



Assessment Reporting

Degree/Cert/Program

Delivery Mode:

Submitted by:

Participating Faculty and Staff:

Outcome Assessed:

Courses Used:

Course or degree outcomes to be added/changed/removed:

Course Level Assessments:

Liberal Arts: Fine Arts

(Choose one)

R-EUREKA\Mark-Renner on 5/23/2021

Cindy Hooper, Lindsay Kessner, Ed Macan, Philip Mancus, Natalia Margulis, Shannon Sullivan and David Wilson. Facilitator: Mark Renner

2 - Recognize and evaluate competing aesthetic and critical claims.

ART-1A-S2021, 1B-S2021, 3A-S2021, 4-S2021, 10-S2021, 17-F2020, 19-S2021, 23-S2021, 31A-S2021, 31B-S2021 and 35-S2021;
CINE-3-S2021;
MUS-12-S2020

- 1) We propose specific resource and/or technology requests (to be entered into the Program Review workflow);
- 2) We suggest online or blended courses should have a balance between asynchronous and synchronous content, codified before the course starts (in WebAdvisor, in the Syllabus, and in the orientation letter); and
- 3) We support continuing dialogue (possibly District-wide) about the issue of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students.

Details are found within the "Findings/Results" section of this report

1 course was not successful at conveying this outcome.

3 courses were generally successful at conveying this outcome.

9 courses were definitely successful at conveying this outcome to most of the students.

8 courses were not included in this report.

Findings/Results:**A) PROGRAM-LEVEL DIALOGUE SUMMARY:**

1) Overall, the courses included in this outcome assessment clearly indicate that students are achieving this degree program's learning outcome #2 at respectable-to-high levels. The aggregate of all CSLO scores indicate the composite achievement of this PLO to be that 90% of all students met and/or exceeded the expectation! Given the adversities during a global pandemic AND concomitant challenges related to moving courseware online, this is a highly commendable metric for which faculty in these disciplines deserve huge praise.

2) From evaluated CSLO reports, we saw that for many sections there are atypically high levels of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students which, we believe, reflect challenges related to:

- a) The rapid change to a fully online modality with concomitant technical challenges; and
- b) Other unique (and hopefully temporary) stressors upon students (and their support networks) during this unprecedented global pandemic. However,
- c) Many sections (including a few recent sections that occurred during the pandemic) did NOT have abnormally high levels of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students, so there may well be other factors which caused (and conversely, suppressed) the abnormally high levels of 'N/A' students. Additional contemplation would be useful to identify ways in which to reduce high levels of 'N/A' students during assessment activities.

3) We also noted that aside from having many 'N/A' students, those students who did the work being assessed were doing so (in most but not all sections) at levels of success (on this learning outcome) that are reasonably comparable to previous semesters, and in a few cases exceed those from previous semesters.

4) Online and/or hybrid modalities offer certain unique benefits (see, for example, narratives below in section E) for ART-31A) but many negative challenges (see, for example, many/most narratives below in section E). The extreme case may be for courses which may now appear to be a poor "fit" for the online and/or hybrid modalities, especially where specific technology needs are unmet.

As a result of the observations above, we excluded 'N/A' student head counts when we computed PLO success from CSLO reports. We further expand on the issue of 'N/A' students in section E) below.

Finally:

5) Recommendations (found in section D below) are principally focused on issues relevant to a change from face-to-face to online modality, especially for courses best suited to face-to-face delivery venue or needing vast digital storage space.

B) WHAT WERE THE GENERAL FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS?

Total number of students assessed = 378 if counting those 'N/A' during assessment process;
Total number of students assessed = 321 if excluding those 'N/A' during assessment process.
We summarized above why we chose to exclude 'N/A' students when computing the PLO outcome

- NOT successful: If < 70% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome;
- Generally successful: If 70-85% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome;
- Successful: If >85% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome.

Qualitative narratives/data from the evaluated CSLO reports raised three "red flags": One in a specific course (ART-3A) that is likely ill-suited to the online delivery venue, and the other two involving resource issues (a new ceramics kiln for ART-31A/B, and a different way to store students' digital images in ART-35).

But in general, these data suggest that achievement of this degree program's PLO #2 has been quite successful among the cross-section of courses mapped to this outcome.

C) ARE THE FINDINGS UNIQUE TO A COURSE, DISCIPLINE, OR SUBSET OF COURSES?

No; these findings appear to be reasonably consistent throughout the subset of CSLO reports evaluated for this PLO report (with a few outliers that are described in detail below).

D) DESCRIBE POSSIBLE CHANGES OR IMPROVEMENTS TO PROGRAM COURSES, REQUIREMENTS, RESOURCES, AND/OR OUTCOMES BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISCUSSED:

We propose 1) specific resource and/or technology requests (to be entered into the Program Review workflow), and 2) continuing dialogue about the issue of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students:

1) Though Program Review is the appropriate venue for resource issues/requests, narratives in ART-31A clearly indicate an urgent need to replace a mission-critical kiln, and narratives in ART-35 clearly indicate an urgent need to find a suitable means (which excludes Canvas, due to its limitations) for online storage of vast libraries of student digital images.

2) Regarding the issue of 'N/A' students and its impact on assessment methodology, we propose a potentially District-wide dialogue session (maybe a convocation/flex activity) where the issue of 'N/A' students is considered, with the goal of reducing the number of students in the 'N/A' assessed category. This is salient because unless students are required to take an assessment in order to complete the course, the 'N/A' problem may well persist. See E) below for an expanded discussion.

E) ADD OTHER COMMENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE PROGRAM-LEVEL DIALOGUE:

WHOSE FOCUS IS HANDS-ON WORK (such as ART-3A) and COURSES REQUIRING ONLINE DIGITAL STORAGE SPACE BEYOND CANVAS' CAPACITY (such as ART-35).

3) These issues are clearly reflected in abnormally high levels of students who were not assessed ("absenteeism") on assessment instruments (for example, 23% in ART-4-S2021, 34% in ART-17-F2020 and 35% in ART-31B-S2021), and/or lower achievement of CSLO(s) for such courses (for example, ART-3A-S2021). For all courses evaluated, the average 'N/A' was 15%, a modest but potentially problematic value.

4) Several faculty suggested it may be helpful to AVOID deploying assessment instruments close to the end of the semester (when student stressors might be at very high levels) in hopes of eliciting fuller participation (thus lower levels of "absenteeism" on assessments).

The following selected anecdotes from CSLO reports encapsulate these themes:

ART-1B-S2021:

"Timing delivery of assessment instruments at the end of the semester may limit participation and maximize the number of absentee students who are not assessed. The pressures associated with the pandemic have resulted in higher-than-normal numbers of students dropping out as well as increased absenteeism on assignments that instructors use as instruments of CSLO assessment. Changing to online/virtual courses exacerbated these issues, in part due to students' technology and/or internet challenges. Some students struggled with absenteeism. Overall students' performance tended toward extremes, with many either exceeding outcome expectations or not meeting them at all. To what degree this was the result of the online format is hard to say. Larger than normal numbers of students have dropped this semester, many because of pandemic-related stressors. As a result, larger than normal numbers of students were not available this semester for SLO assessment."

ART-3A-S2021:

"Teaching a "making" course via Zoom presented significant challenges. Specifically, ART 3A requires access to very specialized tools which most students don't possess. For this version of the

posted their in-progress work at regular intervals for instructor and peer feedback, students successfully met all the outcomes for assignment, and even exceeded the outcomes in most cases. Students who skipped one or more video lectures did less well, but could typically meet the basic outcomes so long as they carefully followed along with the video demonstration. Without watching the "Examples From Art History" and/or the "Examples of Past Student Work" lectures, however, students' ideas and approaches for this assignment were far more limited, and they needed extra guidance to understand and demonstrate the differences between traditionally western and Asian constructions of space. Students who watched none of the video lectures/demonstrations were unable to meet any of the outcomes for this assignment."

ART-17-F2020:

"The transition to remote learning for fall 2020 impacted student learning in many ways, particularly in how the students evaluated and critically assessed the work of fellow students and art historical examples. Rather than in class critiques and discussions, this work was largely completed through discussion boards. Additionally, conducting demonstrations over video changed how students learned to draw and complete assignments. Student enthusiasm for communicating with one another through discussion boards was much greater than I expected and offers an opportunities to meet outcomes in new ways utilizing this resource.

It is noteworthy to point out that online classes have a larger drop out rate than face to face classes, and especially in the time of covid, larger than normal numbers of students dropped this semester, sometimes very inexplicably. This means larger than normal amounts of students could not be assessed this semester, for some of the SLOs."

ART-10-C2021:

**Actions/Changes To
Be Implemented:**

Course Mapping:

21 individual CSLOs from 21 separate courses (14 in ART, 4 in CINE and 3 in MUS) are mapped to this Program Learning Outcome. This analysis is based on a subset of thirteen (13) very-recently-assessed course outcomes from thirteen (13) courses in all three (3) disciplines mapped to this PLO.

This subset of mapped courses and relevant outcomes reflects the diversity of courses in this degree program as well as in this specific PLO. Reports used for this analysis are very recent (F2020 and S2021); virtually all of them were submitted into eLumen. Participating faculty are to be commended for their impressive effort to have their courses assessed and their assessment reports submitted to eLumen prior to this dialogue session, which fell in week 16 of an exceedingly busy and complex pandemic year.

Yes, these course assessments are a sufficient sample to evaluate achievement of Liberal Arts: Fine Arts outcome # 2.