total of 3 peer assessments: 10%
- The work log: 10%
- A portfolio of classwork: 10%
- Juried grade for museum project: 20%
- Juried grade for online museum: 20%
- Juried grade for print project: 20%

Note that I was responsible for scoring a portfolio of 5 low-stakes writing exercises and an annotated bibliography. This portfolio was worth 10% of the final grade.

Student Work

Each student filled out a consent form that granted me permission to use their work and an agreement not to plagiarize and to abide by the grades given to them by their peers and jurors. No part of the art exhibit was the product of a single author, and for this reason, it is difficult to say much about grade distribution with regard to the research and writing.

The 100-word exhibit labels required multiple drafts and were vetted extensively by the museum staff and returned to their authors, some as many as six or seven times. In the feedback returned to all students, some of the editorial comments on early drafts were quite directive. The final labels were far more professional. When the exhibit is taken down, the finished labels will go into the CUAM artifact catalogue, leaving a permanent stamp (if small) on the knowledge collected by this institution.

The research writing of on the one-page supplements, which the CUAM will also retain as part of its holdings, was peer edited both in and out of class time. Deven Parker also made substantive suggestions. They did not, however, go through the rigorous copy-editing process required for exhibit labels. The writing is not smooth, but for an introductory-level course that included three different projects, it is reasonable. Once the exhibit is down, I will devise a rubric and score these short essays. This is one area where I think instructional intervention (mine or otherwise) can be scaled depending on the level of the class. Because we didn't count on how long the labels would take (writing succinct, consistent explanatory labels proved surprisingly difficult) the longer, less visible writing suffered from a lack of attention from the whole team.

The juried evaluation was very positive, and the students earned an A for the 20% of the final grade that comprised the exhibit.

Reflections

In general, we walk into a classroom knowing the material. I could teach *Rape of the Lock*, for example, not quite in my sleep—but I could probably teach it standing on my head. I know that poem so well that it's part of me. But this project is about letting go of that urge to cling to content. In this case, I knew as little as they did about the material in front of us as the first-year students did. Because I was willing to say "I don't know," we were able to share in the process of research and discovery. In fact, the students mastered the content better than I did. This collaboration was about teaching how to make something exhibit-worthy from a pile of loose prints, some of whose titles and authors we did not know. I know how to do research and how to write. The museum staff knows how to make exhibits. Our curator, an expert on prints, knew what was unique or noteworthy about the objects themselves. The students chose based on their own criteria. They sought connections between their choices. They researched. They made the decisions. I recorded, advised, sometimes outright discounted—but I didn't decide anything. The students debated and voted. I sat on my hands.

It's not as easy as it sounds.

At times, students resisted this teaching method. There were some tense moments, moments of near rebellion. They didn't like having to flail in all that information, figuring out what questions to ask, or how to look for answers. At times they said this should be an advanced class. But it shouldn't. Nothing we did was beyond their capacity. They had a huge institutional safety net in

the form of a museum, which will not put up a sub-par exhibit. And so they struggled, and what I am most proud of is the fact that I let them.

There were some wonderful moments, too. The excitement of discovery is nice to watch. And it's nice to facilitate—not just for me: Deven and Hope witnessed many of these eureka moments. One group was excited to find that their large engravings of womens' heads originally belonged tiny figures in the background of a crowded Michelangelo painting. The opening was another fantastic thing to behold. By that point I had come to know these students as whole people, and I badly wanted the jurors to reward their hard (sometimes frustrating) work. Probably best was the moment when the class first saw their prints framed and mounted on the "Highlights of the Collection" wall in the front room of the CUAM, labels in place. It looked, as one student put it, "so completely legit."

Learning isn't always fun. I can certainly attest from my own work that research writing is not an easy thing. Sometimes it's an awful lot more interesting in your head than it is on the page. Sometimes the whole process is frankly kind of boring. I have thought a lot about these days of "You'll never get a job." I want students to walk away from their humanities degree with concrete evidence of their intelligence, their capacity for analysis, their ability to work in teams. I hope that this model of teaching, wherein I offer up a problem (in this case, an unresearched collection) and ask students to solve it (by making meaning of it) gives them a way to talk about what they are capable of, and perhaps even to show what they have done. We can't make jobs, but can be attentive to students who need ways to articulate their skills to future employers.

I am not sure my overarching goals about materializing media were met, exactly. I hope, as was my own experience in undergraduate courses, the ideas will continue to unfold over time. I have faith that they will.

Next semester I will do another expanded project at the CUAM, this time with a class of 19 first-year students. We will be exploring the impulse to collect and the difficulties museums face when confronted with controversial art and artifacts. Once again, I don't have answers. I am learning to be comfortable saying "I don't know." In the process, I hope to have more data points and better arguments for how exactly this methodological shift away from content and into practice can help make our disciplines visible to a world that seems increasingly interested in leaving them behind.

ENGL 2036: Introduction to Media Theory in the Humanities
Time: Tuesday & Thursday, 11am-12:15pm
Location: Hellems 137

Office Hours:
Thora Brylowe: Tuesdays & Thursdays 2-3:30pm in Hellems 142
Deven Parker Tuesdays, 2-4pm in Innisfree Coffee on the Hill (1401 Pennsylvania Avenue)
Hope Saska (Museum Curator): September 5-16, (*we will work out 10 ½ hour blocks, accommodating 2 groups of 2 at a time*)
Susan Guinn-Chipman (Special Collections Librarian): Fridays in October, 10am-12pm and 1-3pm

Course Description:
This class explores the history of media and mediation from the early modern period to the present with an emphasis on hands-on project-based learning. We will investigate the historical development of knowledge technologies—with a particular focus on print and digital modes—to explore their practical use, inquire into the lives of those who used them, and use digital media to organize and explain our findings. Unlike most other pedagogical approaches to the history of media, in this class we will boldly depart from the lecture/discussion format and put into practice the tools and techniques we study. Much like the "flipped classrooms" of engineering departments or the hands-on learning of studio art departments, this class will require you to try your hand at 18th and 19th century print-based mediation, and then use digital tools to design media-focused exhibits for an audience outside the classroom and university.

To this end, the course is divided into three project-based components: first, you will learn the skills involved in the creation and dissemination of early modern print-based media by working with a community-based print lab. There, you will set and print moveable type and then bind the book you have made. Second, you will create an exhibit at the CU Art Museum that highlights pre-digital forms of mediation, including typographic print, engravings, wood-cut and lithographic technologies. Third, you will collaborate with students at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver to produce an international online exhibit that highlights early forms of communication media.

Required Texts:

At CU Bookstore (listed under course number and instructor name)
William Blake, *Songs of Innocence and of Experience, 1789-1794*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977, ISBN-13: 978-0192810892
Solveig Robinson, *The Book in Society: An Introduction to Print Culture*, Broadview Press, 2013, ISBN-13: 978-1554810741

Available on D2L
Walter Benjamin, "Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," 1936
Pamela Smith, "In the Workshop of History," 2012

Available online for free
Joseph Viscomi, "Blake's Illuminated Word," 1993, http://siteslab.unc.edu/viscomi/Illuminated_Word/
R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman,* 1747, (search title in Chinook library catalogue – eBook available for free)
Holland Cotter "Why University Museums Matter" NYT 19 February 2009,
http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/20/arts/design/20yale.html?_r=0

Grade Breakdown

Your total self-assessment:	10%
Others' total peer assessment:	10%
Your work log:	10%
Your portfolio of classwork:	10%
Juried grade for museum project:	20%
Juried grade for online museum:	20%
Juried grade for print project:	20%

PLEASE NOTE: You CANNOT pass the class without attending the required 9-5 printing session OFF CAMPUS at the Boulder Book Arts League and the binding session at Norlin Library.

Project jurors:

Dean Valerio Ferme, CU Arts & Sciences
Dean Steve Leigh, CU Arts & Sciences
Jeff Cox, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs
Sandra Furman, Director of the CU Art Museum
Geoffrey Rubinstein, Director of Online Learning
Mark Werner, Director of ASSETT
Lori Emerson, Director of the Media Archeology Lab
Mary Ann Shea, Director of FTEP

Schedule:

Week 1

Tasks by the weekend:

Meet your CU team; complete some team-building work.

- Interview team members for presentation to be held on 8/30. **Write** 300-word introductions for each person on your team. Put them in your portfolio.
- **Create** a team timeline. The directions for this assignment will be given in class. You can use any format you'd like. Put a PDF of the finished product in your portfolio. Each student should upload an individual copy, but you should do share the work of creating it.

Log your hours.

Read two articles, one by Benjamin and one by Cotter (both available under "Documents" in D2L).

Visit any museum and **write** 750 words about one or two exhibits you see there. Upload your description/analysis in your portfolio. Include photos if you'd like.

8/23 – Class
Go over syllabus.
What are object descriptions?
Policies about phones: what do you want to do?
What is media? What is plagiarism? What is a team timeline?
Student consent form (authored by Dan Bernestein)
Handout of 18th century text for candle light reading.

8/25 - Class
Sign the phone policy.
Sign plagiarism policy.
What are exhibits for?
1-hour trip to the CU art museum to familiarize yourself with the collections, see the First Folio and meet Hope Saska, the curator with whom we'll be working.

Week 2

Tasks by the weekend:

Log your hours.

Write a 500-word object description based on something you saw last week at the museum of your choice or something you visit this week. Put this in your portfolio.

Read the Pamela Smith essay available in the Documents sections of D2L

Read by candlelight the handout distributed in class. **Write** 750 words about your experience and put this refection piece into your portfolio.

8/30 Team presentations.
Group work practicing descriptions of objects, discuss Benjamin.
Hand out candlelight reading assignment.
Attend Thora Brylowe's Shakespeare talk 12-1pm in the CU Art Museum (Earn 1 point on final grade for attending!)

9/1 Visit Special Collections to see the collection and meet Susan Guinn-Chipman **(1/2 the class)**
Greg Robl, introducing himself and bindings and book making **(1/2 the class)**
We will switch off halfway through.
_____

Week 3

Tasks by the weekend:

Log your hours.

Complete **self-assessment**.

Read William Blake's book of poetry compiled in 1794, which is entitled *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*. You can get it from the campus bookstore or Amazon.

Begin your research.

Sign up for your REQUIRED printing date at the Boulder Book Arts League

Visit the museum archives with your CU team.

9/6 **Visit Museum Archives (2 groups each for half time)**

9/8 Talk to UBC students via Zoom and on your own device via Skype. **Facilitated discussion about the exhibit: what should it be? Introduce WordPress.** (UBC will be online from 11-11:50)

_____

Week 4

Tasks by the weekend:

Log your hours.

Watch YouTube demonstrations of intaglio engraving (links are under Documents in D2L)

Read Viscomi's essay on Blake's printing.

Meet with your partners at UBC about choosing something.

If you need to, visit the museum archives with your CU team.

9/13 *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*

9/15 *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*

Week 5

Tasks by the weekend:

Log your hours.

Read pages 15-114 of the textbook *The Book in Society.*

Read your sources and https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/03/

9/20 Greg visits our class to talk about layout and printing at the BAL.

9/22 Finalize selections from *Songs of Innocence and of Experience* and determine folio layout
Meet UCB students and discuss choice of objects for online exhibit. (UBC will be online from 11-11:50)

_____

Week 6

Tasks by the weekend:

Log your hours.

Read pages 145-167 of the textbook *The Book in Society.*

You should have researched your object and have at least 10 sources. **Write** an annotated bibliography that includes at least ten sources. Annotations should be least two sentences describing the source. Use MLA format.

Read your sources!

9/27 Meet with UBC students. We will meet in **TLC**!

9/29 SPECIAL COLLECTIONS VISIT Half of you will visit the reading room, where Susan will show our collections and the other will hear Greg talk material book & bindings for rest of us, probably in British & Irish Studies room. We will switch halfway through the period. [NOTE: we can choose 3-4 things to go in a case at the CU art museum.]

_____

Week 7

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Discuss all options for online exhibit with UBC team members.
Post your preliminary posts up on the WordPress site.

10/4 SPECIAL COLLECTIONS VISIT

10/6 Greg will visit class to plan the layout of our printing project. Hope will come and we will discuss limiting choices. Finalize your choices from museum archive for framing!

_____

Week 8

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Teams must **finalize** a choice for EACH exhibit. (CU Art Museum & UBC collaborative online exhibit)
Begin **co-writing** the artifact description for each exhibit. This should be approximately one single-spaced page and must cite at least 5 of each team member's 10 sources.
Draft your museum plaques.
Complete a **peer assessment** for each member of your team including the UBC students.
Hand in the 10-source **annotated bibliography** for each exhibit.

Tuesday 10/11 ALL-DAY PRINTING at Boulder Book Arts League , 9-5 (group 1) *Deven will run class*! (7 students each group) If you are not in group 1, you must attend class and work on the exhibit.

10/12 ALL-DAY PRINTING at Boulder Book Arts League 9-5 (group 2) Deven & I will both be there
Thursday 10/13 Exhibit planning discussion: layout; begin to compose a panel that introduces the class project [150-200 words]. Groups should plan their exhibit labels. These can be NO MORE than 75 words. [Hope will give museum label parameters. Hope & Thora will have met to work this out.]

10/14 ALL-DAY PRINTING at Boulder Book Arts League 9-5 (group 3) (Thora & Deven will both attend)

Week 9

Tasks by the weekend:

Log your hours.
Complete **self-assessment**.
Peer edit all museum materials for UBC online project.

Tuesday 10/18 ALL-DAY PRINTING at Boulder Book Arts League 9-5 (group 4) (No class, Thora & Deven will both attend)

10/19 ALL-DAY PRINTING at Boulder Book Arts League 9-5 (group 5) (Thora & DJ at BAL).

Thursday 10/20 Exhibit label peer review and general finalization. (Deven will run class, Hope will attend and we will turn in the labels to her). Thora's office hours are cancelled so that she and Hope can review the labels after class. If they need to be reworked, we will send them back to you. They MUST BE FINALIZED by Friday, 10/21.

Week 10

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Share your research with your Vancouver teammates.
Post your artifact on WordPress. Link to others' posts in a logical way.

10/25 BINDING DAY with Greg in the library! (class cancelled) Divided into 3 2-hour blocks. 9-11am, 11-1, 3-5pm.

10/27 Begin discussing rubrics for grading.

_____

Week 11   Online exhibit should be coming together.

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Finalize and edit bibliographies for publication.
Finalize online object descriptions.

11/1 Meet in the CU Art Museum. Plan the spacing and finalizing of the CU Museum exhibit: Hope will help us.

11/3 Talk with Vancouver students. Work on layout.

Week 12

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Complete **self-assessment**.
[Steve Martonis, Exhibitions Manager, will install the exhibit this week]

11/8 Finalize bibliography
Talk to UBC students and make sure online exhibit is logically linked.

11/10 Students should be working independently. Instructors and curators available for consulting.

Week 13   LAUNCH WEEK

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Complete **peer assessments** for UBC students.

11/15 <u>LAUNCH:</u> Meet at CU museum. Invite all jurors to catered celebration. Present both exhibits.

11/17 Discussion

Thanksgiving Week

Week 14

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Complete final **peer assessments** for Boulder students.

11/29 General discussion of media history based on what we've accomplished.

12/1 Results from independent evaluators: Invite them to come to class or just send in evaluations.

Week 15

Tasks by the weekend:
Log your hours.
Complete **self-assessment**.

12/6 Quill Pen Lab

12/8 Revisiting the readings: Benjamin and Smith
Celebration, review and sincere evaluation

Work Log

Note to Jacie: This work log should be flexible enough that the students can open it and record notes and hours immediately for the span of a week. Ideally it would record those hours and could not be edited at the end of each week, so students can't go back and add hours.

Work logs are a simple tool designed to keep track of productivity and to self-motivate. Professors Brylowe and Burgess ask that you keep track of all the work you do for ENGL 2036.

Expectations:
Generally, all college students should expect 2-3 hours of homework per credit hour spent in class. Work outside of class time is especially vital when a student is working with a team, so we have decided to formalize this process and make it part of your final grade. We expect you to log a minimum of six hours each week, although ideally you will log the full nine. To attain full credit, students must log a total of 135 hours or more. Once you complete a task, you should log on and add it immediately.

What you need to do:
Follow the link on D2L to the Work Log Google form. You will keep track of how much time you spend on our class. You may fill this out as many times as you like. If you do something for class, log it right away so you don't forget. You will note the kind of work, along with a notes field that allows you to go into more detail in your log.

The form looks like this:

Work Log

1. Museum visits   [field that allows students to enter hours]
2. Media Object Exhibit   [field that allows students to enter hours]
3. CU Museum Exhibit   [field that allows students to enter hours]
4. Special Collections Time   [field that allows students to enter hours]
5. Hands-on Making   [field that allows students to enter hours]
6. Assigned Readings and writing [field that allows students to enter hours]
7. Self- and Peer-Assessments   [field that allows students to enter hours]
8. Meeting with peers or experts   [field that allows students to enter hours]
9. Other   [field that allows students to enter hours]

    NOTES: [Notes field that allows students to explain their work.]

Your task is to log your time as fully as possible.

What your instructor will do:
We will check the logs **three times** over the course of the semester. We will send each student an email that confirms whether his or her logged hours are appropriate.

Students should log a total of 135 hours to receive the full 10% of the final grade.

Self-Assessment

Please fill out the assessment completely and rate yourself honestly. Remember, you are rating yourself only for the **last three weeks**, not for the whole time you've been enrolled in ENGL 2036.

On a 1-10 scale, how carefully have you attended to the **readings and writings** assigned? [Box]

[Notes field]

On a 1-10 scale, how much work have you put into the **projects**? (We understand that you may be working exclusively on one or one project may be on the back burner. Please rate yourself based on the work you've done in the last three weeks.) [Box]

[Notes field]

On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your **time management**? [Box]

On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your **engagement with your team**? [Box]

[Notes field]

On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your **overall effort**? [Box]

[Notes field]

Anything you'd like to add?

[Notes field]

Peer Evaluation Form

You must fill out this form for <u>each</u> member of both your Art Museum Team and Your WordPress Team. That means you'll fill it out approximately SIX TIMES.

Your name [Fill-in]

Which Team Project ?
[a pulldown shoud give options **UBC WordPress Project** or **CU Art Museum Project**]

Name of the team member you are evaluating [Fill-in]

Attends group meetings regularly and arrives on time. [Pullldown 1-10]

Contributes meaningfully to group discussions. [Pullldown 1-10]

Completes group assignments on time. [Pullldown 1-10]

Prepares work in a quality manner. [Pullldown 1-10]

Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude. [Pullldown 1-10]

Contributes significantly to the success of the project. [Pullldown 1-10]

Team Evaluation Form

You must fill this form out twice. <u>Once</u> for each team.

Feedback on team dynamics:

1. How effectively did your group work? [Fill-in text window.]

2. Were the behaviors of any of your team members particularly valuable or detrimental to the team? Explain. [Fill-in text window.]

3. What did you learn about working in a group from this project that you will carry into your next group experience? [Fill-in text window.]

Grading criteria for the CU Art Museum Exhibit

Contrary to most humanities courses in which faculty provide significant direction and guidance for students undertaking research—directing them to sources, databases, and the like—students in ENGL 2036 were given little assistance in how to begin investigating the museum objects they selected, primarily because little information exists on these uncatalogued objects. Like any professional researcher, they faced a fundamental problem: how do you begin researching an object that has never been researched and for which there is no precedent? Lacking a template for their chosen objects, the students instead sought out existing museum exhibits and labels in order to get an idea of what kinds of information they should provide. From there, they worked with CU Art Museum curator Hope Saska, in addition to Professor Brylowe and TA Deven Parker, to find this information.

Please Rate our **exhibit concept and consistency** on a scale of **1-10**. _____
Comments:

Please Rate our **exhibit labels** on a scale of **1-10**. _____
Please note that we had access to a professional copy editor.
Comments:

Please Rate our **exhibit guide pages** on a scale of **1-10**. _____
Please note that students wrote these in teams without access to a copy editor.
Comments:

Please Rate our overall **quality of research** on a scale of **1-10**. _____
Comments:

Please Rate our **overall product** on a scale of **1-10**. _____
Comments:

Student Consent Form – Sharing Course Work

This is an experimental course, which allows us to use grant money instead of charging lab fees. The unique nature of this course means that it may be of interest to other instructors. I will select student work to copy and include in a course archive that I will keep. That archive is important to an ongoing measure of how well students are learning in my classes. I may develop a course portfolio in which I write about the quality of student performance and the kinds of work you did. Once a course portfolio is completed, it may be made available to a wider audience of professors in different disciplines. This form requests your consent to have your work included in discussions of understanding for future students and in any versions of my writing about teaching in a portfolio, at a conference, or in a publication. Note that you have the choice to have your work be anonymous or have your name included with your work.

Please check the following designated purposes (if any) to which you give your consent:

_____I am willing to have copies of my coursework available so later students can use it for preparation.

_____I am willing to have copies of my coursework included in my professor's course portfolio.

_____I am willing to have copies of my coursework included in public presentations or publications.

Please check one of the following:

_____I wish to have my name remain on any work that is used.

_____I wish to have my name removed on any work that is used.

Additional restrictions on the use of my texts (please specify):

Print Name_____ Date_____

Phone Number (   )_____   Email_____

Course Title_____Professor_____

By signing below you give your permission that work you produce for this course may be used with the restrictions and for the purposes you indicated above. You understand that your grade is *NOT* connected in any way to your participation in this project, and I will not receive the list of students who have given permission to have their work shared until after I have turned in the grades for the course. Your anonymity will be maintained unless you designate otherwise. Finally, you understand that you are *free to withdraw consent at any time,* now or in the future, *without being penalized*.

Signature_____

Please address questions to: Thora Brylowe, Department of English, thora.brylowe@colorado.edu

Plagiarism and Grading Agreement Form
ENGL 2036 Introduction to Media Theory in the Humanities
Instructor of Record: Thora Brylowe

This class offers you the opportunity to participate in a grading system whereby your self-assessment and assessment of your peers make up a major component of the grade. You will also participate in Team-Based Learning (TBL) projects that will be evaluated by qualified administrators from across the campus. Part of this TBL experience includes developing the evaluation rubric that will be used to grade your team projects. There will be no criteria other than what you have agreed to in advance.

Because we are working with materials and media technologies that have a long history, you will find that much has already been written on the topics you plan to research. When writing catalogue entries, sometimes it is a challenge to stay away from the language of a textual source. You must be vigilant because the audience for this class is public, and plagiarism of any kind cannot be tolerated.

Finally, this class offers unprecedented access to early-modern materials from the CU Art Museum and Special Collections. These materials are delicate and require your respect and carful handling. We are therefore asking that you agree to follow the rules and guidelines put set by the curators and librarians with the utmost scrupulousness.

I, _____, understand and agree to adhere to the grading system outlined in the syllabus. I will complete my part of the grading honestly and with the respect and integrity my peers deserve. I also agree that to participate in creating a rubric for each project, and I will therefore submit to the grade I receive from the outside jurors.

Furthermore, I agree to stay vigilant to all forms of plagiarism. I am aware that reproducing the grammatical structure of a source—even if I change the words—is a form of plagiarism. I agree to stay true to my own writerly voice.

Finally, I agree to adhere to the rules and directions set forth by any instructor, curator or librarian with regard to both the handling of materials and my actions/behavior in any reading or study room or gallery in Norlin Library or the Art Museum.

_____

Signature   Date signed

Finalized tombstone labels for ENGL 2036 CU Art Museum Exhibit

1

Caroline Watson (1761-1814) was official engraver to Queen Charlotte and other royalty including the Duchess of York. In "Maternal Tuition" she used stippling, the marking of a surface with small dots to show dimension, and aquatint. Accompanying the image is a poem written by Catherine Maria Fanshawe (1765-1834). It is unusual for the time that both artists were women. The calmness of the mother during the rivalry between her children shows the maternal role in moral education. The soft, tonal quality of the engraving reinforces this theme.

2

Wenceslaus Hollar, an expert in spatial reasoning and perspective, was known for creating detailed renderings of characters and landscapes. These etchings depict natural objects and settings with particular concern for detailed backgrounds that enhance the setting. For example, in "The Fox and The Cat" one dog looks out the window, reinforcing the three dimensional feel and drawing the viewer's attention to the detailed background. The carefully rendered setting, in turn, highlights the fantastical characters in the foreground. The effect creates a balance between mythical and realistic details.

3

The intricate details in Wenceslaus Hollar's etchings of the Boar and the Ass and the Fly and the Ant from Aesop's fables help communicate the narrative of each fable. The exaggerated size of the fly reflects his inflated ego while the boar's size in relation to the ass indicates his greater morality. Set within realistic backgrounds, the proportions of the animal characters are further emphasized in order to tell the narratives of each fable.

4

Matthew Dubourg
"Procession of the Dean and Prebendaries of Westminster with The Regalia"
Color aquatint
July, 1822
Property of CU Art Museum
This hand colored aquatint represents the Procession of the Coronation of King George IV, on July 21, 1821. The Dean of Westminster and the Prebendaries are delivering the crown, among other holy objects, to crown George Augustus Frederick King of England. It was engraved by Matthew Dubourg in 1824 using an intaglio method, which involves a rosin resist on a copper plate. The plate is submerged in acid to create tonal fields which have been washed with watercolor. Dubourg uses tonal gradients and color wash to create space and movement, conveying the grandeur of the captured moment.

5

Diana and Endymion
Wood Carver: Nicolas Le Sueur (1691-1764)
Painter: Sebastiano Conca (1680-1764)

Type of Woodcut: Chiaroscuro

"Chiaroscuro" comes from the Italian words for light and dark. This piece uses three separate wood cuts inked with different colors—black, gray-blue, and light blue. The three tones give the piece a three-dimensional look. The print depicts Diana, the goddess of the moon and the hunt, also as known Selene. In the myth, she is mesmerized by Endymion. Diana places him in an eternal sleep so that she can preserve his beauty.

6
John Gibson
"A Map of the Icy Sea in Which the Several Communications with the Land Waters and Other New Discoveries Are Exhibited"
Intaglio engraving
June 1760
Property of CU Art Museum
The London periodical Gentleman's Magazine included this map as a supplement to an article by the French geographer Jean Palairet, which describes a theoretical sea route through the Bering strait. This route connects Western European ports to Japan via the Arctic Sea, but is navigable only during the summer when polar ice melts.
Publications like Gentleman's Magazine were important sources of general geographic knowledge, in addition to articles in a wide variety of scientific and literary disciplines. The title page to the June 1760 issue is on display in the nearby case.

7
This stipple engraving represents the "Seven Ages of Man" monologue in Act II, Scene VII of Shakespeare's As You Like It. Highlighted in the scene is an old man in a chair representing the "mere oblivion" of the final stage of life. John Boydell commissioned the painting from Robert Smirke and the subsequent engraving was made by Jean Pierre Simon for inclusion in his Shakespeare Gallery in London's Pall Mall.

Boydell also published a nine volume edition, The Dramatic Works of Shakespeare, which included engravings from the gallery. The third volume of the 1802 edition opened to the "Seven Ages of Man" monologue is located in the case nearby.

Evaluation of Art Exhibit

JUROR 1
Concept consistency: 10
Exhibit labels: 10
Exhibit guide pages: 10
Overall quality: 10
Overall impression: 9

JUROR 2

I was very impressed with the exhibit done by your students for the CU Art Museum. I read all of the labels and guide pages; I also enjoyed talking to the students about their work on the exhibit (as well as in producing their books). It was clear how valuable this project had been to them and how much they had gained from it. The view also gained a great deal. The students had selected interesting, uncatalogued items. They clearly had done a good deal of research to figure out the provenance of these objects and to learn about their form and content. The exhibit held together as a series of case studies of the ways in which artists use visual art to explore verbal narratives, whether Aesop's Fables, the account of a battle, or a play by Shakespeare. I was happy to learn new things—about women artists, for example, and about artistic techniques.

I thought the exhibit labels were quite good. They were clear and engaging. For the most part, they did a good job of balancing information about the artist, about the image, and about the technique that produced the image. There were some cases where the content of the image was not really addressed and where I wanted to know more about what was going on. Still, overall the labels struck me as professional.

The exhibit guide pages had fascinating information but had more writing and typographical problems than the labels.

Clearly a great deal of research went into this project, and overall it was a very pleasant experience to spend time going through the various images and explanatory items.

Concept consistency: 10
Exhibit Labels: 9
Exhibit guide: 8
Research: 9
Overall: 9.5

JUROR 3

Concept consistency: 9
I thought the concept worked well, and was consistently applied (see below for comment on label consistency). I like the way that the exhibit extracted key points from the larger body of work, and was intrigued by several of the interpretations. It was clear that you and the students put considerable thought into the project, and I would say that there was consistency across the pieces in this regard.

Exhibit labels: 8
The labels were well done, overall. Consistency might be a bit of an issue. For example, some of the labels provided details on the method of printing, while others didn't. I suppose there are "standard" techniques that don't bear mention, while there are others that are more complicated.

I also give this category a little lower score because it looked like two of the labels were inverted relative to the prints (the Gibson and Paton prints). The upper label described the lower print, and vice versa. Forgive me if that is intended: I could see asking the reader to pay a bit more attention by doing that. However, it seemed like an error, and if it isn't, you should feel free to elevate this score.

Exhibit guide pages: 9
I didn't have the opportunity to examine these in meticulous detail. However, it looked to me like the students did a nice job in preparing them, and in referencing the research in depth. The guide highlighted how well the main points were extracted for the labels, and I thought this was a strength.

Overall quality: 9
I guess critique of the labels would bring us to this score. I was very impressed with the entire exhibit, and congratulate you and the students on a fine effort. I was particularly impressed with the range of topics in the exhibit, and saw good attention to detail. I appreciated the Fanshawe/Watson piece on Maternal Tuition piece as including work by female artists (1793, no less).

Overall product/impressions: 9
Very nicely done, overall. The thoughtfulness that you all put into this exhibit was remarkable. It was clear from meeting the students that they benefitted tremendously from this experience. I actually lost track that this was a 2000-level course, and thought it was more advanced than this. I hope your students can find other opportunities to work with you in upper division courses.