Program Student Learning Outcome (PSLO) Assessment Reporting Template 2016-2017

[For further guidance on this process, see the PSLO Assessment How-To Guide on the TLC website]

Program: Studio Arts AA-T Degree   Semester: Fall/Spring (2016-2017)

Faculty/Staff Assessing the Program: Ken Alexander, Lucy Snow, Curtis Corlew, Eric Sanchez

Part 1: Assessment Goals

What do you want to learn about your students and their learning from this process?
- What is/are your research question(s)? Why is this research question significant to your program?

Our research question is:
1) Our goal is to ascertain if our PSLO's are broad enough in scope and focused enough to provide us with sufficiently useful data to allow us to assess our program.
2) What can we do to improve program effectiveness and/or student learning in the department?

The goals behind our research questions are to improve completion rates and evaluate what is working or not working well in our instructional/program design.

Part 2: Assessment Plan

PSLO	Method of Assessment	Proficiency Criteria	Student Population Assessed
Enter all the PSLOs for your program below. (Additional rows may be needed)	**Identify and describe the assessment activity** (capstone project, portfolio, interview, pre/post survey, analysis of success rates, etc.) used to assess the students' proficiency of the PSLO. Explicitly state which part of the assessment activity assessed a particular PSLO.	**List the criteria you used to determine proficiency levels for each of your PSLOs.** How did you determine "needs improvement," "meets proficiency," or "exceeds proficiency" criteria?	**Describe which student populations you assessed and how you chose those populations.** How many students did you assess? To what extent did the sample adequately represent all students in the program? Why did you choose this particular group for this particular PSLO? Explain.
PSLO 1 : **Demonstrate appropriate and safe practices in various two-dimensional media, three-dimensional media and computer-based studio environments.**	Instructors assessed this PSLO by looking at individual projects produced by students, as well as portfolios and journals or sketchbooks, _for appropriate use of media._ Safe and appropriate lab/studio practices were also assessed through observation of and interaction with students as they are working in the 2D and 3D labs, as well as critiques of student works or discussions.	Proficiency assessed through evaluation of learning outcomes demonstrated by projects, journals or sketchbooks, as well as orally in discussions or critiques. Proficiency levels are detailed in the course outlines of record for each course.	Data was rolled up from assessment reports, which were completed for one section of each course required for the AA-T

PSLO 2: Present, explain and justify their conceptual design solutions using the vocabulary of design elements and principles, and critique the solutions of others in a thoughtful, constructive manner.	Instructors assessed this PSLO by looking at individual projects produced by students, as well as portfolios and journals or sketchbooks, _for use of design elements and principles. Thoughtful, constructive participation in critiques was also assessed through observation of and interaction with students during critique_ or discussions, or written critiques.	Proficiency assessed through evaluation of learning outcomes demonstrated by projects, journals or sketchbooks, as well as orally in discussions or critiques. Proficiency levels are detailed in the course outlines of record for each course.	Data was rolled up from assessment reports, which were completed for one section of each course required for the AA-T
PSLO 3: Research and synthesize examples of historical and cultural products with their own ideas in order to improve their creative and conceptualization processes.	Instructors assessed this PSLO by looking at individual projects produced by students, as well as portfolios and journals or sketchbooks. They looked _for use of historical examples. Use of examples of historical and cultural products_ was also assessed through observation of and interaction with students as they are working in the 2D and 3D labs, as well as critiques of student works or discussions.	Proficiency assessed through evaluation of learning outcomes demonstrated by projects, journals or sketchbooks, as well as orally in discussions or critiques. Proficiency levels are detailed in the course outlines of record for each course.	Data was rolled up from assessment reports, which were completed for one section of each course required for the AA-T

Part 3: Assessment Findings

What are the findings from your assessment efforts?

Section One: Summarize and interpret your data. How many students were at each proficiency level?

Studio Art Classes Assessed: Art 10, 11,20, 21,30,38,40, 47,66,72,250

PSLO 1: We found that most of the students surveyed (94%) were at or above proficiency in the studio arts AA-T classes that we looked at across the department.. This represented the majority of the students in the classes that were assessed, based on rolling up the data from the assessment reports that were uploaded to the PRST.

PSLO 2: When we rolled up CSLO assessment data for PSLO 2 in studio arts AA-T classes, we found that 87% of students were assessed at or above proficiency in the hands-on classes that we looked at across the department.

PSLO 3: When we rolled up CSLO assessment data for PSLO 3 in studio arts AA-T classes, we found that 90% of students were assessed at or above proficiency in the hands-on classes that we looked at across the department.

GE Classes Assessed: Art 8,9, and 16.

For the studio AA-T required classes that are also GE classes (Art 8, 9, and 16), 88% of the students were at or above proficiency in PSLO's 1-5, with PSLO's 1 and 2 being the most commonly assessed by instructors.

For PSLO 1 and 2, 89% were rated as meeting or above proficiency.
For PSLO 3 more students met proficiency than were above proficiency (60% met, 30% above).

Ways of assessing critical and creative thinking are quite varied in our data, as well as the ways that students "demonstrated an informed world view. " Less data was gathered for PSLO's 4 and 5. However, for these PSLO's we are still showing above 90% meeting or above proficiency.

Section Two: Describe what you discovered about your students and their learning from the assessment.

For studio arts classes assessed, instructor efforts to break up longer-term assignments and procedures into smaller steps that are accounted for in checklists, quizzes, etc., appear to be effective.

For studio arts classes assessed, increases in providing a choice of assignments appear to be popular with students. We are not sure if it's helping with learning outcomes yet.

For studio arts classes assessed Most of the students are able to complete the learning outcomes if they are consistent about attendance and completion of assignments.

For studio arts classes assessed, encouraging students to feel more comfortable giving each other meaningful feedback was another theme that emerged in the "what did we learn" part of the CSLO assessment reports. Instructors model critiques that are encouraging but also detail improvements that are needed, but students tend to avoid commentary on each other's work at first, but then they improve over the course of the semester. We are exploring ways to speed up this process with peer critiques, group work, etc.

For studio arts classes assessed, our methods for assessing CSLO 3 vary widely and could benefit from more coordination and discussion of what benefits historical and cultural products research assignments provide—and also then what common areas, assignments, or methods we might be able to look at across sections.

The results of this assessment contributed to promoting greater discussion and sharing between instructors.

These ongoing assessments have prompted our sense that while we meet proficiency, we would like to increase our individual and collective performance, contributing to better realization of our goals for students.

As mentioned above for GE classes that are part of the studio arts AA-T degree, we may wish to discuss/refine/align our assessments of critical/creative thinking and demonstration of an informed world view, to make those more consistent and possibly more meaningful across sections.

Part 4: Next Steps

What are your next steps?
- How will the results of this assessment be used to improve student learning in your program, if you found that improvement is needed? How might you adjust your teaching methods, program design, or other component of your program, if applicable?

Teaching method adjustments:
Instructor efforts to break up longer-term assignments and procedures into smaller steps that are accounted for in checklists, quizzes, etc., appear to be effective.

Increases in providing choices of assignments appear to be popular with students. We are not sure if it's helping with learning outcomes yet.

Encouraging students to feel more comfortable giving each other meaningful feedback was another theme that emerged in the "what did we learn" part of the CSLO assessment reports. Instructors are modeling critiques-- that are encouraging but also detail improvements that are needed—but students tend to avoid commentary on each other's work at first but then improve over the course of the semester. We are exploring ways to speed this up with peer critiques, group work, etc.

Program Design adjustments:
All of the above teaching method adjustments seem appropriate at introductory level especially. For our majors, later on in their LMC studies, more opportunities to be in groups of intermediate-level students that can work on more self-paced, independently researched and executed projects, (and then hold each other accountable for fair, honest, constructive feedback) is an area we can explore for growth, perhaps as a 2D/3D together capstone or portfolio-building class or project. (Maybe this could be an intersession or short-term class?) Efforts to get more students into the foundation classes sooner in our program (AKA Art Major advising day, Art Department Surveys, etc.) should soon bear fruit in this area as well.

- To what extent do your results point you to a need for professional development? Explain.

Professional development around working with different populations can be helpful, but then instructors always have to figure out how to put those general strategies into specific practice in a way that makes sense with their own experience and methods. Often the best resources are other instructors in the same department – and so resources to pay adjuncts to attend various formal and informal department events would be useful. In addition, there should be payment or stipends available for part-time instructors to seek help in using course management software and smart classrooms, as well as in doing assessments and writing course outlines. Flex is useful as well, but to really get adjuncts involved stipends or extra office hours, etc., should be made more available for department activities.

- What is the plan of action and timeline of your next steps? Who are the major players?

Our next step is to dialogue further with the entire department next semester as we plan our next wave of assessments and update course materials. The department does need to take specific action to get more part-time faculty engaged in campus connected events.

Part 5: Report Summary

The Art Department at Los Medanos College has identified the following learning outcomes for students in studio courses for the AAT and AA Fine Arts Degrees: **1.** Demonstrate appropriate and safe practices in various two-dimensional media, three-dimensional media and computer-based studio environments. **2**: Present, explain and justify conceptual design solutions using the vocabulary of design elements and principles, and critique the solutions of others in a thoughtful, constructive manner. **3.** Research and synthesize examples of historical and cultural products with new ideas in order to improve the creative and conceptualization process.
Having developed these learning outcomes, our goal was to ascertain if these goals are limited enough in number, broad enough in scope and focused enough to provide us with data to accurately assess our program. **Learning outcome #1:** We found that most of the students surveyed (91%) were at or above proficiency. This represented the majority of the students in the classes that were assessed, based on rolling up the data from the assessment reports that were uploaded to the online campus "program review submission tool." **Learning outcome #2:** we found that 86% of students were assessed at or above

proficiency, based on data from the same assessment reports. **Learning Outcome #3:** We found that 87% of students were assessed at or above proficiency in these reports.

These learning outcomes are broad enough in scope to assess the variety of our program activities while allowing us to find areas that merit further investigation and development. For example, we found that instructor efforts to break up longer-term assignments and procedures into smaller steps that are accounted for in quizzes, etc., appear to be effective. In addition we are still investigating whether providing more choices of assignments helps with learning outcomes.

Having students give each other meaningful feedback was another theme that emerged. By the end of the semester, students give improved feedback in critiques, but in the beginning they tend to avoid commentary on each other's work. We are exploring ways to speed this improvement up with peer critiques and group work.

For art majors, later on in their LMC studies, more opportunities to work on more self-paced, independently researched and executed projects, (and then hold each other accountable for fair, honest, constructive feedback) is an area we can explore for growth. Efforts to get more students into the foundation classes sooner in our program (Art Major advising day, Art Department Surveys, etc.) will accelerate our program success.