**Italian Renaissance: Analysis of a specific work**

To expand our study of the Italian Renaissance you will choose one piece of Renaissance art to analyze. You need to select a piece that we have not covered in class and the pieces from the following artists are off limits: Botticelli, Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, Titian, and Tintoretto. If you find a piece by one of these artists that you would like to analyze check with me to see if we will cover it in class. The artist needs to be considered part of the **Italian** Renaissance—**Not** the northern Renaissance. Make sure that the image is school appropriate. When you have chosen your piece bring me the artist and title. **Everyone in the class should have a different image.**

You will need to research your piece using reliable web sources and books (no Wikipedia), and be sure to quote and cite your information accurately. The 1-1.5 page response should be MLA formatted and structured as follows: Brief intro paragraph that introduces the artist and the piece of art (medium, date, subject, patron, etc.), one body paragraph of analysis, and one body paragraph explaining how the piece represents the Renaissance.

For the analysis include symbolism, composition, color, artistic technique, how the viewer is supposed to interact with the piece or where they should look first—think about how we discuss pieces in class. I recommend choosing a piece that has plenty of information to breakdown as analysis.

You will also include a copy of the image that is marked up to act as a visual for your analysis. Include labeling people, any symbols, compositional aspects that are significance, and anything else that is important to your analysis.

Include a works cited section (**MLA format**)--See Word Doc. template on my website.

Hard copy and turned in on turnitin.com by start of class Wednesday December 20th.

**Turnitin.com Instructions:** Class ID: 16922209 Enrollment Key: Gregory

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 10 | 8.5 | 5 |  |
| Evidence  (x1.0) | \*\* Clear, relevant and highly developed/specific  \*\* Seamlessly integrated  \*\*From reliable sources | \*\* Clear, relevant, and mostly developed/specific  \*\*Integrated well, some problems  \*\*Sources may not be reliable for this purpose | \*\* Somewhat clear and relevant; or somewhat developed/specific  \*\*Major problems with integration  \*\*Sources are not reliable for this purpose | No evidence |
| Analysis  (x1.0) | \*\*Clear, complex, and addresses the content from an art historian’s perspective.  \*\*Addresses full composition of piece and techniques of artist  \*\*Accurate and well presented | \*\*Clear but does not address all aspects of piece.  \*\*Missing aspects of the piece or does not address composition/artist techniques in enough depth to show full understanding of the piece.  \*\*Accurate and well presented | \*\*Clear, lacks some understanding of the content  \*\*Lacks overall depth and missing major components.  \*\*Somewhat inaccurate and/or poorly presented | No analysis |
| Organization and Style  (x0.5) | \*\*Clear, readable form  \*\*Organized in paragraphs  \*\*Follows designated structure  \*\*Clear use of language  \*\*MLA Format | \*\*Clear and mostly readable  \*\*Somewhat follows structure  \*\*Language somewhat distracting, confusing. | \*\*Somewhat clear, problems with readability  \*\*Lacking in transitions or unfocused  \*\*Language distracts from the argument, difficult to follow. | No attempt to organize |

Rubric score /15