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| **2021-2022 Assessment Report** |
| **Assessment Reporting Form:** This report is to show that academic assessment is occurring and that the results are being used to make changes to improve student learning. The assessment being reported could be for Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Measurable Student Level Outcome (MSLOs), and/or Course Common Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs). Each program should be assessing and gathering data for at least **two** PLOs OR **two** MSLOs that contain CSLOs each year.  On the Baseline Assessment Reporting Form, please record the baseline for the percentage of students who are proficient in the student learning outcome(s) assessed and identify improvements that will be made to increase that percentage. Later, you’ll complete a follow-up assessment (recorded on a Follow-Up Assessment Reporting Form) to ascertain whether the adopted improvements resulted in an increased percentage of students proficient in the assessed learning outcome(s). |
| **Course or Program Assessment Details Due Oct. 21, 2021** |
| **1. Program name or course name and number**:  ART 107 Drawing I |
| **2. Division in which the program or course is located**:  Visual and Creative Arts |
| **3. Date form completed**:  10/13/21 |
| **4. Name of person completing report**:  Sarah McLaughlin |
| **5. Semester and year in which the assessment was conducted**:  Fall 2021 |
| **6. Number of student participants**:  23 |
| **7. Number of faculty/staff participants**:  1 |
| **8. What PLOs and/or MSLOs and CSLOs did you assess for this baseline assessment? (For clarity, please label each measure listed as a PLO, MSLO, or CSLO.)**  **CSLO.02 Integrative Knowledge**  **CSLO.03 Personal and Professional Skills**  **CSLO.04 Reasoning Skills**  **MSLO.02 (Application Level)**  **MSLO.03 (Evaluation Level)**  **MSLO.04 (Synthesis Level)**  **MSLO.05 (Synthesis Level)**  **MSLO.06 (Evaluation Level)** |
| **9. Describe the assessment method used and the criteria for successful achievement of student learning outcomes. (e.g., rubrics, licensing exam, internship, portfolio, exam, quiz, research paper, performance exam, EAC, etc.)**  **Rubric:**  **Measuring Composition, Light Source, Shading, and Accuracy/Effort of a particular assignment.** |
| **Program Results & Evaluation Due December 11, 2021** |
| **10. What percentage of the participating students were proficient in the PLOs, MSLOs or CSLOs?  What percentage of correct answers was determined as proficient? (For example, a student has to answer 70% of the questions correctly to be considered proficient.)**  PLOs  MSLOs  CSLOs   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Details** | | | | | | **No** | **Row** | **Average** | **Levels Of Achievement** | **Distribution** | | 1 | Composition | 0.89 | ◼ 10 (52.6%) Excellent  ◼ 6 (31.6%) Satisfactory  ◼ 3 (15.8%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Poor |  | | 2 | Light Source | 0.87 | ◼ 8 (42.1%) Excellent  ◼ 9 (47.4%) Satisfactory  ◼ 1 (5.3%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 1 (5.3%) Poor |  | | 3 | Shading | 0.85 | ◼ 7 (36.8%) Excellent  ◼ 6 (31.6%) Satisfactory  ◼ 5 (26.3%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 1 (5.3%) Poor |  | | 4 | Accuracy/Effort | 0.86 | ◼ 6 (31.6%) Excellent  ◼ 6 (31.6%) Satisfactory  ◼ 7 (36.8%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Poor |  |  **Drawing Rubric** Black Still Life  2021-11-01 - 2021-11-01   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Courses Included** | | | | | | | | | **Learning Activity** | **Course** | **Instructors** | **Enrollment** | **Evaluations** | **Percent** | **# Pass** | **% Pass** | | Black Still Life | ART107 - Drawing I (Fall 2021, Section 21FA4777, TR 9:00a ONL Hybrid - Live Streaming/Online) (21FA4777) | McLaughlin, Sarah | 22 | 19 | 86.36 | 19 | 100 |      |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Summary Statistics** | | | | Scored Evaluations19 | # Pass19 | Mean Score3.46 | | Rows4 | % Pass100 | Median Score3.39 | | Possible Item Scores76 | Highest Score3.94 | Std Dev0.32 | | Actual Item Scores76 | Lowest Score2.97 | KR(20) / Cronbach Alpha0.88 | |
| **11. What changes/improvements were made or will be made in response to the outcomes of the assessment process?**  I will do a specific demo to talk about ways to improve blending and tips/tricks to blend with different materials. I will also do a step by step demo to talk about light sources- natural light vs direct light sources (like lamps). |
| ***Feel free to attach your PLOs OR MSLOs and CSLOs and indicate which were assessed*** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback Rubric** | | | | | |
| **Category** | **1 - Developing** | **2 – Satisfactory** | **3 - Exemplary** | **Score** | **Feedback** |
| **Outcomes Identified** | Outcomes to be assessed were not clear | Outcomes to be assessed were identified but were not aligned to CSLOs | PLOs or MSLOs to be assessed were identified and aligned with CSLOs | 3 | Would like to see the full learning outcomes without having to look them up in Acres. |
| **Scope of Assessment** | The assessment was given by only one faculty member and/or to one class | The assessment was given by a few faculty members to several classes, but it was not district-wide | The assessment was given district-wide by all faculty teaching the course. | 3 |  |
| **Quality of Assessment** | The assessment did not have articulated criteria for assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (e.g., rubrics, exemplary work). | The assessment somewhat articulated criteria for assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (e.g., rubrics, exemplary work). | The assessment clearly articulated criteria for assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (e.g., rubrics, exemplary work). | 2 | It is recommended that a full rubric is developed with ties to the learning outcomes expected to be met. |
| **Interpreting Results** | Data of assessment results was not provided. | Data of assessment results was provided and there was evidence that the results were somewhat analyzed | Data of assessment results was provided and there was evidence that the results were analyzed in depth | 2 | It would be good to see the raw data, and the scores tied to the learning outcomes directly. |
| **Reflection and Future Action** | Reflection of the results of the assessment was not apparent and no changes and/or improvements based on them were identified. | Reflection of the results of the assessment was somewhat clear and one change and/or improvements based on them was identified. | Reflection of the results of the assessment was clear and several changes and/or improvements based on them were identified. | 2 | The development of student resources for differentiated instruction is a great idea. |
| **Additional Comments:**   * A good foundation for assessment. * There is growth potential in the development of the student rubric. * It is sometimes difficult to tie quantitative data to a qualitative performance-based assessment. A more defined rubric could help. * It may also be beneficial to give the students examples of work that fall below, meet, or exceed expectations. * Potential depth added for students looking to pursue art as a career for there to be involvement of an industry advisory. This could help facilitate a transition from school to work. | | | | | |



|  |
| --- |
| **Course or Program Assessment Details Due May 30th, 2022** |
| **1. Program name or course name and number**:  ART 107 |
| **2. Division in which the program or course is located**:  Visual and Performing Arts |
| **3. Date form completed**: |
| **4. Name of person completing report**:  Sarah McLaughlin |
| **5. Semester and year in which the assessment was conducted**:  Spring 2022 |
| **6. Number of student participants**:  18 |
| **7. Number of faculty/staff participants**:  1 |
| **8. What PLOs and/or MSLOs and CSLOs did you assess for this baseline assessment? (For clarity, please label each measure listed as a PLO, MSLO, or CSLO.)**  **CSLO.02 Integrative Knowledge**  **CSLO.03 Personal and Professional Skills**  **CSLO.04 Reasoning Skills**  **MSLO.02 (Application Level)**  **MSLO.03 (Evaluation Level)**  **MSLO.04 (Synthesis Level)**  **MSLO.05 (Synthesis Level)**  **MSLO.06 (Evaluation Level)** |
| **9. Describe the assessment method used and the criteria for successful achievement of student learning outcomes. (e.g., rubrics, licensing exam, internship, portfolio, exam, quiz, research paper, performance exam,**  **Rubric:**  **Measuring Composition, Light Source, Shading, and Accuracy/Effort of a particular assignment.** |
| **10. What percentage of the participating students were proficient in the PLOs, MSLOs or CSLOs?  What percentage of correct answers was determined as proficient? (For example, a student has to answer 70% of the questions correctly to be considered proficient.)**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Row Analysis** | | | | | | | **Position** | **Row** | **Average** | **Std Dev** | **Point Biserial** | **Cronbach Del** | | 1 | Composition | 0.88 | 0.07 | 1 | 0.96 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | 2 | Light Source | 0.86 | 0.06 | 1 | 0.96 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | 3 | Shading | 0.9 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.97 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | 4 | Accuracy/Effort | 0.87 | 0.04 | 1 | 0.99 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Details** | | | | | | **No** | **Row** | **Average** | **Levels Of Achievement** | **Distribution** | | 1 | Composition | 0.88 | ◼ 1 (50%) Excellent  ◼ 1 (50%) Satisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Poor |  | | 2 | Light Source | 0.86 | ◼ 1 (50%) Excellent  ◼ 1 (50%) Satisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Poor |  | | 3 | Shading | 0.9 | ◼ 1 (50%) Excellent  ◼ 1 (50%) Satisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Poor |  | | 4 | Accuracy/Effort | 0.87 | ◼ 1 (50%) Excellent  ◼ 1 (50%) Satisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Unsatisfactory  ◼ 0 (0%) Poor |  | |
| **11. What changes/improvements were made or will be made in response to the outcomes of the assessment process?**   * Include examples of past student work that falls below, meets, and exceeds expectations. * Update rubric to be more defined. * Include more specific demos: I Demonstrated ways to improve blending and tips/tricks to blend with different materials. I also did a step by step demo to talk about light sources- natural light vs direct light sources (like lamps). |
| **Additional Comments or feedback on the Assessment Process (Optional):** |