

Assessment: Course Four Column

Spring/Summer 2019



El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Art

ECC: ART 101: Art and Visual Culture in Modern Life

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to demonstrate analysis of content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of art and visual culture.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - During an in-class presentation, students will be assessed according to their demonstrated understanding of historical, geographical, and chronological context. Students may also be assessed for their communication skills, as this SLO aligns with the communication ILO. Traits assessed include organization of presentation subject matter, level of research, and delivery of findings.</p> <p>Each of the above traits will be assessed on a 5-point scale. See attached rubric.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will score a 3 or higher on each trait.</p> <p>Related Documents: Content context SLO spring 2015 - student presentation score sheet.docx</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>8 sections of Art 101 were assessed: 5001, 5004, 5006, 5009, 5010, 5011, 5015, and 5018. Students were required to do a presentation and results were dis-aggregated according to the following areas: organization, delivery, content, historical context, geographical context, and chronological context.</p> <p>The weighted average performance for the traits were as follows: Organization -- 3.8 Delivery -- 3.7 Content -- 3.7 Historical context -- 3.3 Geographic context -- 3.2 Chronological context -- 3.5</p> <p>The data reported from faculty was inconsistent in format, due to my miscommunication, making it difficult to tell for sure if the target of 70% was reached. However, the averages indicate success in the target of 3 or above and partial data suggests that the standard of 70% was met. The three contextual traits were consistently lower than the</p>	<p>Action: Reconsider how data is gathered in multi-section assessments. We need more than class averages. We need to know how many students received which scores. (11/30/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Consider rewriting the SLO for this course to remove chronological and geographical context because the course objectives are different from the other art history courses. This has already been discussed to some extent. (11/30/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Hold 101 faculty meetings to discuss best teaching practices. Discuss how one instructor was able to get higher results in chronological context as well as other approaches in teaching context in this course. (09/09/2015)</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>communication traits, suggesting that context is more difficult for Art 101 students to convey in their presentations. In a meeting of Art 101 faculty, this was agreed upon. This is perhaps because the course is written from a thematic point of view, making chronology and geographic context less of an emphasis than in the art history survey courses.</p> <p>Observations from faculty were often similar. For example, many noted the student's difficulty with thesis statements, making them clear in a presentation, and supporting that thesis with strong content. Non-verbal skills were also noted as an area for improvement. Most noted that historical context was the easiest part for their students to understand and that chronological context was the least successfully demonstrated -- except for one faculty member who had three sections. Her students performed best in chronological context which she believes is due to her using a date or era as "jumping off point" (thus helping to explain the different averages above). She was able to emphasize the chronology within the thematic structure of the class.</p> <p>Other observations recorded students' ease in using powerpoint and ability to put together visually adept presentations. (06/29/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Gretchen Potts, Karen Whitney, Elizabeth Russell, and Jacqueline Freedman Related Documents: Content.context SLO spring 2015 - student presentation score sheet.docx context rubric example 2015.docx</p>	<p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Project - Through an in-class presentation, a curatorial project, or a research paper, students will be assessed according to their demonstrated understanding of historical, geographical, and chronological context.</p> <p>Use of context will be assessed on a</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met Six sections of Art 101 (5010, 5011, 5018, 5019, 5022, 4502) equaling a total of 219 students, were assessed. Different instructors used different project methods. Among the methods used were papers, presentations, and curatorial projects. The results of the assessment are as follows:</p>	<p>Action: While faculty agreed that there were ways students could improve their demonstration of understanding context, the results were still satisfactory. For the next assessment we will raise the target for success. (09/04/2020) Action Category: SLO/PLO</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions										
	5-point scale, 1 being weakest and 5 being excellent. Standard and Target for Success: 80% of students will score a 3 or higher	<table><tr><td>% that got 1:</td><td>0.00%</td></tr><tr><td>% that got 2:</td><td>11.42%</td></tr><tr><td>% that got 3:</td><td>29.22%</td></tr><tr><td>% that got 4:</td><td>37.90%</td></tr><tr><td>% that got 5:</td><td>21.46%</td></tr></table> <p>88.58% of students received a 3 or higher score on their knowledge of context as it informs content.</p> <p>Some weaknesses noted was depth of historical context of each artwork (perhaps this could be emphasized more in assignment directions). Some strengths include identifying content, strong research and analysis of social issues and biographies of individual artists, where pertinent.</p> <p>Faculty agree that certain types of context could be emphasized more and, where it was a written assignment, assistance from the writing center would be beneficial to students when preparing their arguments.</p> <p>(06/10/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 88 Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Karen Whitney, Elizabeth Russell, Jackie Freedman</p>	% that got 1:	0.00%	% that got 2:	11.42%	% that got 3:	29.22%	% that got 4:	37.90%	% that got 5:	21.46%	Assessment Process <hr/> Action: 101 Faculty need to meet and agree upon what aspects of contextual analysis are most important for this course. Likely there will be an outcome of a more detailed rubric to prepare students. (09/04/2020) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
% that got 1:	0.00%												
% that got 2:	11.42%												
% that got 3:	29.22%												
% that got 4:	37.90%												
% that got 5:	21.46%												

ECC: ART 102A:History of Western Art - Prehistoric to Gothic

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to demonstrate analysis of content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of prehistoric through gothic art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students were given a 3-5 page essay assignment based on the assessment of an artwork from a local museum. More specifically, they are required to interpret the artwork by comparing it to two other artworks selected from their textbook in order to demonstrate their understanding of various art historical concepts. They were required to include proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, discussion of subject matter and iconography, and social context.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85 % to 90% of the students will score 80% or above on the paper including: proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, discussion of subject matter and iconography, and personal response. (85% of the students will score 80-64 out of 80 possible points.)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Forty-three students were enrolled in the course; thirty-eight participated in this assessment. The standard was met. 36 students achieved 75% or higher surpassing the target of 80%. In fact, 18 of those (more than half) achieved a 90% and above. Eleven students achieved a score of 80% or higher, therefore scoring above average. Seven were 75-79%. Two were in the 60-74% range and the other 5 did not participate. These 5 enrolled students did not submit papers, therefore received O/F grade, and were not considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Overall, all of the students were successful in their ability to comprehend and utilize the terms and concepts pertinent to visual literacy, one of the primary goals of an art history course. Most of the students scored above average due to their ability to apply the terms and concepts and their ability to articulate the concepts in an effective manner. I believe that those at the lower end of the spectrum did in fact understand the concepts but had greater difficulty articulating the information in an organized manner due to inexperience with formal or proper essay writing. The assignment was comprehensive and required synthesis of many concepts into a singular framework. (05/18/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Lucy Alamillo</p>	<p>Action: The outcomes demonstrate success overall and therefore I will continue with this assignment unless I notice any significant reductions in comprehension and/or execution. (09/11/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students were given a set of videos accompanied by readings on two different monuments, the National Monument for Peace & Justice and the 9/11 Memorial & Monument. After completing viewing & reading, the students chose one of the monuments as the focus of an essay. The objective of the essay was to</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Twenty-six students participated in this assessment. The standard was met. Twenty-four students scored above 80%; three students scored between 80-90, while twenty-one scored 90% or higher. One student score 75%. Two enrolled students did not participate. (10/15/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 92</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Lucy Alamillo</p>	<p>Action: The outcomes demonstrate an overall success, however, in the effort to reach all students (100% of participating students) I plan to provide examples, in written form, of a comparative analysis between ancient and modern artworks. Previously, the comparative analysis was only modeled in class</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>relate the legacy and symbolism of ancient monuments (as examined in course content and class discussions) as perceived in the analysis of one of these modern monuments.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85 to 90% of the students will score 80% or above on the essay including proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, and discussion of iconography within a contextual analysis.</p>	<p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Lucy Alamillo</p>	<p>discussion. (10/15/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ART 102B:History of Western Art - Proto-Renaissance to 19th Century

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																
<p>SLO #2 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to demonstrate analysis of content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of renaissance through nineteenth-century art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/15/2013</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration -</p> <p>During an in-class presentation, students will be assessed according to their demonstrated understanding of historical, geographical, and chronological context. Students may also be assessed for their communication skills, as this SLO aligns with the communication ILO. Traits assessed include organization of presentation subject matter, level of research, and delivery of findings.</p> <p>Each of the above traits will be assessed on a 5-point scale. See attached rubric.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>70% of students will score a 3 or higher on each trait.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Two sections were assessed, with a total of 78 students being assessed. This cycle the types of context were not disaggregated as different faculty with focus on different types of context. There was a worry that the last assessment may have reflected poorly in one area of context, when in actuality the instructor was requiring attention be paid to a different type of context. The outcome desired is for students to display an understanding of contextual analysis, which can be achieved in many ways including geographic, historic or chronological. The scores were as follows:</p> <p>1- 3%</p> <p>2- 2.5%</p> <p>3- 20.5%</p> <p>4- 47%</p> <p>5- 26%</p> <p>The results were favorable with 93% achieving a 3 or better which would correlate to a passing score. Students were prepared to address different aspects of context by referencing my rubric. Student focus varied with some focusing more on religion, politics, or stylistic chronology. Using subject matter to reflect the historical context would be one area of improvement for the future.</p> <p>Rubric:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Artist’s Bio</td> <td>15 pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Iconography</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subject Matter</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Content: religious context</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Work Cited Page</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proof of Attendance</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clarity/Professionalism</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Powerpoint/visuals</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(05/15/2019)</p>	Artist’s Bio	15 pts	Iconography	15	Subject Matter	15	Content: religious context	15	Work Cited Page	10	Proof of Attendance	10	Clarity/Professionalism	10	Powerpoint/visuals	10	<p>Action: Raise the standard for success to 80% from 70%. (09/05/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>
Artist’s Bio	15 pts																		
Iconography	15																		
Subject Matter	15																		
Content: religious context	15																		
Work Cited Page	10																		
Proof of Attendance	10																		
Clarity/Professionalism	10																		
Powerpoint/visuals	10																		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>% of Success for this SLO: 93</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Karen Whitney</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>69 students were assessed from two sections. They were scored according to the following areas on a 1-5 scaled rubric.</p> <p>Organization-- 4.1 avg Delivery --3.9 avg Content-- 4.6 avg Historical context --4.4 avg Geographical context -- 4.4 avg Chronological context --4.4 avg</p> <p>Students performed poorest in the area of delivery. Even in preparing for the assessment I realized that needed to give them more direction in this area and will work on a speaking rubric or guidelines sheet.</p> <p>Organization was good, but I gave them a very specific outline of items to cover.</p> <p>Content and Context were also strong areas because I gave them the rubric for this assignment ahead of time. In the past it has not been as strong and often geographical context is lacking. (08/28/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>SLO presentation rubric.docx</p> <p>Presentation Delivery.docx</p>	<p>Action: Create a speaking rubric or guideline sheet to heighten students awareness of their speaking tone and non-verbals. Continue to hand out a rubric to prepare students for strong content explained through contextualized information. (10/21/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Handed out a guide to students on delivery methods and expectations. They are still preparing their presentations, but they seemed to understand the concepts. I think this will improve the presentations overall. (11/15/2016)</p>
	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration -</p> <p>During an in-class presentation, students will be assessed according to their demonstrated understanding of historical, geographical, and chronological context in relation to reformation or counter-reformation era art.</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Understanding of context will be assessed on a 5-point scale, 1 being weakest and 5 being excellent.

Standard and Target for Success:
Standard and Target for Success 80% of students will score a 3 or higher on each trait.

ECC: ART 102C:History of Western Art - 19th Century to Contemporary Times

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																															
<p>SLO #2 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to demonstrate analysis of content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of nineteenth-century through contemporary art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment -</p> <p>Students were given a five page museum assessment activity on the eleventh week of the semester and they were given two weeks to complete the assignment. This gave them only two weekends to complete the assignment. At this point into semester it was expected that they should have a comprehensive understanding of the art historical movements and schools that they studied and the necessary skills to meet the class learning objectives. They were asked to compare and contrast two related and promising art works of their choosing from two different stylistic backgrounds that conveys a significant art historical shift. They were required to include proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, discussion of subject matter and iconography, and personal response.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85 % to 90% of the students will score 80% or above on the paper including: proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, discussion of subject matter and iconography, and personal response. (85% of the students will score 80-64 out of 80 possible points.)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>19 Students received the assignment and 18 students were evaluated in this comprehensive SLO assessment. Based on the fact that the majority of the students in this particular class were ambitious with a solid art historical background the target was set very high. The standard was met and it was even a little above the expected target. 17 students (94% of those who assessed) received 90% and higher and therefore fulfilled all the requirements of this assignment and 1 student (6%) gained 80%. One student did not do the assignment. The following chart reflects the breakdown of assessment data.</p> <p>Art102 C originally had 30 students with several no-show and W.</p> <table><tr><td>17 Students :72-80</td><td>17 -90%-100</td><td>94 %</td></tr><tr><td>1 Students :64-71</td><td>1 -89-80%</td><td>6 %</td></tr><tr><td>0 Students : 63-56</td><td>0 -79-70%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>18 students assessed</td><td>18 did</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1 student did not</td><td>do the assignment</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>A-COMPOSITION and Analysis (Student’s Ability to Compose a Formal, College-Level Essay at the Skill Level of English 1A):</p> <table><tr><td>1. Introduction and Thesis Statement (6points)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>80 % Excellent</td><td>20% Good</td></tr><tr><td>0% Poor</td><td>0% Unsatisfactory</td></tr><tr><td>2. Mechanics of Writing (10points)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(Paragraphs, grammar, punctuation, spelling, tenses, possession, word choice, syntax)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>75% Excellent</td><td>25% Good</td></tr><tr><td>0% Poor</td><td>0% Unsatisfactory</td></tr><tr><td>3- Analysis and Methodology (12points)</td><td></td></tr></table>	17 Students :72-80	17 -90%-100	94 %	1 Students :64-71	1 -89-80%	6 %	0 Students : 63-56	0 -79-70%	0%	18 students assessed	18 did		1 student did not	do the assignment		1. Introduction and Thesis Statement (6points)		80 % Excellent	20% Good	0% Poor	0% Unsatisfactory	2. Mechanics of Writing (10points)		(Paragraphs, grammar, punctuation, spelling, tenses, possession, word choice, syntax)		75% Excellent	25% Good	0% Poor	0% Unsatisfactory	3- Analysis and Methodology (12points)		<p>Action: Since the outcomes of this assessment along with the one given last year (Spring 2014) were successful I will not change this assignment unless I notice a significant shift regarding readiness and responsibility of the students. However, I will make sure to pay extra attention to students who are suffering from having fundamental and sufficient educational background due to their poor education prior to distribution of SLO and other major assignments as a way to sustain them in class and to increase retention and success.</p> <p>Spring 2016 Teaching Strategies (09/07/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Aside from students responsibility and high ethics in doing their works several other factors contributed to great results which we achieved for this SLO (including a workshop concerning SLO assignment, clear guidelines, and providing extra help to those who reached out to me for help). Therefore, I will not only follow up on all these pedagogical class activities, but intensify my involvement with those who really need further help and assistance as a way to</p>
17 Students :72-80	17 -90%-100	94 %																																
1 Students :64-71	1 -89-80%	6 %																																
0 Students : 63-56	0 -79-70%	0%																																
18 students assessed	18 did																																	
1 student did not	do the assignment																																	
1. Introduction and Thesis Statement (6points)																																		
80 % Excellent	20% Good																																	
0% Poor	0% Unsatisfactory																																	
2. Mechanics of Writing (10points)																																		
(Paragraphs, grammar, punctuation, spelling, tenses, possession, word choice, syntax)																																		
75% Excellent	25% Good																																	
0% Poor	0% Unsatisfactory																																	
3- Analysis and Methodology (12points)																																		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		85 % Excellent 15% Good 5 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory 4- Use of Art Historical terminology (6points) 90% Excellent 10% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory SECTION A Total (34 points): 82.5% Excellent 17.5% Good 3 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory B- Identification (8points) 100% Excellent 0% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory C- SUBJECT MATTER/ICONOGRAPHY (8points) 100% Excellent 0% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory D- Stylistic Attributes (FORMAL ELEMENTS) (24points) 94% Excellent 6% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory E- CONCLUSIONS (6points) 94% Excellent 5.9% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory Total: A+B+C+D+E: 94.1 % Excellent 6% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 0% Unsatisfactory 1- Excellent (A) = 100-90 % (80-72 Points) 2- Good (B) = 89-80 % (71-64 Points) 3- Satisfactory (C) = 79-70 % (63-56 Points) 4- Poor (D) = 69-60 % (55-48 Points) 5- Unsatisfactory (F) = 59-0 % (47-0 Points) Analysis: Students were successful in their ability to formulate and articulate meaningful statements and documents and in introducing historical background. They	boost up the retention and success of the unprivileged students. (05/18/2016)

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>also effectively utilized a basic set of interpretive tools in order to critically locate and understand the production, reception and application of visual codes, styles and techniques.</p> <p>Students also demonstrated their Visual Literacy, which is one of the primary goals of this class and one of the requirements of this SLO.</p> <p>Data indicates that students had a clear understanding of formal analysis, art historical terminology, and proper identification, and managed to incorporate that into their overall analysis. As for art historical terminology 90% of the students were excellent and 10% good; which was expected from this class. Students also managed to identify the art works (100% excellent) and did great on subject matter (100% excellent as well). Formal analysis which was another focus of this SLO assessment was also a great success and 94% were excellent and 6% were good. On the forth requirement (conclusion and personal response) 94% did excellent and 6% good. Several different factors contribute to great result which we achieved for this SLO.</p> <p>Several different factors contribute to great result which we achieved for this SLO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A great majority of students who remain in class and finished the course were advanced and responsible students 2. We held a workshop for both this SLO assessment activity and Symposium which was another major assignment in this class which contributed to a better understanding and requirements of these assignments. 3. A worksheet was provided to students which helped them with their observation of the art works during their visit to LACMA. 4. I had spent a great amount of time with many member of this class who came for help. <p>In addition to above data the result for final exam and symposium (students did very well in these assignments as well) are other parallels which proof the success of this SLO assessment.</p> <p>(05/18/2015)</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Faculty Assessment Leader: Ali Ahmadpour
Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None

ECC: ART 110:Drawing Fundamentals I

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Critiquing a Drawing - A student will be able to demonstrate the ability to judge a drawing in terms of its line, value, volume, proportion, perspective and composition.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students were asked to look at two images of drawings produced in an ART110 class, labeled A & B (see related documents), and answer a series of multiple-choice questions. The following were the answer options: 1. Artwork A, 2. Artwork B, 3. Both A & B, 4. Neither A or B. The questions tested a student's ability to identify in each drawing course-specific terminology and concepts.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will answer each question correctly.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>The following are the test questions with the multiple-choice answers. Percentages show how many students answered the question correctly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which drawing employs a linear technique? Artwork A 89% 2. Which drawing employs value (chiaroscuro)? Artwork B 92% 3. Which drawing employs only one point perspective? Neither A or B 55% <p>Total sections assessed: 10. Total students assessed 165.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data shows that students demonstrated an overall successful ability to identify course specific terminology and concepts in two out of the three questions. Students were most successful in identifying the difference between a linear drawing (Question One: 89%) and a value/chiaroscuro drawing (Question Two: 92%). The students were weakest in identifying the use of one point perspective in a drawing (Question Three: 55%). 2. The decline in comprehension for Question Three can be contributed to a number of variables: Question 3 was not as straight-forward as the first two questions, since its answer was not evident in either drawing (both drawings employ one and two point perspective); A student would have had to carefully comprehend the question including the word "only," in addition to carefully looking at each drawing for its evidence of linear perspective; Linear Perspective is a complex drawing system that requires more class time to build student comprehension (and time is limited since ART110 covers an overview of many drawing concepts). <p>(05/12/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Randall V Bloomberg</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Harrison Storms,</p>	<p>Action: Develop a handout and/or an exercise or lecture that helps students comprehend the difference between one and two point perspective, including a caveat that both perspectives can be combined in a single drawing. (05/15/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Linear Perspective continues to be an area for improvement. Drawing Fundamentals is an introductory class. It is recommended that the school and the Art Department reinstate the course: Perspective Drawing. (08/28/2017)</p> <hr/> <p>Action: The Fine Arts Division and the College should reinstate the Perspective Drawing course that was cut a few years ago due to budgetary restraints. This course should be offered regardless of whether it meets minimum student enrollment. To cut courses based on such a criteria profoundly compromises the art program, student success, and a student's ability to complete degrees and certificates. In previous years, students could repeat Drawing Fundamentals (ART110) twice. Repetition allowed a student to explore the subject again or to study with another instructor. Since drawing</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>Willie Brownlee, Tom Kidd, Sandra Trepasso,</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>artwork A.jpg</p> <p>artwork B.jpg</p>	<p>is mostly a practice-based process, repeating the course for credit could increase student comprehension.</p> <p>It is important to note that drawing as exhibited and critiqued in contemporary cultural institutions and market places (i.e. publications, art galleries/museums, and the applied arts) is defined by pluralism. There is no standardization. With ten sections and nine instructors, our program echoes this diversity by presenting drawing concepts that are influenced by each instructor's personal experience as artists and teachers. Though this may make testing more difficult, any extreme standardization would be detrimental to the program, and to the art form at large.</p> <p>(05/12/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: A course proposal for Perspective Drawing is being developed by adjunct instructor: Richard Ewing, lead faculty: Joyce Dalall. (08/28/2017)</p> <hr/> <p>Action: The course objectives on record for ART110 were written when the semester was longer than the current 16 weeks. It may be advisable to rewrite and edit the objectives, such as eliminating the color component. Develop a list of course specific terminology to be used in all drawing classes.</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			(05/12/2016) Action Category: Curriculum Changes
			Action: Drawing Fundamentals (ART110) is an introductory course covering an overview of drawing topics. Perspective Drawing (ARTxxx) was offered as a separate course in previous years and should be reinstated and offered at least once per academic year. (05/12/2016) Action Category: Curriculum Changes
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students were asked to look at two images of drawings produced in an ART110 class, labeled X & Y (see related documents), and answer a series of multiple-choice questions. The following were the answers: 1. Artwork X, 2. Artwork Y, 3. Neither A or B. The questions tested a student's ability to identify in each drawing course-specific terminology and concepts. (Active)</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Ideally, success would be 75% of students submitting correct answers for each question. If we were giving a letter grade for this assessment, then 70% would be acceptable, but department standards are higher than the bare minimum.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>The following are the test questions with the multiple-choice answers. Percentages show how many students answered the question correctly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which drawing employs a linear technique? Artwork A 77% 2. Which drawing employs value (chiaroscuro)? Artwork B 90% 3. Which drawing employs only one point perspective? Neither A or B 66% <p>Total sections assessed: 8. Total students assessed 149.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data shows that students demonstrated an overall successful ability to identify course specific terminology and concepts in two out of the three questions. Students were most successful in identifying the difference between a linear drawing (Question One: 77%) and a value/chiaroscuro drawing (Question Two: 90%). The students were weakest in identifying the use of one point perspective in a drawing (Question Three: 66%). 2. The decline in comprehension for Question Three can be contributed to a number of variables: Question 3 was not 	<p>Action: This particular SLO is very difficult to access broadly in a course with 8 - 10 sections every semester and almost as many instructors. This SLO should be changed to something based more on demonstrated student learning through drawings, and not critique process. While the critique process is integral to the learning of art, it is a process that can't be easily standardized for so many different instructors. In add-on, As stated in previous assessment years, the Fine Arts Division and the College should reinstate the Perspective Drawing course that was cut a number of years ago due to budgetary restraints. This course should be offered regardless of whether it meets minimum student enrollment. To cut courses based on such a criteria profoundly compromises the art program, student success,</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>as straight-forward as the first two questions, since its answer was not evident in either drawing (both drawings employ two-point perspective, but not one-point perspective). In addition to carefully looking at each drawing for its evidence of linear perspective; Linear Perspective is a complex drawing system that requires more class time to build student comprehension (and time is limited since ART110 covers an overview of many drawing concepts). 66% is an improvement from the last time that this assessment was given. Previously students scored 55% on this same question. Faculty are successfully building better curriculum and giving the submit more time to produce improved scores. (06/14/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 77</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joe Hardesty, Katherine Sheehan, Thomas Kidd, Sandra Trepasso, Binh Ngo, Nicola Vruwink, and Joe Kabriel</p> <p>Related Documents: SLO_assesment_STUDENT_questionnaire_SP19_art110.pdf SLO_multi-slide.presentation_SP19_art110.pdf</p>	<p>and a student's ability to complete degrees and certificates. In previous years, students could repeat Drawing Fundamentals (ART110) twice. Repetition allowed a student to explore the subject again or to study with another instructor. Since drawing is mostly a practice-based process, repeating the course for credit could increase student comprehension. It is important to note that drawing as exhibited and critiqued in contemporary cultural institutions and market places (i.e. publications, art galleries/museums, and the applied arts) is defined by pluralism. There is no standardization. With ten sections and nine instructors, our program echoes this diversity by presenting drawing concepts that are influenced by each instructor's personal experience as artists and teachers. Though this may make testing more difficult, any extreme standardization would be detrimental to the program, and to the art form at large. (06/28/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>

ECC: ART 129 :Fundamentals of Color

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions															
<p>SLO #2 Hue and Color Scheme - A student will have a foundational understanding of hue, hue contrast and color scheme and demonstrate the ability to compose chromatically, appropriately applying an assigned color harmony to a color composition, which demonstrates a specific color scheme, hue contrast and chroma pattern.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students were given 2 hours and 45 minutes to use recently acquired critical and analytical skills to chromatically compose a pre-established composition by unifying the randomly assigned color parameters of hue, value, saturation and temperature into one viable arrangement in partial fulfillment of the required analytical and critical thinking core competencies for this class. This particular assessment focuses on harmony formulation and hue allocation, with attendant analysis of functionality within random value and temperature structures.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will score 75% (Satisfactory) or above on the SLO</p> <p>RUBRIC</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 129:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Harmony Formulation (ability to accurately apply the correct diagrammatic formula to the color harmony scheme assigned)2. Hue Allocation (ability to accurately designate a correct combination of hues in concert with the assigned color harmony scheme)3. Analysis of Functionality (ability to analyze and adjust the	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <table><tr><td>Harmony formul.</td><td>3= 18</td><td>2= 2</td><td>1= 2</td><td>0= 1</td></tr><tr><td>Hue Allocation</td><td>3= 19</td><td>2= 1</td><td>1= 2</td><td>0= 1</td></tr><tr><td>Analysis/Function</td><td>3= 17</td><td>2= 3</td><td>1= 2</td><td>0= 1</td></tr></table> <p>Observable Patterns</p> <p>A In the midterm practicum, students this semester on the whole demonstrated very strong competence with regards to Harmony schemes, Harmony allocations, and their overall Functional analysis as applied in a color composition.</p> <p>B There were three weaker students as is evidenced by the above data numbers. These students were very sporadic in their attendance and homework/classwork and their results show as much. These students had no declared (nor apparent) learning disabilities.</p> <p>C Although not statistically significant, the weakest area was Analysis/Function, having one or two less ‘As’ than the other categories. But altogether well above the expected 85% of students scoring 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO</p> <p>D The amount of time allotted the midterm was sufficient as all practica were turned in within the time parameters.</p> <p>What are the implications of the data relative to this course?</p> <p>The data gathered from this assessment indicate that overall, the lessons (as well as the lesson’s structure and time allotment) leading up to the midterm practicum are appropriate and successful in meeting the student learning outcomes.</p> <p>The application of the correct hue weights functioning well within the assigned temperature parameters was much improved from the last time this particular SLO was assessed (2015). A more rigorous color notebook</p>	Harmony formul.	3= 18	2= 2	1= 2	0= 1	Hue Allocation	3= 19	2= 1	1= 2	0= 1	Analysis/Function	3= 17	2= 3	1= 2	0= 1	<p>Action: None, as there is no prerequisite for this class that involves a considerable amount of color. This is a foundational class in color and the analysis of color as explored in this SLO is well-placed here. (09/15/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p>Action: None necessary as the results show overall student learning outcomes are being met and with the above listed focus on temperature in place, student application of their hue analyses should improve. (09/15/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <hr/> <p>Action: This particular semester was strong, the three ‘weak’ students were affected by their sporadic attendance and lack of rigor in their class/home work. That being said, I am looking to alter and improve another color notebook assignment regarding harmonizing hues by equalizing their relative chroma. This will only bolster the results we get. I feel that overall this SLO seems well set and cohesive for the students based on the assessment results. (09/15/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
Harmony formul.	3= 18	2= 2	1= 2	0= 1														
Hue Allocation	3= 19	2= 1	1= 2	0= 1														
Analysis/Function	3= 17	2= 3	1= 2	0= 1														

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>cohesion between harmony scheme and the requirements of the temperature, chroma and value structures)</p> <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria:</p> <p>Excellent (90%) Good (80%)</p> <p>Satisfactory (75%) Poor (70%)</p> <p>Unsatisfactory (69%)</p>	<p>assignment was implemented to good effect before the assessment was given and the bulk of the students aligned the hue weights correctly with a stronger understanding of the relative nature of temperature. Except for the three 'weak' students the class overall showed that it understood that the ability to compose effectively with hue (and to effectively harmonize hues within temperature parameters) requires an ability to analyze any scheme's warm and cool relationship, and not be formulaic about assigning temperatures. This was evidenced in the assessment. (09/14/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 87</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Richard P Ewing</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Richard P Ewing</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Harmony formul. 3= 23 2= 3 1= 0 0= 0</p> <p>Hue Allocation 3= 22 2= 3 1= 1 0= 0</p> <p>Analysis/Function 3= 18 2= 6 1= 1 0= 1</p> <p>Observable Patterns</p> <p>A In the midterm practicum, students on the whole demonstrated very strong competence with regards to Harmony schemes and their Functional analysis as applied in a color composition.</p> <p>B There was more variance in competence in regard to the Analysis of Functionality; there was a noticeable shift of proficiency in this area. However it was more in the application of the analysis than in the analysis itself.</p> <p>C The other two skill sets: Harmony Formulization and Hue Allocation, showed fairly consistent comprehension and competence.</p> <p>D The amount of time allotted the midterm was sufficient as all practica were turned in within the time parameters. (03/04/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Richard Ewing</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: none</p>	<p>Action: Possibly a full class session on the subject of the relative nature of temperature in any harmony combination should be proffered before the practicum. This can be part of the color notebook assignments. As with the value structure assessment last year I am of the opinion that repetition of actual attempts by the student is the most effective means of learning. To this end, the assessment could be given at a much later date in the semester to allow for further exposure and practice in applying harmonized hues within limitations, but it is valuable to see where the students stand after the initial introduction to these concepts and its current placement is well set. . (04/13/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: In the spring of 2017</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Project - Students were given 2 hours and 45 minutes to use recently acquired critical and analytical skills to chromatically compose a pre-established composition by unifying the randomly assigned color parameters of hue, value, saturation and temperature into one viable arrangement in partial fulfillment of the required analytical and critical thinking core competencies for this class. This particular assessment focuses on harmony formulation and hue allocation with attendant analysis of functionality within random value and temperature structures.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: These are the criteria that are used</p>		<p>the same changes were maintained for the class. This continues to show improvement. will continue with this current set up. . (06/13/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: For the spring 2016 I moved the assessment to mid week 7. This and a good amount of practical repetition appeared to ameliorate the results, functionality of harmony scheme was folded into another notebook assignment as well; this enabled the repetition required. Will continue to maintain this schedule. . (06/12/2017)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>to determine a successful assessment for Art 129:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harmony Formulization (ability to accurately apply the correct diagrammatic formula to the color harmony scheme assigned) 2. Hue Allocation (ability to accurately designate a correct combination of hues in concert with the assigned color harmony scheme) 3. Analysis of Functionality (ability to analyze and adjust the cohesion between harmony scheme and the requirements of the temperature, chroma and value structures) <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criterion: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (75%) Poor (70%) Unsatisfactory (69%) It is expected that 85% of students will score: 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO Additional Information: Date of Assessment: 3/27/2019</p>		

ECC: ART 130:Two-Dimensional Design I

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Formal Analysis - Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the principles and elements of design and the ability to use the formal vocabulary in the evaluation and analysis of works of art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p> <p>Comments:: Was scheduled for SP18 but was not assessed so moved to SP19</p>	<p>Project - Andrea Micallef, Walter Cox Students will be asked to create three compositions incorporating line, pattern, texture and value and write an analysis of their work using the formal vocabulary of the elements and principles of design.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The expectation is that 85% of students will score 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO.</p> <p>RUBRIC These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 130:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fundamental Composition- Before adding line, pattern, texture and value. 2. Design Process- Thumbnails, roughs and comps. 3. Application of Line, Pattern, Texture and Value 4. Use of the Formal Vocabulary of Elements and Principles <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (70%) Poor (60%) Unsatisfactory (50%)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>4/4/2014 - 42 students assessed from 4 sections</p> <p>Summary of Outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Fundamentals of Composition – Excellent 19%, Good 50%, Satisfactory 26%, Poor 5%, Unsatisfactory 0% 2) Design Process – Excellent 26%, Good 45%, Satisfactory 26%, Poor 3%, Unsatisfactory 0% 3) Application of Line, Pattern, Texture, Value – Excellent 16%, Good 48%, Satisfactory 28%, Poor 5%, Unsatisfactory 3% 4) Use of Formal Vocabulary – Excellent 21%, Good 54%, Satisfactory 19%, Poor 3%, Unsatisfactory 3% <p>The results from the data indicate that 88% of the students in 2 Dimensional Design (Art 130) achieved the target for success (75% or higher) for Fundamentals of Composition, Design Process, Application of Line, Pattern, Texture, Value and Use of Formal Vocabulary. The data also indicate that student achievement was fairly consistent across all measures and no particular measure stood out from the others in terms of greater or less achievement. This indicates that efforts for improvement should be focused on strategies that have the potential to raise scores in all areas, thereby achieving greater success in bringing more students into the Excellent category. (04/30/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Walter Cox</p>	<p>Action: Student success in studio classes depends on assimilating and utilizing both skills and theory. We will develop a new assignment that requires students to create their own examples of the elements and principles and we employ game strategies in small group settings to encourage discussion and evaluation. (09/02/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Follow-Up: Students were given a new assignment where they were required to illustrate each principle using every element in 64 individual compositions. Each composition shows the use of one element to create one principle until every combination of elements and principles is created. As they work through the project, students gather in small groups and work together to critique their compositions. (09/10/2015)</p>
	<p>Project - Students created compositions demonstrating how each element (line, value, shape, texture, pattern, volume, color, illusion of space, illusion of motion)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 130:</p>	<p>Action: Students working in small teams to critique each others work would help them learn how to use the elements and principles in practice. Rotating students so</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>can be used to create each principle (scale, proportion, variety, unity, focal point, balance, rhythm). Each student was asked to present their own designs and comment on the designs made by classmates during class critiques and then select the best seven images to mount as a final project.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Students created compositions demonstrating how each element (line, value, shape, texture, pattern, volume, color, illusion of space, illusion of motion) can be used to create each principle (scale, proportion, variety, unity, focal point, balance, rhythm). Each student was asked to present their own designs and comment on the designs made by classmates during class critiques and then select the best seven images to mount as a final project.</p>	<p>1. Fundamental Composition- Students are able to develop compositions that demonstrate an understanding of each element and principle.</p> <p>2. Design Process - Students are able to experiment with each element to create multiple possible solutions for the purpose of illustrating each principle convincingly.</p> <p>3. Analysis - Students are able to evaluate compositions critically and use the vocabulary of the elements and principles to make informed observations and suggestions.</p> <p>4. Vocabulary - Students are able to name and define each of the elements and principles of design.</p> <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (70%) Poor (60%) Unsatisfactory (50%)</p> <p>5/24/2019 - 71 students assessed from 3 sections</p> <p>1) Fundamental Composition – Excellent 7%, Good 38%, Satisfactory 31%, Poor 19%, Unsatisfactory 5%</p> <p>2) Design Process – Excellent 12%, Good 43%, Satisfactory 30%, Poor 10%, Unsatisfactory 5%</p> <p>3) Analysis – Excellent 25%, Good 52%, Satisfactory 18%, Poor 4%, Unsatisfactory 0%</p> <p>4) Vocabulary – Excellent 34%, Good 46%, Satisfactory 14%, Poor 4%, Unsatisfactory 2%</p> <p>The results from the data indicate that 89% of the students in 2 Dimensional Design (Art 130) achieved the target for success (70% or higher) for understanding the elements and principles of design and the use of the vocabulary. (10/09/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 89</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Douglas Angulo, Preston Craig</p>	<p>that they are not always in the same group will keep them on their toes. (09/18/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

SLO #2 Self-Critique - Students will be **Project** - Student will do a self

Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15

Action: Action Keeping students

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>able to demonstrate the ability to analyze and assess their own design projects.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>assessment assure of each element to create each principle. Students will use the rubric below to do a self-evaluation of their work and post it to Facebook.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 75% of students will show a minimum of Satisfactory growth.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed the assigned number of comprehensive thumbnail sketches and effectively self-critiqued their work on Facebook . 2. Student posted assigned number of projects on Facebook but had very little self-evaluation. 3. Student posted some thumbnail sketches on Facebook with minimal self-evaluation. 4. Student posted a limited number to no sketches with no self-evaluation. <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%)</p> <p>Project - Students create and mount two designs that illustrate the idea of contrast, which they present to their classmates.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The expectation is that 80% of students will score 70% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO.</p>	<p>(Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>A simple rubric was used. If the student did an excellent job communicating the content of their poster, their work was rated a "4". If a student did a good job, their work was rated a "3". If a student did a satisfactory job, their work was rated a "2". Unsatisfactory or incomplete work was given a "1" and poor work was given a "0".</p> <p>12 students were rated as excellent (71%), 4 student did a good job (24%) , 1 student was rated as satisfactory (6%), 0 students were rated as unsatisfactory (.0%).</p> <p>100% of class was rated as satisfactory or above. The class average was a 3.64 rating (09/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Walter Cox</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 130:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design Process- Thumbnails, roughs and comps. 2. Critique - In small groups/teams, students critique each others work and give constructive feedback 3. Vocabulary - Use of the formal vocabulary of the elements and principles of design 	<p>engaged and understanding the importance self critique is always challenging. Social Media as well as text book, lecture, internet resources and class discussion are all used to encourage the student to observe elements and principles in the work. (09/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: A work in class day that provided assistance on using light tables and a variety of professional tools and materials which will assist in expressing the different types of lines that are used to communicate the different moods on the subject that was chosen. (09/27/2017)</p> <p>Action: Have students present their work to the entire class using the appropriate vocabulary. (09/18/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Students' achievement ratings for each criteria:
 Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (70%) Poor (60%)
 Unsatisfactory (50%)

5/24/2019 - 71 students assessed from 3 sections

1) Design Process – Excellent 34%, Good 57%, Satisfactory 8%, Poor 1%, Unsatisfactory 0%
 2) Critique – Excellent 65%, Good 26%, Satisfactory 9%, Poor 0%, Unsatisfactory 0%
 3) Vocabulary – Excellent 59%, Good 31%, Satisfactory 10%, Poor 0%, Unsatisfactory 0%

The results from the data indicate that 99.66% of the students in 2 Dimensional Design (Art 130) achieved the target for success (70% or higher) for their ability to critique their own work. (10/09/2019)

% of Success for this SLO: 99.66

Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef

Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Douglas Angulo,
 Preston Craig

ECC: ART 131:Lettering and Typography I

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Evaluation of Design - Students will be able to evaluate typographic designs for audience, meaning and effectiveness. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Fall 2013), 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students hand in a written evaluation of a typographic sample provided by the instructor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students receive a sample of a layout or design incorporating typography about which they are then required to write an essay evaluating the design in terms of the use of typographic hierarchy and emphasis in revealing the meaning of the subject to an audience. Students evaluate the same sample according to intended audience and clarity of meaning. <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment of Art 131.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Hierarchy Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Emphasis Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Audience Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Meaning <p>Students' achievement ratings for</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met In this ART 131 class the assignment was given and assessed on a percentage scale. 86% of the students were at 70% or above in the evaluations of the supplied typographic designs. 14% were below the 70% mark. (10/04/2014) % of Success for this SLO: 86 Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Fall 2013) Standard Met? : Standard Met 22 students from one section were assessed</p> <p>Summary of Outcomes Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample - Hierarchy 14% Excellent, 42% Good, 28% Satisfactory, 11% Poor, 6% Unsatisfactory Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample - Emphasis 11% Excellent, 47% Good, 36% Satisfactory, 3% Poor, 3% Unsatisfactory Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample - Audience 17% Excellent, 53% Good, 22% Satisfactory, 14% Poor, 6% Unsatisfactory Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample - Meaning 8% Excellent, 39% Good, 33% Satisfactory, 14% Poor, 6% Unsatisfactory</p> <p>The majority of students (over 70% in each criteria) evaluated scored in the Good and Satisfactory range of results, indicating that a few students (ranging from 6% to 20%) failed to successfully integrate the material few students were capable of mastering it beyond a basic understanding (no higher than 17%). Because the distribution of outcomes is relatively even across the entire criterion, it is appropriate to examine teaching strategies</p>	<p>Action: the intended action is give an additional list of vocabulary with each assignment to try and build up the students use of written communication skills when talking a bout visual elements. (10/28/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: This project has been revised to be a partner project. In doing this the hope is to proofread each others work and make one another aware of their partner writing skills. This project has also encouraged the instructor to encourage students to be more openly expressive about typos. (10/21/2017) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: After adding peer reviews this project remains to have the same results. ESL and remedial comprehension of English skills will keep any writing project at about the same level. Students come to my classes to explore success in the visual arts and struggle with the written word. (10/13/2019)</p> <p>Action: Revise teaching strategies by the introduction of the concepts earlier in the semester and reviewing and discussing with</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>each criterion: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (below 60%)</p>	<p>that will raise student success in each criteria. (09/27/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Walter Cox</p>	<p>students the application of the concepts to the projects they work on them. Critique sessions may successfully be utilized to query students about their understanding and application of the concepts related to the learning outcomes. (04/01/2014) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: Introducing these concepts earlier in the semester seems to have improved the use of hierarchy and an interest in the subject. The project change to putting the e history section after the hierarchy of meaning seems to have been a successful adjustment. (10/13/2019)</p>
	<p>Project - At the conclusion of this project students should be able to demonstrate that a typographic solution addresses a given audience. They should be able to evaluate their work for it's effectiveness to communicate using the Elements of Design. They should be able to compare and contrast what elements they would like to emphasize with the use of only black and white typography. Students will learn to identify their thought process. Standard and Target for Success: By the end of the course students will be able to layout and select text that and contrast the meaning by the use of layout the identical text. In doing this student will be able define and analyze the level of hierarchy in their</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met After giving this introductory the were evaluated on a percentage scale. In this ART 131 class the data show that 92% of the students developed an understanding of the vocabulary at a 70% or better level. 8% were below the 70% level. The 8% that were below either did not show up for class or the project was incomplete. (09/30/2015) % of Success for this SLO: 92 Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: The intended action is to try and engage all the students earlier in the semester by name so that they feel accountable. I see many student that feel invisible and seem to think it is acceptable to not turn in assignments. (10/22/2017) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: This introductory project has proven useful. After this project 95% of the student are able to use and understand the vocabulary of typography. (10/13/2019)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>layout solutions. Students will demonstrate this by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying opposing points of view with the same text • Demonstrate how to use hierarchy to influence the reader • Demonstrate how to apply the Elements of Design by the use only typography • Be able to present the design process of their project <p>Using the the following 30 point rubric is is expected that 90% of the students will score 80% of above on this SLO.</p> <p>SKILL 1 Basic Skills CRITERIA POINT 1 Follows Requirements, Craftsmanship LEVELS 1 5 Complete understanding of project, exceptional skill with media 4 Very good idea of the class 3 Above average art skills 2 Barely average grasp of directions, shows some skill 1 Does not meet expectation but has made an effort to produce workHigher</p> <p>SKILL 2 Higher Level Thinking CRITERIA POINT 2 Thinking Skills, Originality Creativity LEVELS 2 5 Unique, very original, individual; work draws the view in</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>4 Usually original, expressive</p> <p>3 Little effort is made to develop original ideas</p> <p>2 Seldom original, work possibly copied</p> <p>1 No original ideas</p> <p>SKILL 3</p> <p>Apply Knowledge</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 3</p> <p>Design Principles / Elements and Brand ID</p> <p>LEVELS 3</p> <p>5 Complete understanding, use of elements and principles</p> <p>4 Has very good idea of art intent; success of the media</p> <p>3 Work is effective but the intent is not clear</p> <p>2 Unclear thinking; little use of principles and elements</p> <p>1 No concept of art principles or elements</p> <p>SKILL 4</p> <p>Community Participation</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT4</p> <p>Effort to Learn and Master Skills to Produce Project</p> <p>LEVELS 4</p> <p>5 Learned and mastered the skills beyond what has been presented</p> <p>4 Has excellent command of the tools that have been presented</p> <p>3 Has good command of the tools that have been presented</p> <p>2 Has some command and success of the tools</p> <p>1 Has made little effort to learn the tools</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>SKILL 5</p> <p>Communication Skills</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 5</p> <p>Project Presentations</p> <p>LEVELS 5</p> <p>5 Gives clear reasons for the design thought process, excellent speaker</p> <p>4 Entertaining presentation, excellent speaking skills but design reasons are not clear</p> <p>3 Good speaking skills with some reasons for the design process</p> <p>2 Poor speaking skills with some reasons for the design process</p> <p>1 No concept of art principles, no contribution to critique</p> <p>SKILL 6</p> <p>Responsible Citizen</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 5</p> <p>Attitude, Constructive Critique Contributions</p> <p>LEVELS 5</p> <p>5 Very helpful, positive and considerate; motivates other students</p> <p>4 Is positive about projects, is helpful</p> <p>3 Is indifferent to projects, usually makes up work missed</p> <p>2 Is negative about projects, argumentative</p> <p>1 Un-involved in projects, feels no responsibility to make up work missed</p> <p>Project - Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO. These are the criteria that are</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>1) Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Hierarchy</p> <p>2) Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Emphasis</p>	<p>Action: I plan on continuing using this project as a way for students to learn about the vocabulary of typography. I plan on intervene with students earlier</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	used to determine a successful assessment of Art 131.	<p>3) Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Audience 4) Critical Evaluation of Typographic Sample-Meaning Students' achievement ratings for each criterion: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (below 60%) (02/09/2019) Number of Students who Participated in this Assessment: 28 Number of Students Who Successfully Met the Standard for this Assessment: 26 % of Success for this SLO: 96 Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Cherly, Dimson</p>	<p>to make sure they are successful in completing the project in the time frame given. (02/09/2020) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: At the conclusion of this project students should be able to demonstrate that a typographic solution addresses a given audience. They should be able to evaluate their work for it's effectiveness to communicate using the Elements of Design. They should be able to compare and contrast what elements they would like to emphasize with the use of only black and white typography. Students will learn to identify their thought process. (06/28/2019)</p>
<p>SLO #2 Typographic Vocabulary - Students will be able to demonstrate comprehension of typographic vocabulary by evaluating examples of design. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - After lecture, reading and project application students will be given a test on typographic vocabulary in the form of test. Student will be given a 100 point test. Standard and Target for Success: This test will be a percentage based test with 100-90% being excellent, 89 - 80% good, 79- 70 proficient, 69 - 60% poor. It is expected the 88% of will be proficient or better.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met This 100point test will be given as a midterm assessment. The test will be given as a fill in the blank type test. There will be 100 possible points. (09/01/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Cheryl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: After giving this exam I realized that my students did not have very good recall of the typographic vocabulary. So I have modified my project to include one that deals primarily with typographic terms. (09/10/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Project - Student will collect samples of typography which they define as good or bad. Student will organize samples into five primary typeface classifications, and create written</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Standard Met? : Standard Met The first project in ART 131 student were asked to do a project that demonstrated their understanding of</p>	<p>Action: This introductory project is no longer given is the first digital project. The modification has been made to give a opening project to make sure 100% of the students</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>descriptions for each classification. Student will also define which typographic samples are weak and delineate why. Student will use appropriate typographic terminology in these descriptions.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 90% of students will comprehensively and successfully complete project with satisfactory or better results.</p>	<p>typographic vocabulary. During the process of this project students were evaluated on the comprehension of the terminology. 91% of the students had 70% or better comprehension of the terms. 9% did not complete the project and were unaware of the terms. (10/21/2017)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 91</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>A simple rubric was used. If the student did an excellent job of typeface classification and supplied accurate written descriptions using appropriate terminology, their work was rated a "3". If a student did a satisfactory job, their work was rated a "2". Unsatisfactory or incomplete work was given a "1". 12 students were rated as excellent (70.6%), 4 students were rated as satisfactory (23.5%), 1 student was rated as unsatisfactory (5.9%). 94.1% of class was rated as satisfactory or above. The class average was a 2.65 rating. (09/01/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Ron Romain</p>	<p>have access to a computer. This has helped raise the success rate of this project. The plan is to make the introductory project a bit more comprehensive so that the rate of success of this project could be raised. (10/21/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Keeping students engaged and understanding the importance of this typographic vocabulary is always challenging. Text book, lecture, internet resources and class discussion are all used to encourage the student to observe typography in the world, and to be able to accurately express its effectiveness, or lack thereof, by using appropriate vocabulary. I will continue to search for new resources and visual examples to make future classes more successful. (09/01/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Project - In conclusion of the introductory project of ART 131 students will be able create and present a project in tradition and digital media that incorporates the use of typographic terminology. Students should be able to apply the Principles of Design to the use of black and white typography.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: By the end of the course students will be able to analyze and identify parts of the letter-forms and use</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>appropriate vocabulary to identify the basic historical movements in the development of type. Students will demonstrate this by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying the parts of a letter-forms • Demonstrate the differences of letter-forms as they relate to the history of type development • Demonstrate how to identify the parts of type by the use only typography • Demonstrate how to apply the Elements of Design by the use only typography • Be able to identify how type vocabulary relates to the history of typography • Be able to present the design process of their project <p>Using the the following 30 point rubric is is expected that 90% of the students will score 80% of above on this SLO.</p> <p>SKILL 1 Basic Skills CRITERIA POINT 1 Follows Requirements, Craftsmanship LEVELS 1 5 Complete understanding of project, exceptional skill with media 4 Very good idea of the class 3 Above average art skills 2 Barely average grasp of directions, shows some skill 1 Does not meet expectation but has made an effort to produce</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	workHigher		
	SKILL 2 Higher Level Thinking CRITERIA POINT 2 Thinking Skills, Originality Creativity LEVELS 2 5 Unique, very original, individual; work draws the view in 4 Usually original, expressive 3 Little effort is made to develop original ideas 2 Seldom original, work possibly copied 1 No original ideas		
	SKILL 3 Apply Knowledge CRITERIA POINT 3 Design Principles / Elements and Brand ID LEVELS 3 5 Complete understanding, use of elements and principles 4 Has very good idea of art intent; success of the media 3 Work is effective but the intent is not clear 2 Unclear thinking; little use of principles and elements 1 No concept of art principles or elements		
	SKILL 4 Community Participation CRITERIA POINT4 Effort to Learn and Master Skills to Produce Project LEVELS 4 5 Learned and mastered the skills		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	beyond what has been presented 4 Has excellent command of the tools that have been presented 3 Has good command of the tools that have been presented 2 Has some command and success of the tools 1 Has made little effort to learn the tools		
	SKILL 5 Communication Skills CRITERIA POINT 5 Project Presentations LEVELS 5 5 Gives clear reasons for the design thought process, excellent speaker 4 Entertaining presentation, excellent speaking skills but design reasons are not clear 3 Good speaking skills with some reasons for the design process 2 Poor speaking skills with some reasons for the design process 1 No concept of art principles, no contribution to critique		
	SKILL 6 Responsible Citizen CRITERIA POINT 5 Attitude, Constructive Critique Contributions LEVELS 5 5 Very helpful, positive and considerate; motivates other students 4 Is positive about projects, is helpful 3 Is indifferent to projects, usually makes up work missed 2 Is negative about projects,		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

argumentative
 1 Un-involved in projects, feels no responsibility to make up work missed

ECC: ART 132:Advertising Design I

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Design Idea - Students will be able to demonstrate ability to compare and contrast a variety of their thumbnail sketches and justify the development of a single design idea.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p> <p>Comments:: SP18 was on timeline but no assessment was entered; moved to SP19 by IP</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Critique of Projected Thumbnail Sketches over multiple projects. Compare and contrast work. Work should improve on second project. The amount of growth is evaluated on the second set of sketches that were presented in the 8th week.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 75% of students will show a minimum of Satisfactory growth.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed the assigned number of thumbnail sketches and scanned them for presentation. 2. Effectively presented the sketches to class 3. Accepted evaluation input 4. Showed growth in idea development presented with sketches 5. Was able to define prospective directions of development by comparing their work and that of others <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>March 12, 2015 - This assessment was conducted as part of the midterm evaluation. There was a 79% success rate of students completing this task with a "good/3" results. Students completed their sketches, scanned and prepared them for the in-class presentation. The students that did not achieve "good" results had sketches but did not scan them for presentation. These student presented in a pin-up form.</p> <p>I reviewed scanning and the importance of this process in the advertising industry. In following projects I had a much higher success rate of this process. (10/08/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Summary of Outcomes</p> <p>I started to have students scan and project their thumbnail sketches. This large-scale projection improved, student engagement and accountability. Students were evaluated on content, effectiveness of concepts, craftsmanship and ability to objectively compare their work with others. 38% showed excellent growth and were completely successful, 42% showed satisfactory growth and had adequate success, 12% had poor growth, 8% had unsatisfactory results. (09/11/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: I plan to continue this process and improve on it by asking students to share their work scanned and projected deeper into the projects. In this semester I only had students show work in this manor in the first phase. I plan on showing development work projected so as to better engage the whole class in the learning process and give the students the opportunity to compare and contrast their work with other students. (09/11/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: May 12, 2015: For my Spring 2015 Advertising 1 students I continued this method of projecting thumbnail sketches. The results have been very</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>positive in raising the expectation of the class as a whole. On May 12, 2015 my Advertising 1 students did a presentation of their campaign development process this presentation was evaluated on the rubric with the following results.</p> <p>46% showed excellent growth and were completely successful, 42% showed satisfactory growth and had adequate success, 12% had poor growth, 0% had unsatisfactory results. I attribute a very small class size along with a refinement of the process to this rather large raise in success rate.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed the assigned number of thumbnail sketches and scanned them for presentation. 2. Effectively presented the sketches to class 3. Accepted evaluation input 4. Showed growth in idea development presented with sketches 5. Was able to define prospective directions of development by comparing their work and that of others <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%) (08/31/2015)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Project - Students will demonstrate their ability to compare and contrast a visual concept by the critique process of their thumbnail sketches. The scanned sketches will be projected and evaluated by the class and then the instructor. Students will verbally give critique to their peer about what the most effective direction is. With this process student demonstrate their ability to justify an idea and compare their work to their peers.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: By the end of the course students will be able to analyzes thumbnail sketches and verbalization of their ideas will be evaluated on the instructors standard rubric. The rubric outlines not only the creativity of the idea but also the though fullness and way the ideas have been presented. Students will demonstrate this by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being ready for critiques with the required amount of ideas • Demonstrate how they envision their ideas and concepts • Demonstrate how they can draw their vision of an idea • Demonstrate how they can help their peers with their ideas • Demonstrating accept critique from peers <p>Using the the following 30 point rubric is is expected that 90% of the students will score 80% of above on this SLO.</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	SKILL 1 Basic Skills CRITERIA POINT 1 Follows Requirements, Craftsmanship LEVELS 1 5 Complete understanding of project, exceptional skill with media 4 Very good idea of the class 3 Above average art skills 2 Barely average grasp of directions, shows some skill 1 Does not meet expectation but has made an effort to produce workHigher		
	SKILL 2 Higher Level Thinking CRITERIA POINT 2 Thinking Skills, Originality Creativity LEVELS 2 5 Unique, very original, individual; work draws the view in 4 Usually original, expressive 3 Little effort is made to develop original ideas 2 Seldom original, work possibly copied 1 No original ideas		
	SKILL 3 Apply Knowledge CRITERIA POINT 3 Design Principles / Elements and Brand ID LEVELS 3 5 Complete understanding, use of elements and principles 4 Has very good idea of art intent;		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>success of the media</p> <p>3 Work is effective but the intent is not clear</p> <p>2 Unclear thinking; little use of principles and elements</p> <p>1 No concept of art principles or elements</p> <p>SKILL 4</p> <p>Community Participation</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT4</p> <p>Effort to Learn and Master Skills to Produce Project</p> <p>LEVELS 4</p> <p>5 Learned and mastered the skills beyond what has been presented</p> <p>4 Has excellent command of the tools that have been presented</p> <p>3 Has good command of the tools that have been presented</p> <p>2 Has some command and success of the tools</p> <p>1 Has made little effort to learn the tools</p> <p>SKILL 5</p> <p>Communication Skills</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 5</p> <p>Project Presentations</p> <p>LEVELS 5</p> <p>5 Gives clear reasons for the design thought process, excellent speaker</p> <p>4 Entertaining presentation, excellent speaking skills but design reasons are not clear</p> <p>3 Good speaking skills with some reasons for the design process</p> <p>2 Poor speaking skills with some reasons for the design process</p> <p>1 No concept of art principles, no</p>		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>contribution to critique</p> <p>SKILL 6 Responsible Citizen</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 5 Attitude, Constructive Critique Contributions</p> <p>LEVELS 5 5 Very helpful, positive and considerate; motivates other students 4 Is positive about projects, is helpful 3 Is indifferent to projects, usually makes up work missed 2 Is negative about projects, argumentative 1 Un-involved in projects, feels no responsibility to make up work missed</p> <p>Project - Presentation/Skill Demonstration Critique of Projected Thumbnail Sketches over multiple projects. Compare and contrast work. Work should improve on second project. The amount of growth is evaluated on the second set of sketches that were presented in the 8th week. (Active) Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 75% of students will show a minimum of Satisfactory growth.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed the assigned number of thumbnail sketches and scanned them for presentation. 2. Effectively presented the sketches to class 3. Accepted evaluation input 4. Showed growth in idea development presented with sketches 5. Was able to define prospective directions of development by comparing their work and that of others <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%) (02/09/2019)</p> <p>Number of Students who Participated in this Assessment: 24</p> <p>Number of Students Who Successfully Met the Standard for this Assessment: 20</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 83</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Cherly, Dimson</p>	<p>Action: Due to this project being due very early in the semester and requiring that a scanner/phone app and computer access are necessary area needed to complete this task after they have done the sketches the number of students that are not able to complete this early in the term are very high. I feel it is necessary to give this self evaluation or ideas early so student understand the demands of the class early. Action to be taken is to make sure the computer labs and in lab support is assailable to the students from day one of the semester. It was shocking to find that lab support was unwilling to help my students that asked</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>because they did not support my classes only 141.</p> <p>After writing to the department chair this semester hopefully this will be corrected. (02/09/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: I started to have students scan and project their thumbnail sketches. This large-scale projection improved, student engagement and accountability. Students were evaluated on content, effectiveness of concepts, craftsman-ship and ability to objectively compare their work with others. (06/28/2019)</p>
<p>SLO #2 Effective Visual Communication - Students will be able to create designs that demonstrate visual unity and justify its importance in effective visual communications.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students demonstrated the importance of effective visual communication when presenting their complete process of the final project.</p> <p>Student were evaluated on the following rubric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Complete understanding, use of elements and principles, and demonstrated very effective visual communication of an idea 2 Has very good idea of art intent; success of the media, is able to articulate about ideas but they are not always justified 3 Work is effective but the intent and clarification is not clear 4 Unclear thinking; little use of 	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>May 14, 2015</p> <p>Students completed their presentations with an 86% success rate of completing the task with "good /3" results. They were working with partners and presenting to guest "clients." These two factors along with a very small class contributed to the high success rate. A lot of in-class lecture and lab time was spent preparing the students for this task. One group was not fully prepared and did not present to the guest "clients."</p> <p>(10/08/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: I plan to continue to create one project per semester that include a group effort. The plan is to introduce this collaborative effort earlier in the semester to try and improve the total class semester outcome. (10/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>principles and elements, thoughts and ideas are scattered</p> <p>5 No concept of art principles or elements</p> <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%)</p> <p>BASED ON RUBRIC: It is expected that 82% of students will score 3 or above on this SLO.</p> <p>Project - Student should be able to a advertising campaign that has visual unity. Students should demonstrate their process in the form of a digital and physical processbook. The process and outcome of the campaign will be evaluated on a standard class rubric. This assessment will be done when the student is presenting their processbook and final advertising campaign.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: By the end of ART 132 students will be able to demonstrate how to produce an adverting campaign that is unified and has one message being sent to one demographic in a variety of mediums. The end product will be a processbook that demonstrates how they arrived at their solution. Students will demonstrate this by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being ready to present the digital version of their processbook 	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>87% of the students met or exceed the target of 70% success</p> <p>13% of the students were below the target of 70% success, these students did not complete all the homework and were often unprepared for the class critiques. (10/21/2017)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 87</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: Moving forward the plan is to personally contact students that are missing or unprepared for class. Improvement can be made by the instructor to attempt to engage 100% of the students in the first coupld weeks of school. (10/21/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how they envision they defined their target demographic through research • Demonstrate how they envision their ideas and concepts in the form of research and thumbnails • Demonstrate how they developed their idea • Demonstrate how they united their concept to different mediums • Demonstrate their organizational skills by how their book is organized • Demonstrate cohesive the campaign is when presenting their book <p>Using the the following 30 point rubric is is expected that 90% of the students will score 80% of above on this SLO.</p> <p>SKILL 1 Basic Skills CRITERIA POINT 1 Follows Requirements, Craftsmanship LEVELS 1 5 Complete understanding of project, exceptional skill with media 4 Very good idea of the class 3 Above average art skills 2 Barely average grasp of directions, shows some skill 1 Does not meet expectation but has made an effort to produce workHigher</p> <p>SKILL 2 Higher Level Thinking CRITERIA POINT 2</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Thinking Skills, Originality Creativity LEVELS 2 5 Unique, very original, individual; work draws the view in 4 Usually original, expressive 3 Little effort is made to develop original ideas 2 Seldom original, work possibly copied 1 No original ideas		
	SKILL 3 Apply Knowledge CRITERIA POINT 3 Design Principles / Elements and Brand ID LEVELS 3 5 Complete understanding, use of elements and principles 4 Has very good idea of art intent; success of the media 3 Work is effective but the intent is not clear 2 Unclear thinking; little use of principles and elements 1 No concept of art principles or elements		
	SKILL 4 Community Participation CRITERIA POINT4 Effort to Learn and Master Skills to Produce Project LEVELS 4 5 Learned and mastered the skills beyond what has been presented 4 Has excellent command of the tools that have been presented 3 Has good command of the tools that have been presented		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>2 Has some command and success of the tools</p> <p>1 Has made little effort to learn the tools</p> <p>SKILL 5</p> <p>Communication Skills</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 5</p> <p>Project Presentations</p> <p>LEVELS 5</p> <p>5 Gives clear reasons for the design thought process, excellent speaker</p> <p>4 Entertaining presentation, excellent speaking skills but design reasons are not clear</p> <p>3 Good speaking skills with some reasons for the design process</p> <p>2 Poor speaking skills with some reasons for the design process</p> <p>1 No concept of art principles, no contribution to critique</p> <p>SKILL 6</p> <p>Responsible Citizen</p> <p>CRITERIA POINT 5</p> <p>Attitude, Constructive Critique Contributions</p> <p>LEVELS 5</p> <p>5 Very helpful, positive and considerate; motivates other students</p> <p>4 Is positive about projects, is helpful</p> <p>3 Is indifferent to projects, usually makes up work missed</p> <p>2 Is negative about projects, argumentative</p> <p>1 Un-involved in projects, feels no responsibility to make up work missed</p> <p>Project - Presentation/Skill</p>		
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19	Action: Due to this project being

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Demonstration Critique of Projected Thumbnail Sketches over multiple projects. Compare and contrast work. Work should improve on second project. The amount of growth is evaluated on the second set of sketches that were presented in the 8th week. (Active)</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 75% of students will show a minimum of Satisfactory growth.</p>	<p>(Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed the assigned number of thumbnail sketches and scanned them for presentation. 2. Effectively presented the sketches to class 3. Accepted evaluation input 4. Showed growth in idea development presented with sketches 5. Was able to define prospective directions of development by comparing their work and that of others <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%) (02/09/2019)</p> <p>Number of Students who Participated in this Assessment: 24</p> <p>Number of Students Who Successfully Met the Standard for this Assessment: 20</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 83</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Cherly, Dimson</p>	<p>due very early in the semester and requiring that a scanner/phone app and computer access are necessary area needed to complete this task after they have done the sketches the number of students that are not able to complete this early in the term are very high. I feel it is necessary to give this self evaluation or ideas early so student understand the demands of the class early. Action to be taken is to make sure the computer labs and in lab support is assailable to the students from day one of the semester. It was shocking to find that lab support was unwilling to help my students that asked because they did not support my classes only 141.</p> <p>After writing to the department chair this semester hopefully this will be corrected. (02/09/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: Giving the students free access to the equipment at school and requesting the material early in the semester, scanner, phone app and computer access are necessary in order to pass my class increased students work. (06/28/2019)</p>

ECC: ART 133:Graphic Design

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Creative Problem-Solving - Students will be able to apply the creative problem-solving process by combining methods to create visually cohesive designs that successfully communicate the intended message.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students will create a poster design based on a single event from a single year in history. They will research their subject, develop text and graphics that communicate content and arrange it in a visually pleasing, conceptually strong final poster.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 75% of students will show a minimum of Satisfactory growth.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed comprehensive research on their subject . 2. Write a short paragraph to be used as copy for the poster. 3. Create suitable graphics to accompany the text. 4. Arrange text and graphics in a poster format that is visually pleasing and communicates meaning. <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>A simple rubric was used. If the student did an excellent job communicating the content of their poster, their work was rated a "4". If a student did a good job, their work was rated a "3". If a student did a satisfactory job, their work was rated a "2". Unsatisfactory or incomplete work was given a "1" and poor work was given a "0".</p> <p>2 students were rated as excellent (17.0%), 5 student did a good job (42.0%) , 3 students were rated as satisfactory (.25%), 2 student was rated as unsatisfactory (.17%).</p> <p>83% of class was rated as satisfactory or above. The class average was a 2.58 rating (09/10/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p>	<p>Action: Keeping students engaged and understanding the importance of composition, the design process and communicating a clear message is always challenging. Social Media as well as text book, lecture, internet resources and class discussion are all used to encourage the student to observe and self critique their work for clarity and hierarchy in their work. 09/09/2015 (09/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Implemented the class Facebook page to straighten the class engagement and understanding of composition. This is working very well. (09/28/2017)</p>
	<p>Project - For this project, you will be creating a 4 page (minimum) magazine article.</p> <p>Layout can be:</p> <p>2 Spreads</p> <p>Cover-Spread-Back Cover</p> <p>Option to do more. Emphasis is on</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Using the following assessment: Application of Design Principles with attention to hierarchy, balance, rhythm, use of grid, and user experience, 80% of the 18 students scored 80% or higher as assessed by completion of the project.</p>	<p>Action: Update smart cart so that students have access to computer and up-to-date software. (06/12/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Action: Make Art 141 Digital Art a</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>using the grid and the viewer's experience from beginning to end. You will also be submitting a Process Book with this project so be sure to keep and document ALL of your process.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will score 75% or above on this SLO.</p>	<p>50% (9) scored 90% or higher 30% (5) scored 80-89% 10% (2) scored 70-79% 10% (2) scored 60-69%</p> <p>Close examination of assessment confirmed that the greatest detriment to success was lack of process work, timely submission of process work, and execution of project. Overall, students successfully convey an understanding and application of Design Principles. (06/07/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 80 Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Nicola Vruwink</p>	<p>pre-req. (06/07/2020) Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>

ECC: ART 141 :Digital Art

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #3 2D Design Concepts - Students will apply 2D design concepts in the execution of original digital art projects.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - These assessments are from 5 sections of Art 141 Digital Art. Each instructor used a slightly different assignment, but all required the student to create an original vector drawing in response to a specific prompt such as: design a book cover for a children's book, or design a tarot card featuring an original character design. Students were to use 2D design concepts of color, value, scale, line, positive and negative space to create a successful composition. This comprised the "Aesthetic" portion of their grade.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Instructors expected 75% of students to score at or above 70% 4 sections used a 10 point rubric: 10/10 demonstrates excellent understanding of the use of these concepts in an illustration, 9/10 shows a good understanding, 7-8/10 shows partial understanding, 6/10 or below shows little understanding. 1-5/10 shows very little understanding 0/10 indicates that the project was not handed in</p> <p>1 section used a 4 point rubric: 4 Demonstrates full understanding of skills and concepts 3-Demonstrates some understanding of skills and concepts</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met Joyce Dallal, instructor (2 sections of Art 141) 42 students total 13 earned 10/10 30% 17 earned 9/10 40% 3 earned 8/10 7% 5 earned 7/10 13% 2 earned 6/10 5% 2 earned 0/10 5%</p> <p>Joy Curtis-Urlick instructor (2 sections of Art 141) 32 students total 8 earned 10/10...25% 11 earned 9/10.... 34% 10 earned 8/10 ...31% 1 earned 7/10....3% 2 earned 0/106% (because they didn't turn it in)</p> <p>Annette Owens, instructor (1 section) 24 students: 13 earned 4 points 54% 4 earned 3 points 17% 5 earned 2 points 21% 2 earned 1 point (or less) 8%</p> <p>In addition to these scores, all students who hand-in their work on time participate in a critique that involves the entire class giving feedback on their final work. (09/16/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Joyce Dallal Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joy Curtis-Urlick, Annette Owens</p>	<p>Action: Although our expectations of success were met, we felt that we can improve our feedback to the students. In looking over the results, we have decided to all switch to the 4 point rubric since those of us using the 10 point rubric did not even use scores of 1-5. However, we will adjust the rubric as follows to be more accurate and clear: 4- Demonstrates full understanding of skills and concepts 3-Demonstrates understanding of most skills and concepts 2-Demonstrates little understanding of skills and concepts 1-Does not demonstrate understanding of skills and concepts 0-Not turned in (09/16/2014) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>2-Demonstrates little understanding of skills and concepts 1-Does not demonstrate understanding of skills and concepts</p> <p>Project - For this assessment I decided to compare the aesthetic grades from the first assignment and the last assignment. Both assignments were animations, but they were using different software: the first is in Adobe Illustrator and the last in Adobe Photoshop. Although each application has different ways of creating graphics, the 2D design issues are similar as animation is essentially a 2D visual medium with the addition of time and movement. In evaluating the 2D design aspect of the projects I look at the overall composition and use of scale, positive and negative space, color, drawing skills, and mainly whether the subject stands out from the background sufficiently to follow the action. They are graded on a 4 point scale with 4 being similar to an A grade.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: I expected the beginning assignment grade to be lower than the final assignment grade and that is what I found. However, I did expect the beginning assignment grade average to be lower than it actually was. The average for the first assignment was 86% and the final was 94% which is an 8% improvement. The high score on the first assignment could either be a reflection of my going easy on</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

them since it was their first assignment, or it could be due to implementing a pre-critique of the work before they handed it in to look specifically at the 2D design issues and ways they could improve.

Additional Information: Sometimes it is hard to incorporate a discussion of aesthetics into these digital courses because there is so much technical information to impart as well as just teaching them how to use the programs. However, a focus on the 2D design aspect of the work can be achieved by using pre-critiques and evaluations, and showing examples of other types of 2D artwork. I think this assessment shows the value of doing this from the beginning to the end of the course.

ECC: ART 143 :Digital Design and Publishing

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions												
<p>SLO #3 2-D Design Concepts - Students will apply 2D design concepts to digital publications.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Assessment was attached to the midterm project. Students were asked come up with a design proposal for a publication by creating a mock up of the publication cover and sample of several interior pages. As part of the final grade, students received 10 points for effective use of 2D design concepts in their proposal.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Students were given 10 points in 4 areas: Technical, Aesthetic, Conceptual, and Presentation for a possible total of 40 points. The area relating to SLO #3 is “Aesthetic,” which includes the effective application of design principles (formal visual qualities). I expected at least 70% of students to score above 7 points. A successful design made effective use of images and text as compositional elements, color, value, and positive/negative space to effectively convey the message that needed to be communicated to the audience.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>These grades were specifically for the “Aesthetic” part of the total grade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students will apply 2D design concepts to digital publications. <table><tr><td>22 students total (1 sections of Art 143)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>7 earned 10/10</td><td>32%</td></tr><tr><td>6 earned 9/10</td><td>27%</td></tr><tr><td>5 earned 8/10</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>3 earned 7/10</td><td>14%</td></tr><tr><td>1 earned 5/10</td><td>5%</td></tr></table> <p>Art 143 is an intermediate class and many of the students have taken several art, design, and digital classes in addition to the required prerequisite of Art 141, so I expect them to already have a knowledge of design concepts. I have also met with the students individually and they meet together in groups to critique and improve their work as it is progressing. A score of 10/10 demonstrates excellent understanding of the use of these concepts in an illustration, 9/10 shows a good understanding, 7-8/10 shows partial understanding, and 6/10 or below shows little understanding. 0/10 indicates that the project was not handed in.</p> <p>In addition to these scores, all students who hand-in their work on time participate in a critique that involves the entire class giving feedback on their final work.</p> <p>(09/08/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joyce Dallal</p>	22 students total (1 sections of Art 143)		7 earned 10/10	32%	6 earned 9/10	27%	5 earned 8/10	22%	3 earned 7/10	14%	1 earned 5/10	5%	<p>Action: I think the fact that I did not even use scores of 1-5 shows that I should change my scoring to a scale of 3 points, which is what I use for technical exercises:</p> <p>3-Demonstrates full understanding of skills and concepts</p> <p>2-Demonstrates partial understanding of skills and concepts</p> <p>1-Does not demonstrate understanding of skills and concepts</p> <p>I think this scale would be clearer for both myself and the student, and also easier to use and interpret. (09/08/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
22 students total (1 sections of Art 143)															
7 earned 10/10	32%														
6 earned 9/10	27%														
5 earned 8/10	22%														
3 earned 7/10	14%														
1 earned 5/10	5%														

ECC: ART 144 :Three-Dimensional Computer Animation

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #3 Original Animation - Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of three-dimensional modeling and animation by producing a short original animation.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Assessment was conducted during submission of the semester's final project. The final project was a short animation consisting of an original, animated 3-D character. The project required that the students animate their character in a way that demonstrates the character's type and personality.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Students will be assessed on three different criteria from the class SLO. Results will be defined in percentages. Student can receive one of three assessments for each criteria: 1) They completely met the standard (100%); 2) They adequately met the standard (70%); 3) They did not meet the standard (0%). Based on my recent semesters' class results, I would expect that 90% of the students will achieve an overall score of 75% or better.</p> <p>Related Documents: ART-144-SPRING-2019-ASSESSMENT-GRADES.pdf</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Total Number of student assessed 14</p> <p>Assessment Results</p> <p>Number of students that exceed the standard (100%): 12</p> <p>Number of students that adequately met the standard (70%): 1</p> <p>Number of students that did not meet the standard (0%):1</p> <p>I was expecting a high rate of success due to the fact that as the semester progressed, I learned that many of the students aspired to be animators. Taking this into consideration, I transitioned from the modeling portion of the semester to the animation portion sooner than I have done in previous semesters.</p> <p>(09/14/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 93</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joyce Dallal</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: David Turner</p>	<p>Action: Action 08/21/2019 I will poll the students as to the degree of interest that they have in character animation and ensure that the students who are more challenged by character animation, received the appropriate assistance in completing this learning outcome.</p> <p>Action Category Teaching Strategies</p> <p>(09/14/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: I think that I can improve students' ability in animating their character by providing motion capture files that they can use as a base animation. They then can modify the base animation to suit their character's type.</p> <p>Action Category Teaching Strategies (09/14/2019)</p>
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>CRITERIA ASSESSED (Percent of students who scored 70% or better)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Original Character Creation (100%) 2. Original Character Animation (100%) 3. Presentation of Short Animation (75%) 	<p>Action: To improve student success percentages, I will increase the number of intermediate milestone deadlines during the production of the final project. I will also increase the amount of time spent on rendering and post-production for</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>Here is a breakdown of the students individual assessment scores (16 students total):</p> <p>10 students assessed at 100%</p> <p>4 students assessed at 70%</p> <p>2 students assessed at 0%</p> <p>It should be noted that the students who received a 70% assessment score submitted their animations late and the 2 students who received a 0% failed to present anything.</p> <p>14 out of 16 students (87.5%) achieved a total assessment score of 70% or better, which is less than my expectation of 90%. In order to improve the student success percentages, I will need to seek out a way to improve students' time management skills when it comes to meeting deadlines and completing projects.</p> <p>(09/09/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joyce Dallal</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: David Turner</p>	<p>the final film. (09/09/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ART 153 :Illustration I

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions															
<p>SLO #2 Design Tactics - Students will be able to effectively communicate visual ideas, narratives and opinions by appropriately applying various applications of design tactics emphasizing visual rhythm, balance strategies and a strong sense of depth.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students were given 2 hours and 45 minutes to use recently acquired analytical and creative skills to alter a composition in three different ways applying various design tactics to emphasize narratives, opinions or visual ideas:</p> <p>1) Enhance the energy dynamics (primarily rhythm applications)</p> <p>2) Manipulate the degree of visual tension (primarily balance strategies)</p> <p>3) Influence the sense of time analysis of mood. (depth and space allocation)</p> <p>In partial fulfillment of the required analytical core competencies for this class, the students were given 3 identical compositions on which they were required to display their understanding and command of narrative design (esp. rhythm, balance and space) for effective visual theatre.</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 153:</p> <p>1. Energy dynamics (ability to effectively enhance the conceptual energy level with the visual energy by adjusting the visual rhythm and cadence throughout the composition)</p> <p>2. Visual Tension (ability to manipulate the mood and stress of the visual theatre by aligning the</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <table><tr><td>Energy Dynamics</td><td>3= 16</td><td>2= 2</td><td>1= 2</td><td>0= 1</td></tr><tr><td>Visual Tension</td><td>3= 15</td><td>2= 3</td><td>1= 1</td><td>0= 2</td></tr><tr><td>Time and Mood</td><td>3= 18</td><td>2= 0</td><td>1= 1</td><td>0= 2</td></tr></table> <p>Observable Patterns</p> <p>A In this midterm appraisal, students on the whole demonstrated a very strong competence with regards to the three illustration skills assessed: Energy Dynamics, Visual Tension, and Time and Mood.</p> <p>B Application and strategies for Visual Tension showed a slightly wider range in competence than in the other skill sets. Although still successful overall, except for point D below.</p> <p>C The other two skill-sets, Energy Dynamics, and Time and Mood, showed strong comprehension and competence.</p> <p>D Atypically, there were 2 (possibly 3) students who struggled to achieve an understanding of the concepts and the task at hand with this SLO assessment vehicle. These students had what I would term as ‘obvious’ learning disabilities and really were either not prepared for nor appropriate for this class. Only one student had identified with the Student Services Center.</p> <p>D The amount of time allotted the midterm was sufficient as all practica were turned in within the time parameters.</p> <p>What are the implications of the data relative to this course?</p> <p>The data gathered from this assessment indicate that overall, the lessons (as well as the lesson’s structure and time allotment) leading up to the midterm are appropriate and successful in meeting the student learning outcomes. The data clearly shows the contrast between the average</p>	Energy Dynamics	3= 16	2= 2	1= 2	0= 1	Visual Tension	3= 15	2= 3	1= 1	0= 2	Time and Mood	3= 18	2= 0	1= 1	0= 2	<p>Action: The specifics addressed here are somewhat unique to the field of illustration, (although they have many practical applications in varying fields following), and for most students of visual art these cannot be appropriately addressed in any prior or prerequisite classes. On a larger note, a uniform attitude towards assigning and rigorously requiring copious preliminary studies in any concept-based communicative art class would acclimate the student to expanding their explorations and applying learned visual strategies, as those assessed above, more successfully. There seems to be a noticeable increase over the last few semesters of students with obvious learning disabilities. I’ve had classes with a number of students afflicted with Asperger’s syndrome, Autism, Functioning Autism, ADHD, ADD, Anxiety Disorders, OCD, Gender Identification issues and other issues that were not identified to me (and I’m not proficient in this field to be able to ascertain the nature). I’m not sure why there is this increase nor how to effectively deal with their afflictions (the more severe) in terms of learning the class</p>
Energy Dynamics	3= 16	2= 2	1= 2	0= 1														
Visual Tension	3= 15	2= 3	1= 1	0= 2														
Time and Mood	3= 18	2= 0	1= 1	0= 2														

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>visual elements with appropriate balance strategies)</p> <p>3. Time and Mood (ability control the sense of immediacy and tone of the image by staging decisions and a judicious analysis of negative space)</p> <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (75%) Poor (70%) Unsatisfactory (69%) Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will score: 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO</p>	<p>student in the class and the two or three who were afflicted with a learning disability. I was not informed of the specific nature of their disability although one student informed me that he had documented his learning disability with SSC and had a note-taker with him during the class. These students account for the zeros in all categories: the 'declared' student achieved a level of conceptual success in this SLO by the end of the semester after many re-workings, however his drafting skill level remained at what I would call a 'grammar/middle-school level; the other student never quite understood the concept(s). (04/24/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 87</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Richard P Ewing</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Richard P Ewing</p>	<p>material. I understand from talking to some of these students that they are routed towards the Fine Arts division by their high school or other pre-college institution because they were absolutely not capable of success in other fields such as the sciences, math, liberal arts, medical etc. Fine Arts seems to be a dumping ground when all else fails and there is a lack of understanding that what we teach in this division is just as rigorous and challenging as other majors. We would do well to get the word out to those institutions, however I realize the challenge in reversing the stereotype. (09/14/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p>Action: None necessary as the results show overall student learning outcomes are being met and with a continuation of the above listed strategies, student learning should continue to maintain this level and excel. (09/14/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <hr/> <p>Action: The previously suggested twofold approach consisting of another competency-specific in-class assignment and practical repetition from the last assessment for this SLO ameliorated the student outcomes. -Earlier, an incisive in-class</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions															
			<p>assignment was folded into the preliminary studies for the larger project and bolstered the results; this continued to be the case. (aside from the two students mentioned above.) There was also more attention paid to thumbnail studies and rough sketches that incorporated a focus on combining strategies such as visual direction with proximity of elements; these aided in successfully applying visual tension (criteria #2) to the compositions. There must be awareness, however, that the results herein are well above expectations and the current teaching strategy appears quite effective as is. (09/14/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>															
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <table> <tr> <td>Energy Dynamics</td> <td>3= 20</td> <td>2= 2</td> <td>1= 0</td> <td>0= 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Visual Tension</td> <td>3= 18</td> <td>2= 3</td> <td>1= 1</td> <td>0= 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Time and Mood</td> <td>3= 21</td> <td>2= 0</td> <td>1= 1</td> <td>0= 0</td> </tr> </table> <p>Observable Patterns (Describe the patterns observed in the data.)</p> <p>A In this midterm appraisal, students on the whole demonstrated a very strong competence with regards to the three illustration skills assessed: Energy Dynamics, Visual Tension, and Time and Mood.</p> <p>B Application and strategies for Visual Tension showed a wider range in competence than in the other skill sets. Although still successful, there was a noticeable difference in proficiency in this area relative to the other skills assessed.</p>	Energy Dynamics	3= 20	2= 2	1= 0	0= 0	Visual Tension	3= 18	2= 3	1= 1	0= 0	Time and Mood	3= 21	2= 0	1= 1	0= 0	<p>Action: The specifics addressed here are somewhat unique to the field of illustration, (although they have many practical applications in varying fields following), and for most students of visual art these cannot be appropriately addressed in any prior or prerequisite classes. On a larger note, a uniform attitude towards assigning and rigorously requiring copious preliminary studies in any concept-based communicative art class would acclimate the student to expanding their explorations and applying learned visual strategies, as those assessed</p>
Energy Dynamics	3= 20	2= 2	1= 0	0= 0														
Visual Tension	3= 18	2= 3	1= 1	0= 0														
Time and Mood	3= 21	2= 0	1= 1	0= 0														

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>C The other two skill-sets, Energy Dynamics, and Time and Mood, showed strong comprehension and competence.</p> <p>D The amount of time allotted the midterm was sufficient as all practica were turned in within the time parameters. (10/07/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Richard Ewing</p>	<p>above, more successfully. (04/01/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p>Action: A twofold approach consisting of another competency specific in-class assignment and practical repetition should ameliorate the student outcomes.</p> <p>-An incisive in-class assignment can easily be folded into preliminary studies for a larger concurrent project, and would bolster the results thereof. - Further, thumbnail studies and rough sketches should incorporate strategies for increasing or decreasing the sense of tension (or lack thereof); a focus on combining strategies such as visual direction with proximity of elements might help bolster this application. There must be awareness, however, that the results herein are well above expectations and the current teaching strategy appears quite effective as is. (04/01/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: For this class in the spring 2017 (this class was shifted to spring semesters only from the previous fall semesters only schedule) I have created a specific powerpoint presentation and lecture that expands on strategies to achieve visual tension. However, this being a different group of students from the earlier</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Project - Students were given 2 hours and 45 minutes to use recently acquired analytical and creative skills to alter a composition in three different ways applying various design tactics to emphasize narratives, opinions or visual ideas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Enhance the energy dynamics (primarily rhythm applications) 2) Manipulate the degree of visual tension (primarily balance strategies) 3) Influence the sense of time analysis of mood. (depth and space allocation) <p>In partial fulfillment of the required analytical core competencies for this class, the students were given 3 identical compositions on which they were required to display their understanding and command of narrative design (esp. rhythm, balance and space) for effective visual theatre.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 153:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Energy dynamics (ability to 		<p>assessment I found it slightly vague on whether this improved results, or if this class was just a stronger batch of students. This is a problem I find throughout the entire SLO process. Overall results were stronger this semester.</p> <p>.</p> <p>(06/13/2018)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>effectively enhance the conceptual energy level with the visual energy by adjusting the visual rhythm and cadence throughout the composition)</p> <p>2. Visual Tension (ability to manipulate the mood and stress of the visual theatre by aligning the visual elements with appropriate balance strategies)</p> <p>3. Time and Mood (ability control the sense of immediacy and tone of the image by staging decisions and a judicious analysis of negative space)</p> <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (75%) Poor (70%) Unsatisfactory (69%) It is expected that 85% of students will score: 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO Additional Information: Date of Assessment: 4/24/2019</p>		

ECC: ART 160:Three-Dimensional Design

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Utilizing Materials - Students will be able to demonstrate basic competency in utilizing materials and methods appropriate for three-dimensional design.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Student's created ocarinas from clay that were required to both make a sound and be sculpted so that they displayed an image from the theme "Sounds of the Sea".</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>The standard for this project is that 80% of the students would be able to both make the ocarina make a sound, and model it into an image that reflects the theme "Sounds of the Sea".</p> <p>Students were assessed on a 1-4 scale, with 4 being outstanding, 3 good, 2 passing, and 1 poor.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>A series of materials were utilized during the course, ranging from Plastic Materials such as traditional clay to paper clay.</p> <p>Construction materials spanned from paper cut outs and folding, to construction materials, card board, card stock and foam board. Various attaching materials were used.</p> <p>58 of students began the class, with 55 completing with a grade of C or higher.</p> <p>The grouping success rates were: 4 did not complete the course</p> <p>3 completed the course, but received a grade of C or lower</p> <p>52 completed the course with a grade of B or higher</p> <p>43 this many completed the testing with a grade of A.</p> <p>The overall success rate for the course, based on the parameters of 3 points or hires is 89%.</p> <p>This is above/below the set goal at this time, and Above/Below the % from 3 years ago.</p> <p>Here are the grades for 3-D</p> <p>Art 160 5130</p> <p>20 A</p> <p>8 B</p> <p>1 F</p> <p>2 W</p> <p>Art 160 5131</p> <p>23 A</p> <p>1 B</p> <p>2 C</p> <p>1 W</p> <p>(08/19/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 89</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Pam Huth</p>	<p>Action: Based on these numbers and a review of the last two reviews, I would recommend that we continue with our process. Given that we have an experienced assistant professor with a proven and consistent testing record, I believe that both the range of materials and the skills sets designed into the projects, and the student's outcomes justifies no formal modifications. (08/19/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 46 students: 34 had a score of 4, or roughly 75%</p> <p>7 had scores of 3, roughly 16%</p> <p>3 had scores of 2, roughly 6%</p> <p>2 had poor scores. roughly 4%</p> <p>(09/11/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russ McMillin</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Pam Huth</p>	<p>Action: Over the course of several semesters, Pam Huth and I had discussed ways to improve our grading rubric, so that the scale was more detailed and broke down the process for success more clearly for the students. Presently Pam came up with a possible 10 point model, which is being tested out in both the 3D courses and in Beginning Sculpture. At the same time, we are still using the original 4 point system, so that we can compare results. (10/14/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Although the 10 point grading standard worked fine, we saw little benefit from the 4 point standard. Basically the grades were virtually the same. The down side of the 10 point system is that it seemed to encourage students to be a little more combative at grading time, with critique grades and final grades taking longer to address without any greater benefit to the student or faculty. (09/05/2017)</p>

ECC: ART 161:Beginning Ceramics

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																																
<p>SLO #2 Building and Forming - Students will be able to show competency in basic building and forming techniques of ceramic art through their creations.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students will use specific tools and skills, clearly demonstrated in class, to create 4 cylinders that will be measured for correct height and thickness as well as visual quality and appropriate level of craftsmanship.</p> <p>Tools used: Sponge, Wooden Stick, Wire Tool, Potters Wheel</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: There are 4 areas of assessment: 1. Height 2. Thickness 3. Visual Quality 4. Craftsmanship</p> <p>Each student is assessed on a scale from 1. Poor 2. Average 3. Good 4. Exceptional</p> <p>Each cylinder must be 4 inches or taller and ½ inch or thinner with even wall thickness top to bottom. Cylinders must be smooth and evenly thrown showing a reasonable level of craftsmanship. Students have 3 weeks to complete task. In that 3 week time period, Students are show each day what is expected and how to accomplish the task.</p> <p>Target for Success is 80% or more performing at the Average or higher level.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Total students assessed: 50.</p> <table><tr><td>Height:</td><td>Poor</td><td>2</td><td>Average</td><td>40</td><td>Good</td><td>8</td><td>Exceptional</td></tr><tr><td>Thickness</td><td>Poor</td><td>10</td><td>Average</td><td>30</td><td>Good</td><td>10</td><td>Exceptional</td></tr><tr><td>Visual Quality</td><td>Poor</td><td>Average</td><td>32</td><td>Good</td><td>18</td><td>Exceptional</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Craftsmanship</td><td>Poor</td><td>Average</td><td>30</td><td>Good</td><td>20</td><td>Exceptional</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>I use a six- step method to teach students how to throw cylinders with a clear demonstration of tool use and technique. The data shows that students understand and have a high level of success. 98% performed at the Average or higher level having never thrown on the potter’s wheel. One trend to be noted is in the assessment area of thickness. Students had the most trouble with this area. This is a skill that is improved with practice. Like golf or basketball or any coordination skill, practice and repetition is needed. One semester is only enough time to introduce the skill. More levels and class repeatability are needed to master the skill.</p> <p>My six-step method is very effective but there is a small percentage still not getting it. More time to practice and perfect cylinders and achieve the correct wall thickness would help. Also more individual instruction for students struggling with the assignment will help improve their success. Making students aware of youtube videos of throwing demonstrations is something to consider. The program or College could support these recommendations by providing better internet access in the classroom as well as projection support for the ceramics area. (09/25/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Vince Palacios</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14</p>	Height:	Poor	2	Average	40	Good	8	Exceptional	Thickness	Poor	10	Average	30	Good	10	Exceptional	Visual Quality	Poor	Average	32	Good	18	Exceptional		Craftsmanship	Poor	Average	30	Good	20	Exceptional		<p>Action: No action is needed at this time. The high level of success shows that the class is accomplishing it's objectives. I will watch for trends which might suggest needed changes. (09/25/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: No action is needed at this</p>
Height:	Poor	2	Average	40	Good	8	Exceptional																												
Thickness	Poor	10	Average	30	Good	10	Exceptional																												
Visual Quality	Poor	Average	32	Good	18	Exceptional																													
Craftsmanship	Poor	Average	30	Good	20	Exceptional																													

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																																
		<p>(Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Total students assessed: 78.</p> <table> <tr> <td>Height:</td> <td>2% Poor</td> <td>32% Average</td> <td>51% Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14% Exceptional</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thickness</td> <td>0% Poor</td> <td>46% Average</td> <td>50% Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4% Exceptional</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Visual Quality</td> <td>0% Poor</td> <td>30% Average</td> <td>61% Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8% Exceptional</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Craftsmanship</td> <td>0% Poor</td> <td>30% Average</td> <td>57% Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12% Exceptional</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Total 9% of all students performed at the Exceptional level</p> <p>55% of all students performed at the Good level</p> <p>34% of all students performed at the Average level</p> <p>2% of all students performed at the Poor level</p> <p>98% of all students performed at the Average or higher level.</p> <p>I use a six- step method to teach students how to throw cylinders with a clear demonstration of tool use and technique. The data shows that students understand and have a high level of success. 98% performed at the Average or higher level having never thrown on the potter's wheel. One trend to be noted is in the assessment area of thickness. Students had the most trouble with this area. This is a skill that is improved with practice. Like golf or basketball or any coordination skill, practice and repetition is needed. One semester is only enough time to introduce the skill. More levels and class repeatability are needed to master the skill.</p> <p>My six-step method is very effective but there is a small percentage still not getting it. More time to practice and perfect cylinders and achieve the correct wall thickness</p>	Height:	2% Poor	32% Average	51% Good	14% Exceptional				Thickness	0% Poor	46% Average	50% Good	4% Exceptional				Visual Quality	0% Poor	30% Average	61% Good	8% Exceptional				Craftsmanship	0% Poor	30% Average	57% Good	12% Exceptional				<p>time. The high level of success shows that the class is accomplishing it's objectives. I will watch for trends which might suggest needed changes. (08/31/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Will keep an eye on student success to determine the need for future changes to class instruction. (10/19/2015)</p>
Height:	2% Poor	32% Average	51% Good																																
14% Exceptional																																			
Thickness	0% Poor	46% Average	50% Good																																
4% Exceptional																																			
Visual Quality	0% Poor	30% Average	61% Good																																
8% Exceptional																																			
Craftsmanship	0% Poor	30% Average	57% Good																																
12% Exceptional																																			

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will use specific tools and skills, clearly demonstrated in class, to create 4 cylinders that will be measured for correct height and thickness as well as visual quality and appropriate level of craftsmanship. Tools used: Sponge, Wooden Stick, Wire Tool, Potters Wheel Standard and Target for Success: Standard and Target for Success: There are 4 areas of assessment: 1. Height 2. Thickness 3. Visual Quality 4. Craftsmanship</p> <p>Each student is assessed on a scale from 1. Poor 2. Average 3. Good 4. Exceptional</p> <p>Each cylinder must be 4 inches or taller and ½ inch or thinner with even wall thickness top to bottom. Cylinders must be smooth and evenly thrown showing a reasonable level of craftsmanship. Students have 3 weeks to complete task. In that 3 week time period, Students are show each day what is expected and how to accomplish the task.</p>	<p>would help. Also more individual instruction for students struggling with the assignment will help improve their success. Making students aware of youtube videos of throwing demonstrations is something to consider. The program or College could support these recommendations by providing better internet access in the classroom as well as projection support for the ceramics area. (09/03/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Vince Palacios</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--	----------------	----------------

Target for Success is 80% or more performing at the Average or higher level.

ECC: ART 173 :Introduction to Jewelry and Metalsmithing

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Define - Students will be able to define and give examples of terminology, methods, and materials appropriate to the beginning level jewelry and metalsmithing.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students were given a multiple choice quiz in which they were to select appropriate methods and terminology to describe the proper sequence and techniques required to create a cabochon set stone ring.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 80% of the students will score 70% or above on the quiz</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>10 students or 28% scored 4 or Outstanding on the Rubric, 19 students or 52% score 3 or Good on the Rubric, 5 students or 14% scored 2 or needs improvement and 2 students or 6% scored 1 or Poor. According to the data most of the students are able to meet the objective. Most students were able to use appropriate terminology and identify materials. Areas for further improvement lie in the criteria of proper identification of technique and sequence. (09/11/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Irene Mori</p>	
	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - The student was shown a completed brooch. After viewing the piece the student was asked to describe the materials, methods and sequence in detail used to fabricate the brooch in a written document.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Based on rubric it is expected that 80% of the students will score 3 or above</p>		
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Each student will turn in a notebook which identifies tools, techniques, and uses. Students will be assessed on their ability to correctly identify terms and tools. Each student will receive an A<B<C<D<F letter grade</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70 % or more will receive a C grade or higher.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>There were a total of 32 students participation in the assessment.</p> <p>8 students (24%) received an A grade</p> <p>19 students (59%) received a B grade</p> <p>5 students (15%) received a C grade</p> <p>The results demonstrate that the assessment tool is appropriate for beginning level class. The high level of success confirms this. The majority of students received a B grade indicating room for personal growth as well as re-evaluating course expectations to challenge students further. (10/09/2019)</p>	<p>Action: Re-evaluating the difficulty level of the course in order to provide more depth in ability and understanding of course content. (10/09/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

% of Success for this SLO: 100

Faculty Assessment Leader: Irene Mori

Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Irene Mori

ECC: ART 181 :Beginning Sculpture

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Utilizing Material - Students will be able to demonstrate basic competency in utilizing sculptural materials and methods in their design projects.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Working with ideas the students generated from the examination of chosen words and the images they provoke in their mind, students were to combine and represent these words in a 3 dimensional sculpture in clay. They were assessed on whether they were able to translate the idea clearly and with craft, using water based clay and ceramic hand tools.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Students were assessed on the 1-4 point system, with 4 points being the highest score.</p> <p>The goal was for 80% of the students to receive a score of 3 or 4.</p> <p>In this assessment, there were a total of 30 students. Of them 13 students received a score of 4 and 14 received a score of 3. Only 3 students did not create a work that met with the criteria.</p> <p>Thus the results of the assessment indicated that 90% of the students were able to meet the desired scores.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>In this SLO we broadened student's outcomes with class materials ranging from basic mediums such as water base clay and synthetic clays the development of modeling skills, as well as their success at using various forms of detritus, mostly recycled products, to fabricate pre-designed objects. The basic objective was to see which students scored a 3-4 on a scale of 0-4.</p> <p>I have decided to include students who have dropped the courses for two reasons.</p> <p>The First being that I feel it gives a better understanding of not only Student Outcomes, but also the challenges we as faculty face in the classroom.</p> <p>Second, by excluding them, it appears to me that success rates have been and continue to be very good.</p> <p>Unfortunately, any increases in success can only be incremental.</p> <p>By including the students that drop, it demonstrates more the actually Student Outcomes success, but also where the challenge actually is in the Community College System.</p> <p>Basically, my thesis is that student success is reasonably good to even excellent in many of the courses provided, if the student has regular attendance and full engages in the class.</p> <p>The big issues, where the 30-50% of Classes and Students struggle is in keeping students in the seats and making strong efforts throughout the semester, and ultimately through their college career.</p> <p>Case Study:</p> <p>In these two classes we had 51 students at the beginning of the semester.</p> <p>Of these students:</p> <p>12 did not complete the project.</p> <p>3 students failed</p> <p>1 student received a C or 2 points.</p>	<p>Action: I am going to continue to include data on students that did not complete the class or course work. I will be including data reflecting percentages with and without the drops. The reason to include the drops is that they are by far the greatest challenge group, if we are seeking to improve Student Learning Outcomes. (08/19/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>Thus 35 students succeeded in meeting the desired outcomes.</p> <p>Overall, that is a 70% success rate.</p> <p>If one were to eliminate the students that did not complete the testing, IE Dropped the course.</p> <p>The rate would be closer to 88% success rate.</p> <p>(08/19/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 88</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p>	
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>The results of this assessment were higher than expected. Although this is a good thing, I am unclear whether this is a indicator of what to expect, or simple a higher than normal result.</p> <p>One possible reason for the higher than expected results in the 3D areas focus on hand skills.</p> <p>Meaning, not only in sculpture, but in Jewelry, Ceramic, and Three Dimensional Design, all faculty have similar basic skill set goals. (10/14/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russ Mcmillin</p>	<p>Action: We changed the textbook to provide students with images related to the assignments and topics covered in class. The text is also reviewed in class to make sure that students are exposed to the relevant information in the text. Lectures have been broken down into smaller units to expand on detail and make them more accessible to student learning. I am testing a new 10 point grading system to compare the results of this with my old 4 point system. (10/14/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Trends in the quality of student work seem consistent. There has even been an uptick in the number of students receiving scholarships to art schools. The ten point grading system worked fine, but there was no measurable difference in grades between the 10 point system and the 4 point system, except for complexity. In the 3D courses, the faculty</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			found that some students tended to be more argumentative about their grades when using the 10 point system. (09/05/2017)

ECC: ART 187 :Printmaking I - Etching, Relief, and Lithography

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #2 Analyze and Critique - Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique etching, relief, and lithographic prints using course-specific terminology.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Project: Students present completed print making artwork in an interactive critique format.</p> <p>Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze and critique their own and other's finished prints, demonstrating correct use of course specific terminology.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 75% of students will demonstrate "Fair" progress.</p> <p>Students were evaluated on 4 point scale, where students demonstrating "Excellent" analysis/critique skills received a 4, "Good" analysis/critique received a 3, "Fair" analysis/critique received a 2, "Unsatisfactory" analysis/critique received a 1, and "Poor/Incomplete" analysis/critique received a 0.</p> <p>Rubric: Excellent: 4 Good: 3 Fair: 2 Unsatisfactory: 1 Poor/Incomplete: 0</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met 12 Students were evaluated.</p> <p>6 students: excellent, 50% 4 students: good, 30% 2 students: poor/incomplete, 15%</p> <p>10 out of 12 students were rated as satisfactory or above (10/12/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Katherine Sheehan</p>	<p>Action: Engaging students in critique and self-analysis can be challenging. Exposure to outside artwork through slides, readings, and field trips are/can be used to encourage to participate in an expanded dialogue about artwork (05/12/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																								
	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will present their work at the end of a project to the class. They will use course specific terminology in their presentation. They will evaluate their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by the rubric to follow</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Based on Rubric: It is expected that 80% of students will score 3 or above on this SLO</p> <p>Additional Information: Grading rubric as follows:</p> <table> <tr> <td></td><td>Excellent</td><td>Good</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Average</td><td>Below Average</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Poor</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>(5)</td><td>(4)</td><td>(3)</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td>(2)</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td>(1)</td><td></td></tr> </table> <p>Technical</p> <p>Inking</p> <p>Craftsmanship</p> <p>Registration</p>		Excellent	Good			Average	Below Average			Poor			(5)	(4)	(3)				(2)				(1)		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>20 students were assessed.</p> <p>The rubric attached above shows the criteria for assessment in student critique.</p> <p>8 students scored 5 (excellent) i in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric</p> <p>10 students scored 4 (good) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric</p> <p>1 student scored 3 (average) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric</p> <p>1 student scored 1 (poor) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric</p> <p>(05/30/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 95</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kathrine Sheehan</p>	<p>Action: When students do not have a basic foundation of visual skills, creating prints is often very challenging for students. Two different approaches might help. The requirement of a prerequisite for Art 87 of the successful completion of 2D Design and/or Basic Drawing would mean students in the class could spend more time mastering the technical aspects of printmaking and less time working through basic visual foundational skills. Also, due to the complexity of printmaking processes, student would benefit from the option of repeating the course more than twice, as the mastery of printmaking skills is a long process.</p> <p>Because of the equipment and chemical intensive nature of the printmaking process, most of this work can only be done in the Print Shop under qualified supervision.</p> <p>The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing funding or support for a Print Shop technician and open studio hours outside of regular class time for students to work in the Print Shop. I periodically hold open studio periods on Fridays throughout the semester (about 6 hours, 3-5 times a semester), but regular access to the facilities supported by the ECC in addition to class</p>
	Excellent	Good																									
	Average	Below Average																									
	Poor																										
(5)	(4)	(3)																									
		(2)																									
		(1)																									

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Aesthetic		time for students, would be greatly beneficial to their work. (08/31/2020)
	Effective Composition		Action Category: Program/College Support
	Full range of values		
	Diverse range of marks		
	Conceptual		
	Ideas (as related to assigned theme)		

ECC: ART 195:Portfolio and Career Planning for Artists and Designers

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Develop Strategies - Students will be able to analyze various sectors of the art and design industry and develop strategies for portfolio planning and resume preparation for specific career areas.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Each student will create a written analysis of a career sector in the field of art and design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a potential career path, salary potential and top employers and/or galleries. • Identification of required education and/or certification. • Contact with one person in the desired career path. • Present findings to class. <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment of Art 195.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Career Research 2) Identification of Schools and Certification Programs 3) Networking Skills 4) Presentation Skills <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criterion:</p> <p>Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (below 59.999%)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>36 students from one section were assessed</p> <p>Summary of Outcomes</p> <p>Career Research 19% Excellent, 39% Good, 28% Satisfactory, 11% Poor, 3% Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Identification of Schools and Certification Programs 25% Excellent, 42% Good, 25% Satisfactory, 6% Poor, 3% Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Networking Skills 8% Excellent, 19% Good, 50% Satisfactory, 14% Poor, 8% Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Presentation Skills 14% Excellent, 22% Good, 53% Satisfactory, 18% Poor, 3% Unsatisfactory</p> <p>One hundred percent of students met the objectives, however there was a noticeable dip in outcomes when it came to students' ability to demonstrate Networking Skills. 8% of students scored in the Excellent category, 19% scored in the Good category, 53% were Satisfactory, 11% were Poor and 8% were Unsatisfactory. Although the expected outcomes of the combined categories were met with 86% of students scoring over 75% overall, this was clearly the lowest category with only 81% of students meeting the objective (09/27/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Walter Cox</p>	<p>Action: Include a new project where students must research contacts at a school, in an industry or at a business or studio. They would need to turn in their list of contacts and must have spoken to, or had correspondence with at least three individuals on the list. (04/01/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Follow-Up: Students researched contacts and were required to find one personal contact, one online and one through visiting a school, business or studio. They were required to hand in the name and contact information of the contact and a brief summary of their interaction. (09/10/2015)</p>

ECC: ART 205B:History of Asian Art - China, Korea, and Japan

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO#3 Communication - Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate ideas about Chinese, Korean, and Japanese art verbally or by written methods.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students were given a pop quiz asking to write a short paragraph identifying an artwork by focusing on medium, style, and cultural significance.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The quiz is a base measurement intended to be administered early in the term. Therefore, the expectations of communicating six elements within five minutes is low. It is expected that 60% of students would be able to communicate three or more ideas about the object.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Eighteen out of nineteen enrolled students took the pop quiz. Eleven out of eighteen students communicated three or more ideas about the object. This constitutes 61% of the students who took the quiz. (11/12/2019)</p> <p>Number of Students who Participated in this Assessment: 18</p> <p>Number of Students Who Successfully Met the Standard for this Assessment: 11</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 60</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Juliann Wolfram</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Juliann Wolfram</p>	<p>Action: I would not make any changes to this process as the SLO quiz was a great determinant for future curriculum emphasis in the latter part of the semester! This was a great way to establish areas that needed additional learning and it served as an excellent practice for later assessment. (11/12/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

ECC: ART 207:Art History of Mexico and Central and South America

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																																								
<p>SLO #2 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to analyze and explain content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of Mexican, Central and South-American art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment -</p> <p>Students were given a five page museum assessment activity on the eleventh week of the semester and they were given two weeks to complete the assignment. This gave them only two weekends to complete the assignment. At this point into semester it was expected that they should have a comprehensive understanding of the art historical movements and schools that they studied and the necessary skills to meet the class learning objectives. They were asked to compare and contrast two related and promising art works of their choosing from two different stylistic backgrounds that conveys a significant art historical shift. They were required to include proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, discussion of subject matter and iconography, and personal response.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80 % to 85% of the students will score 80% or above on the paper including: proper use of art historical terminology, formal analysis, discussion of subject matter and iconography, and personal response. (80% of the students will score 80-64 out of 80 possible points.)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>16 Students received the assignment and 14 students were evaluated in this comprehensive SLO assessment. For the first time I had a different crowd of students for this class. Most of them not ready for such a vigorous and advance course. For these reasons and since I could not scarify the standards several students by the time of this assignment dropped out. Therefore, the remaining students were ambitious with a great sense of responsibility and despites all the odds the standard was met and it was even a little above the expected target. 50% scored above 90% and 43% above 80% and therefore 93% of the class did above 80% and that is above the target. Only one student (7%) received 56% credit and therefore failed this assignment. The following chart reflects the breakdown of assessment data.</p> <table> <tr> <td>7 Students :</td><td>72-80</td><td>7 - 90%-100</td><td>50 %</td></tr> <tr> <td>6 Students :</td><td>64-71</td><td>5 - 89-80%</td><td>43 %</td></tr> <tr> <td>0 Students :</td><td>63-56</td><td>0 -79-70%</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr> <td>1 Students</td><td>55-40 1-</td><td>69-50 %</td><td>7%</td></tr> <tr> <td>14 students assessed</td><td></td><td>14 did</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2 students did not</td><td></td><td>2 didn't</td><td></td></tr> </table> <p>Art 207 originally had 26 students with several no show and W.</p> <p>A-COMPOSITION and Analysis (Student's Ability to Compose a Formal, College-Level Essay at the Skill Level of English 1A):</p> <table> <tr> <td>1. Introduction and Thesis Statement (6points)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>50% Excellent</td><td>43% Good</td><td>0 % Satisfactory</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>0% Poor</td><td>7% Unsatisfactory</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2. Mechanics of Writing (10points)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table> <p>(Paragraphs, grammar, punctuation, spelling, tenses, possession, word choice, syntax)</p>	7 Students :	72-80	7 - 90%-100	50 %	6 Students :	64-71	5 - 89-80%	43 %	0 Students :	63-56	0 -79-70%	0%	1 Students	55-40 1-	69-50 %	7%	14 students assessed		14 did		2 students did not		2 didn't		1. Introduction and Thesis Statement (6points)				50% Excellent	43% Good	0 % Satisfactory		0% Poor	7% Unsatisfactory			2. Mechanics of Writing (10points)				<p>Action: 1-Since the outcomes of this assessment along with the one given last year were successful I will not change this assignment unless I notice a significant shift regarding readiness and responsibility of the students.</p> <p>2-What is usually missing in our assessments are students who dropped the class towards the end of the semester and for this reason (I think) our assessments are not as truthful as it could be. Therefore, I will intensify my efforts and activities to prevent students with a poor educational background to remain in class and for this task to be done I need the full support of my division dean (more hours for TAs, consoling, etc.)</p> <p>(06/18/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: 1-Aside from students' responsibility and high ethics in doing their works several other factors contributed to great results which we achieved for this SLO (including a workshop concerning SLO assignment, clear guidelines, and providing extra help to those who reached out to me for help). Therefore, I will not only follow up on all these pedagogical class activities, but</p>
7 Students :	72-80	7 - 90%-100	50 %																																								
6 Students :	64-71	5 - 89-80%	43 %																																								
0 Students :	63-56	0 -79-70%	0%																																								
1 Students	55-40 1-	69-50 %	7%																																								
14 students assessed		14 did																																									
2 students did not		2 didn't																																									
1. Introduction and Thesis Statement (6points)																																											
50% Excellent	43% Good	0 % Satisfactory																																									
0% Poor	7% Unsatisfactory																																										
2. Mechanics of Writing (10points)																																											

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		50% Excellent 43% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	intensify my involvement with those who really need further help and assistance as a way to boost up the retention and success of the unprivileged students. 2- Art 207 is a very comprehensive and vigorous course and requires students with a solid educational background; for this reason alone I will do my best to actively participate with Counselling office to recruit eligible students. To further this task I will also advertise the course campus- wide. (05/18/2016)
	3- Analysis and Methodology (12points)	55% Excellent 38% Good 5 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	4- Use of Art Historical terminology (6points)	55% Excellent 38% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	SECTION A (1+2+3+4) Total (34 points):	52% Excellent 41% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	B- Identification (8points)	48% Excellent 45% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	C- SUBJECT MATTER/ICONOGRAPHY (8points)	50% Excellent 43% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	D- Stylistic Attributes (FORMAL ELEMENTS) (24points)	55% Excellent 38% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	E- CONCLUSIONS (6points)	45% Excellent 48% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	Total: A+B+C+D+E:	50 % Excellent 43% Good 0 % Satisfactory 0% Poor 7% Unsatisfactory	
	1- Excellent (A) = 100-90 % (80-72 Points) 2- Good (B) = 89-80 % (71-64 Points) 3- Satisfactory (C) = 79-70 % (63-56 Points) 4- Poor (D) = 69-60 % (55-48 Points) 5- Unsatisfactory (F) = 59-0 % (47-0 Points)		

Analysis: Students were successful in their ability to

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>formulate and articulate meaningful statements and documents and in introducing historical background. They also effectively utilized a basic set of interpretive tools in order to critically locate and understand the production, reception and application of visual codes, styles and techniques.</p> <p>Students also demonstrated their Visual Literacy, which is one of the primary goals of this class and one of the requirements of this SLO.</p> <p>Data indicates that students had a clear understanding of formal analysis, art historical terminology, and proper identification, and managed to incorporate that into their overall analysis. Overall, 50% of the class did excellent in all aspects of this SLO and 43% did well.</p> <p>Several different factors contribute to great result which we achieved for this SLO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A great majority of students who remain in class and finished the course were advanced and responsible students 2. We held a workshop for both this SLO assessment activity and Symposium which was another major assignment in this class which contributed to a better understanding and requirements of these assignments. 3. A worksheet was provided to students which helped them with their observation of the art works during their visit to LACMA. 4. I had spent a great amount of time with many member of this class who came for help. <p>In addition to above data the result for final exam and symposium (students did very well in these assignments as well) are other parallels which proof the success of this SLO assessment.</p> <p>(05/18/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Ali Ahmadpour</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p>	

ECC: ART 210:Drawing Fundamentals II

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Creative Drawing - Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to create compositions utilizing image manipulation techniques and creative invention in order to deconstruct, reformulate, and translate single and groups of objects into effective compositions employing the principles and elements of pictorial organization.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Fall 2013), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Portfolio - Review a portfolio of improvisational drawings, submitted by each student, that reflect image-manipulation techniques and contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two 18"x 24" improvisational compositions that represent the integration of an invented grid structure, assorted three-dimensional forms, and various invented textures, tones, shapes, and patterns using black and white drawing media. At least two 18"x 24" improvisational compositions that represent the integration of multiple views of a single object in conjunction with invented textures, tones, shapes, and patterns using colored pencil on colored paper. 	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Fall 2013)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Assessment Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33.43% scored a 4 (Excellent) 41.29% scored a 3 (Good) 25.28% scored a 2 (Satisfactory) 00.00% scored a 1 (Unsatisfactory) 00.00% scored a 0 (Failing) <p>Summarize the patterns observed in the data. Overall, 100% of the students assessed scored satisfactory or better in their ability to utilize image manipulation techniques, creative invention, and the elements of pictorial organization to create compositions based on a combination of formal analysis and improvisation. Although approximately 75% of students assessed scored good or excellent, 25% demonstrated only minimal ability to use the techniques and concepts taught in Art 210.</p> <p>What were the most important findings from the data?</p> <p>The data indicates that even though the current teaching strategies are effective for 75% of students assessed, there is a need to determine optional strategies for the 25% of students that performed at the satisfactory or minimal performance level.</p> <p>(01/08/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Willie C. Brownlee</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Drawing Fundamentals II_Grading Rubric_Fall 2013.doc</p> <p>Drawing Fundamentals II_ASSESSMENT DATA_Fall 2013.doc</p>	<p>Action: Small group critiques/demonstrations for students having difficulty understanding and implementing improvisational concepts and techniques taught in Art 210. (12/10/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: The faculty who administered this SLO assessment has retired. The Action for small group critiques /demonstrations is a good one. It will be considered the next time the course is taught. (06/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Project - For their final project, students were asked to use color drawing materials to draw a double self-portrait. A major component of</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the ten students assessed, seven of the students</p>	<p>Action: IN order to maintain a high success rate, current practices must be maintained to insure further success in the future. An</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>this assignment was creativity and interpretation. Their drawing was supposed to communicate something about their beliefs, personality, history, or emotions. In addition to submitting a drawing for review, each student was asked to write a written reflection about thier drawing and whether it successfully communicated what they intended. Students had regular small-group discussions with other students in the class about thier progress and the project culminated in a full class critique. A written rubric for grading and assessment purposes was used in determining student success. The rubric for the assignment measured creativity on a 10 point scale. Other factors were assessed on final project rubric, but for the purposes of this SLO, I will only be reporting performance one creativity component.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The rubric for grading and assessment measured creativity on a 10 point scale. A score of 8 or above was the target for success. 10 students participated in the assignment and were assessed.</p>	<p>received a score of 10/10; two of the students received a score of 9/10; one of the students received a score of 8/10. 100% of students met the target set for the assessment. (06/14/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joe Hardesty, Katherine Sheehan, Thomas Kidd, Sandra Trepasso, Binh Ngo, Nicola Vruwink, and Joe Kabriel</p>	<p>open lab has been added to the department offerings to help support students without a place to work off campus and it is our belief that this will further support student success. (07/01/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
SLO #3 Critiquing a Drawing - Analyze and critique drawings in terms of value and volume, proportion and placement, theme and concept, composition and structure, improvisation and expression, and technique and craft.	Presentation/Skill Demonstration - The final project for the semester was to create a double self-portrait from observation using any color drawing medium of the students choosing. The culminating step for this project was to attend a 2 hour	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>The professor who taught the only section of this class for years, has retired. There is no data to analyze. This course is taught in the spring semester. The new instructor will resume SLO assessment process. (06/08/2017)</p>	<p>Action: SLO action will be implemented by the new instructor. (06/08/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: New instructor has reviewed previous SLO</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>in-person class critique. Each student was asked to contribute to the critique with observations and suggestions. In addition to this verbal critique, students were also asked to write a reflection on their own work, breaking down and analyzing the formal qualities of their drawings, the conceptual foundation for their content, as well as observations concerning material and technique. This assessment is based on the verbal critique and the written self-reflection for each student.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of the students will answer the questions with a satisfactory result.</p> <p>Project - The final project for the semester was to create a double self-portrait from observation using any color drawing medium of the students choosing. The culminating step for this project was to attend a 2 hour in-person class critique. Each student was asked to verbally contribute to the critique with observations, suggestions, and responses to the work being reviewed. In addition to this verbal critique, students were also asked to write a reflection on their own work, breaking down and analyzing the formal qualities of their drawings, the conceptual foundation for their content, as well as observations concerning material and technique. This assessment is based on the verbal critique and the written self-</p>	<p>% of Success for this SLO: 85</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Willie Brownlee</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Randall V Bloomberg</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Total sections assessed: 1. Total students assessed 18</p> <p>1. The data show that the benchmark was met for all of the components of the grading rubric -- averaging the total student results, 95% of students met expectations.</p> <p>2. The results within the rubric categories were as follows: Value/volume – 10 Exceed Expectations, 8 Met Expectations and 0 Fell Below Expectations Theme/concept – 14 Exceed Expectations, 4 Met Expectations and 0 Fell Below Expectations Proportion/placement –10 Exceed Expectations, 8 Met Expectations and 0 Fell Below Expectations Composition/structure – 13 Exceed Expectations, 4 Met Expectations and 1 Fell Below Expectations Improvisation/expressi— 11 Exceed Expectations, 5 Met Expectations and 2 Fell Below Expectations technique/craft– 10 Exceed Expectations, 6 Met Expectations and 2 Fell Below Expectations</p>	<p>documentation and has integrated suggestions into curriculum per previous instructor's notes. (07/06/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Follow up will be implemented the next time the course is taught and assessed. (06/08/2018)</p> <p>Action: In the area of improvisation/expression, additional handouts and exercises will be added to curriculum to aid in student comprehension. The department just added Art Tutor and students will be encouraged to use art tutor to help insure success in this area. (06/28/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Improvisation and expression were given more attention in the Spring 2019 semester and readings were assigned that pertained to the subject. The department has had an art tutor for a year and some students seem to be taking advantage of that resource. In addition Open Lab hours for</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>reflection for each student.</p> <p>The rubric was broken down into the following categories for consideration and student performance during the critique:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value/volume Theme/concept Proportion/placement Composition/structure Improvisation/expression technique/craft <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will earn a result of Meets Expectations or above on the SLO.</p> <p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration -</p> <p>The final project for the semester was to create a double self-portrait from observation using any color drawing medium of the students choosing. The culminating step for this project was to attend a 2 hour in-person class critique. Each student was asked to contribute to the critique with observations and suggestions. In addition to this verbal critique, students were also asked to write a reflection on their own work, breaking down and analyzing the formal qualities of their drawings, the conceptual foundation for their content, as well as observations concerning material and technique. This assessment is based on the verbal critique and the written self-reflection for each student. The assignment had rubric that included a section about critique. Students were given a score on a scale of 1 - 5 for the</p>	<p>3. Conclusions – Although the standards were met, data shows the area needing improvement is Improvisation/expression, where 2 out of 18 students fell below the expectation. It is our intention to raise the number of students in this area. Better modeling of how to talk and write about improvisation and expression will hopefully raise this area in the future.</p> <p>(06/28/2018)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 95</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Ten students were assessed. Eight of the students received a score of 5/5 on the critique. One student received a score of 4/5 on the critique. One student received a scored of 3.75/5 on the critique. 90% of the students were successful. (06/14/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 90</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joe Hardesty</p>	<p>drawing students were added.</p> <p>(06/14/2019)</p> <p>Action: Critique is a difficult for some students to acquire. It takes repetition and practice, along with a little bit of self confidence. The biggest thing we can do as instructors is create a safe space and model "correct" critique etiquette and technique. Instructors are encouraged to keep doing this and to create a community within the classroom that will nurture participation in critique. (06/14/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--	----------------	----------------

critique component of the project
(Active)

Standard and Target for Success:

85% or higher of students
demonstrating understanding and
skillfulness around critiquing a
drawing would be success

ECC: ART 219:Watercolor Painting I

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Color Principles - Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to use basic color principles such as hue, value, temperature, intensity, complementary, analogous, and split-complementary to represent the effects of light, shade, space, and atmosphere.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 06/04/2015</p>	<p>Portfolio - Review a portfolio of watercolor paintings containing color-mixing studies, special-effects studies, and at least one finished painting based on these studies.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: BASED ON RUBRIC: It is expected that 85% of students will score 2 or above on this SLO.</p> <p>Related Documents: Watercolor Painting I GRADING RUBRIC_SP 2015.doc Watercolor Painting I ASSESSMENT DATA_SP 2015.doc</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met WATERCOLOR PAINTING I ASSESSMENT DATA SPRING 2015 TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN ASSESSMENT 13</p> <p>GRADING SCALE: 4 points = Excellent 3 points = Good 2 points = Satisfactory 1 point = Unsatisfactory 0 point = Failing</p> <p>LIGHT AND SHADE (Point Average = 3.62)</p> <p>Strong ability to create light and shade using basic color principles [8/13 = 62.00%]</p> <p>Moderate ability to create light and shade using basic color principles [5/13 = 38%]</p> <p>Minimal ability to create light and shade using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]</p> <p>Slight ability to create light and shade using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]</p> <p>Inability to create light and shade using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]</p> <p>SPACE AND ATMOSPHERE (Point Average = 3.62)</p> <p>Strong ability to create space and atmospheric effects using basic color principles [8/13 = 62.00%]</p> <p>Moderate ability to create space and atmospheric effects using basic color principles [5/13 = 38%]</p>	<p>Action: Offer Art 219 and Art 220 once per semester instead of once per year. (08/29/2015) Action Category: Program/College Support Follow-Up: reviewed previous action -- spoke with dean and we are waiting on offering the course twice a year. (02/21/2018)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		Minimal ability to create space and atmospheric effects using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]	
		Slight ability to create space and atmospheric effects using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]	
		Inability to create space and atmospheric effects using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]	
		COLOR MIXING [Point Average = 3.62]	
		Strong ability to mix and apply appropriate colors using basic color principles [8/13 = 62.00%]	
		Moderate ability to mix and apply appropriate colors using basic color principles [5/13 = 38%]	
		Minimal ability to mix and apply appropriate colors using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]	
		Slight ability to mix and apply appropriate colors using basic color principles [0/13 = 0%]	
		OVERALL POINT AVERAGE = 3.62 62.00% Scored 4 Points 38.00% Scored 3 Points 0.0% Scored 2 Points 0.0% Scored 1 Point	
		ANALYSIS OF ASSESSMENT DATA The assessment data shows a high degree of student success, however, through a combination of the elimination of repeatability and the reduction offerings of Art 219 and Art 220 to only once per year as part of budget reductions, the enrollment has dropped dramatically. A student would have to wait one year after taking Art 219 before they can take Art 220. This eliminates continuity from Watercolor Painting I to Watercolor Painting II and reduces student incentive to enroll. These courses need to be restored to their former offering of once per semester.	

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Project - Students were asked to create a watercolor painting on stretched paper of a still-life set up by the instructor. Based on the light and color conditions that students observed, they were supposed to create a painting that was faithful to what they saw. They were shown techniques and asked to demonstrate how to use hue, value, temperature, intensity, complementary, analogous, and split-complimentary colors to represent the effects of light, shade, space, and atmosphere. They were graded on a 20 point scale.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 85% of students should receive a score of 14 or higher.</p>	<p>(06/04/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Willie C. Brownlee Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Willie C. Brownlee Related Documents: Watercolor Painting I_GRADING RUBRIC_SP 2015.doc Watercolor Painting I_ASSESSMENT DATA_SP 2015.doc</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met Sixteen students were assessed. Nine students received a score of 20/20; three students received a score of 19/20; Two students received a score of 18.75/20; one student received a score of 17/20; one student received a score of 15/20 (06/14/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joe Hardesty</p>	<p>Action: The biggest area of improvement that students can make is in the area of color temperature and it's relationship to space/form (cool color recede). Students have difficulty observing this in still life. More attention should be paid to how this concept can be communicated during lectures and demonstrations. (06/30/2020) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ART 220 :Watercolor Painting II

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Improvisational/Abstract Context - Working from the general to the specific, students will be able to develop watercolor paintings based on assigned themes that describe and interpret geometric and organic forms within an improvisational/abstract context.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Portfolio - Review a portfolio of at least six watercolor paintings submitted by each student that demonstrate the process of working from the general to the specific given assigned themes that describe and interpret geometric and organic forms within an improvisational/abstract context.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 85% of students will score 2 or above.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met WATERCOLOR PAINTING II ASSESSMENT DATA SPRING 2015 TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN ASSESSMENT = 2</p> <p>GRADING SCALE: 4 points = Excellent 3 points = Good 2 points = Satisfactory 1 point = Unsatisfactory 0 point = Failing</p> <p>GENERAL STRUCTURE TO SPECIFIC DETAIL [POINT AVERAGE = 3.50]</p> <p>Strong ability to develop watercolors from general structure to specific details [1/2 = 50%]</p> <p>Moderate ability to develop watercolors from general structure to specific details [1/2 = 50%]</p> <p>Minimal ability to develop watercolors from general structure to specific details [0%]</p> <p>Slight ability to develop watercolors from general structure to specific details [0/0 = 0%]</p> <p>Inability to develop watercolors from general structure to specific details [0/0 = 0%]</p> <p>RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THEMES [POINT AVERAGE = 3.50]</p> <p>Strong ability to research, interpret, and develop assigned themes [1/2 = 50%]</p> <p>Moderate ability to research, interpret, and develop</p>	<p>Action: Offer Art 219 and Art 220 each semester instead of once per year. (08/29/2015) Action Category: Program/College Support Follow-Up: Enrollment remains an issue because of lack of continuity. Spoke with dean about changing this for 2018/19 school year and was given the impression that it will be seriously considered. (02/25/2018)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		assigned themes [1/2 = 50%]	
		Minimal ability to research, interpret, and develop assigned themes [0/0 = 0%]	
		Slight ability to research, interpret, and develop assigned themes [0/0 = 0%]	
		Inability to research, interpret, and develop assigned themes [0/0 = 0%]	
		IMPROVISATION AND ABSTRACTION OF FORM [POINT AVERAGE = 3.50]	
		Strong ability to reconfigure organic and geometric forms using improvisation and abstraction [1/2 = 50%]	
		Moderate ability to reconfigure organic and geometric forms using improvisation and abstraction [1/2 = 50%]	
		Minimal ability to reconfigure organic and geometric forms using improvisation and abstraction [0/0 = 0%]	
		Slight ability to reconfigure organic and geometric forms using improvisation and abstraction [0/0 = 0%]	
		Inability to reconfigure organic and geometric forms using improvisation and abstraction [0/0 = 0%]	
		OVERALL POINT AVERAGE = 3.62 50.00% Scored 4 Points 50.00% Scored 3 Points 0.0% Scored 2 Points 0.0% Scored 1 Point	
		ANALYSIS OF ASSESSMENT DATA Through a combination of the elimination of repeatability and reducing the offering of Art 220 to only once per year as part of budget reductions, the enrollment has dropped	

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		dramatically. A student would have to wait one year after taking Art 219 before they can take Art 220. This eliminates continuity from Watercolor Painting I to Watercolor Painting II. Since two students are statistically insignificant for serious analysis, I will not comment further.	
		(08/29/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Willie C. Brownlee Related Documents: WATERCOLOR PAINTING II_SLO ASSESSMENT DATA_SP2015.doc	
	Portfolio - A portfolio of work was collected and assessed for success in the area of improvisational/abstract painting Standard and Target for Success: 85% of students demonstrated success on their portfolio Additional Information: I believe this is a poor Learning Objective and should be changed in the future	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met Five students were assessed. All Five students successfully submitted a portfolio of work that included at least one project that demonstrated their understanding of improvisation/abstraction and it's development from a general to specific approach.. (06/14/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Joe Hardesty	Action: While success was achieved on this SLO, it is my believe that the SLO itself is somewhat flawed. It is too prescriptive in what it asks for and doesn't not allow for instructors to develop their curriculum in a manner more specific to their personal style/pedagogy. Watercolor II students shouldn't be required to work in an abstract manner if they do not wish to. This is a skill that is covered in watercolor I and does not need to be repeated at the second level in such a specific manner. (06/14/2020) Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process

ECC: ART 225 :Life Painting II

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #2 Analyze and Critique - Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique figure paintings based on technique, anatomical structure, media manipulation, color, theme, content, improvisation, and expression.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - there were no student enrolled in the section in the spring 2016 semester</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: there were no student enrolled in the section in the spring 2016 semester</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Total sections assessed: 1. Total students assessed 5</p> <p>1. The data show that the benchmark was not met on any of the traits. Overall, only 33% of students answered the questions correctly.</p> <p>2. The results were as follows:</p> <p>Which painting/s demonstrate contrapposto? Two out of five students answered correctly.</p> <p>Which painting/s utilize a triadic color harmony? One out of five students answered correctly.</p> <p>Which painting/s use color shapes and brushstrokes to describe the planes of the figure? Two out of five students answered correctly.</p> <p>3. Conclusions – With only five students assessed, each student carried a 20% value out of 100% for the class. Part of the disappointing results may be a combination of the SLO tool employed and a need to cover course specific terms more comprehensively.</p> <p>Question 1: Contrapposto is a term that is extensively explored in Life Drawing. Since Life Drawing is a pre-requisite for Life Painting, it was assumed students could identify this in a life painting. None of the figures were standing, so there was no contrapposto pose.</p> <p>Question 2: Color Harmonies are explored more extensively in the Painting Fundamentals class, since this is a pre-requisite for Life Painting, it was assumed the students</p>	<p>Action: To increase student comprehension, a handout outlining key terms can be distributed as a reference during discussion/critique time. (08/28/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: These teaching strategies were implemented. (06/06/2019)</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Rethink SLO assessment tool for future assessments. (08/28/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <p>Follow-Up: Both the SLO assessment tool was reassessed and the SLO statements were revised. (08/18/2019)</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>could identify a triadic color scheme. It should be noted, in Life Painting, color is explored more intuitively and observationally.</p> <p>Question 3: Both paintings exhibit value transitions, but one painting employs “blending” while the other does not. If “Blending” was included in the wording of the question, more students may have answered it correctly.</p> <p>(06/08/2017) Faculty Assessment Leader: Randall V Bloomberg Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Randall V Bloomberg</p>	
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Spring 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Met there were no student enrolled in the section in the spring 2016 semester (04/04/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Randall V Bloomberg Faculty Contributing to Assessment: none</p>	<p>Action: there were no student enrolled in the section in the spring 2016 semester (04/04/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Portfolio - Each student was assessed based on their final portfolios consisting of three in class paintings creating from a model, and one homework painting. The students were evaluated on the three SLO statement for 2019: 1. Figure Conception and Composition, 2. Value, Volume, Space, and 3. Color</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% OF STUDENTS WILL MEET THE EXPECTATION ON EACH OF THE THREE CATEGORIES.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met 1. Figure Conception/Composition: 50% of students exceeded the expectation, 50% met expectation. 2. Value, Volume & Space: 50% of students exceeded the expectation, 50% met expectation. 3. Color: 50% of students exceeded the expectation, 50% met expectation. Overall the students met or exceeded the expectation in each category. Their were only two students assessed with a 50/50 break in each category. (08/18/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Randall V Bloomberg Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Jennifer Phelps</p>	<p>Action: Same as Life Painting I: Utilize various teaching strategies that may more greatly inform students on color usage. This can include presenting successful color paintings, painting demonstrations utilizing successful color, and one on one (teacher/student) feedback during the painting process. (08/18/2020) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ART 230:Two-Dimensional Design II

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 Principles and Elements - Students will demonstrate an understanding of the principles and elements of design in the production of an original composition and show the consideration of multiple alternate solutions in the design process.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students will be asked to create a composition of cut paper based on a story or fairytale. Standard and Target for Success: The expectation is that 85% of students will score 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO.</p> <p>Rubric These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 230:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of Craft and Final Presentation 2. Design Process- Thumbnails, roughs and comps. 3. Development of an Effective Composition 4. Identification of How Elements Create Principles <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (70%) Poor (60%) Unsatisfactory (50%)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 6 Students assessed from 2 sections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Quality of Craft and Final Presentation – Excellent 33.33%, Good 50%, Satisfactory 7.66%, Poor 0%, Unsatisfactory 0% 2) Design Process- Thumbnails, roughs and comps – Excellent 50%, Good 50%, Satisfactory 0%, Poor 0%, Unsatisfactory 0% 3) Development of an Effective Composition – Excellent 33.33%, Good 66.66%, Satisfactory 0%, Poor 0%, Unsatisfactory 0% 4) Identification of How Elements Create Principles – Excellent 66.66%, Good 33.33%, Satisfactory 0%, Poor 0%, Unsatisfactory 0% <p>The results from the data indicate that 100% of the students in 2 Dimensional Design II (Art 230) achieved the target for success (75% or higher) for Quality of Craft and Final Presentation, Design Process, Development of an Effective Composition and Identification of How Elements Create Principles. The data also indicate that student achievement for Quality of Craft and Final Presentation and Development of an Effective Composition with only 33.33% of students achieving an Excellent rating. This indicates that efforts for improvement should be focused on strategies that have the potential to raise scores in these areas, thereby achieving greater success in bringing more students into the Excellent category. (04/30/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Walter Cox</p>	<p>Action: Changes to teaching strategies would be made to have students in Art 230 work with students enrolled in Art 130 (2 Dimensional Design I) in small groups where the more advanced students work with new students and demonstrate mounting and presentation techniques and critique work being done by Art 130 students. Having to demonstrate and critique key elements of the curriculum for newer students will assist older students in assimilating skills and knowledge. (09/02/2014) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Students were required to create two contrasting compositions using cut paper and in small critique groups were required to evaluate each others work in terms of the quality of craft, their design process, how effective their compositions are and the ease with which they can identify how the elements create the principles in the composition. (09/10/2015)</p>
<p>SLO #2 Analyze and Evaluate - Students will be able to analyze and evaluate, orally and in writing, two-dimensional compositions utilizing</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students complete a project for class and are required to analyze and evaluate their own work, write up a</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met A simple rubric was used. If the student did an excellent job</p>	<p>Action: Students engaged and understanding the importance self critique is always challenging.</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>the vocabulary of the elements and principles of design in the critique process.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>prompt explaining their work utilizing the vocabulary of the elements and principles. They then present their work to the class in an oral critique.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:It is expected that at least 75% of students will show a minimum of Satisfactory growth.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed an assignment designed to utilize the elements and principles of composition. 2. Written analysis of how they created the principles using the elements. 3. Students write a self-evaluation critiquing their own use of the elements and principles.. 4. Students present their work to the class orally using the proper vocabulary. <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%)</p>	<p>communicating the content of their poster, their work was rated a "4". If a student did a good job, their work was rated a "3. If a student did a satisfactory job, their work was rated a "2". Unsatisfactory or incomplete work was given a "1" and poor work was given a "0".</p> <p>2 students were rated as excellent (40.0%), 2 student did a good job (40.0%) , 1 student was rated as satisfactory (20%), 0 student was rated as unsatisfactory (.0%).</p> <p>100% of class was rated as satisfactory or above. The class average was a 3.2 rating (09/10/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Walter Cox</p>	<p>Presentation and class discussion are used to encourage the student to observe elements and principles in the work. (09/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: More classroom crit and discussion was used. this was encouraging to students and a much better understanding was observed. (09/28/2017)</p>

ECC: ART 231:Lettering and Typography II

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SLO #2 Creative Typesetting - Students will be able to develop a personal typographic aesthetic based on an understanding of creative typesetting. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/16/2013	Project - Working one-on-one with student to develop and execute a project which they define completely in terms of product, audience and media. Student will be encouraged to understand and explore their own style of typographic design. Standard and Target for Success: As this is an advanced class, I expect 100% of students to exceed satisfactory results.	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Standard Met? : Standard Met After looking at the percentage evaluation I have had 100% success of student successful at this SLO at an 80% level or above. The nature of the level 2 classes they are very small and consist of 1-4 students. Students that take level two instruction are very motivated and have had success in level one. (10/22/2017) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson	Action: The intent is to encourage more students to take level two studies at ECC (10/22/2017) Action Category: Program/College Support
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Standard Met? : Standard Met Students were given a grade for their projects. There was 100% success with a 75% understanding of the assignment. The level 2 sections that run with the level one Type class are attended by a very select group of students that have a true interest and understanding of typography. Thus the success rate is generally very high in my level 2 classed. (10/21/2017) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson	Action: Try and encourage more level one typography students to continue on with level 2 studies (10/21/2017) Action Category: Program/College Support
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Spring 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Met After looking at the percentage evaluation I have had 100% success of student successful at this SLO at an 80% level or above. The nature of the level 2 classes they are very small and consist of 1-4 students. Students that take level two instruction are very motivated and have had success in level one. (10/15/2016) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheryl Dimson	Action: The goal is to try and encourage more students to take level two classes. (10/22/2017) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met	Action: The action is to persuade more students to take level two studies at ECC. (10/22/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>Rubric: Excellent - exceeded expectations = 3; Satisfactory - met basic expectations = 2; Unsatisfactory - did not meet basic expectations. Only two students were in this section of Art 231. One student worked very hard and exceeded expectations in every way (rated as "3" - 50% of class). The other student did not work very hard, and did not communicate well, and only achieved satisfactory results (rated as "2" - 50% of class). The average student rating was 2.5. (09/01/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Ron Romain</p>	<p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Use social media to communicate with a broader base of students. Assign students to join the community. (10/21/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <hr/> <p>Action: I believe I could have improved one student's chance of success by more actively communicating with them. I believe they needed me to push them harder to meet deadlines and strive for better work. In future semesters of this class, I will emphasize good communication to the students and be more proactive in my communication. (09/01/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Performance - Working one-on-one with student to develop and execute a project which they define completely in terms of</p> <p>product, audience and media. Student will be encouraged to understand and explore their own style of typographic design.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Students that take this second level of typography are generally very motivated. Thus I would expect 100% success.</p> <p>Rubric: Excellent - exceeded expectations = 3; Satisfactory - met basic expectations = 2; Unsatisfactory - did not meet basic expectations. (02/09/2019)</p> <p>Number of Students who Participated in this Assessment: 2</p> <p>Number of Students Who Successfully Met the Standard for this Assessment: 2</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Cheryl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: Students that take this second level of typography are generally very motivated. Thus I would expect 100% success. (02/09/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: At the conclusion of this project students should be able to demonstrate that a typographic solution addresses a given audience. They should be able to evaluate their work for it's effectiveness to communicate using the Elements of Design. They should be</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

able to compare and contrast what elements they would like to emphasizes with

the use of only black and white typography. Students will learn to identify their thought process.
(06/28/2019)

ECC: ART 232:Advertising Design II

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Demographics - Students will be able to identify a target demographic for a product or service.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students defined and refined the demographic for an ad campaign. During their final presentation student defined their targeted demographic. This portion of the presentation was evaluated the following rubric.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <p>5 Learned and mastered how to define a demographic beyond what has been presented</p> <p>4 Has excellent understanding of what can define a demographic and how to apply it to advertising</p> <p>3 Has good understanding of the basics of what a demographic is</p> <p>2 Has some idea of what a demographic definition is</p> <p>1 Has made little effort to learn about how to define a demographic.</p> <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%)</p> <p>BASED ON RUBRIC: It is expected that 85% of students will score 3 or above on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>At the conclusion of ART 232 students were able to define a demographic and present the demographic as part of their research. This was evaluated that the time of the classroom presentations and critique. Due to the exclusive nature of level 2 classes there was 100% success rate and 80% or better. (10/22/2017)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheyrl Dimson</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>May 12, 2015; During the final presentations of the Spring 2015 semester students were evaluated with rubric. The class had a 81% success rate of scoring 3 or above. (09/06/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Cheyrl Dimson</p>	<p>Action: To broaden students view of demographic by per-setting a few pieces of the demographic. (10/22/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: In future projects I intend to have students narrow down their demographic further and further define the "type." With more discussion about what how a demographic can be categorized student will find it a better tool to inspire original ideas. (09/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Project - Students will demonstrate their understanding of this SLO in ART 232 by doing research of the service or product they will be advertising and defining a target</p>		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>demographic. They will create a persona around this target.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 100% success of student successful at this SLO at an 80% level or above is expected.</p> <p>Additional Information: The nature of the level 2 classes they are very small and consist of 1-4 students. Students that take level two instruction are very motivated and have had success in level one.</p> <p>Project - At the onset of a project students will define the targeted demographic for their project. Students will present this demographic as part of the research in a digital presentation to the class.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: This presentation will be evaluated on a percentage scale. The target for this level 2 class is to have 100% success at 80% or above.</p>		
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students defined and refined the demographic for an ad campaign. During their final presentation student defined their targeted demographic. This portion of the presentation was evaluated the following rubric.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>5 Learned and mastered how to define a demographic beyond what has been presented</p> <p>4 Has excellent understanding of what can define a demographic and how to apply it to advertising</p> <p>3 Has good understanding of the basics of what a demographic is</p> <p>2 Has some idea of what a demographic definition is</p> <p>1 Has made little effort to learn about how to define a demographic.</p> <p>Students' received rating for each criteria: Excellent (90%), Good (80%), Satisfactory (70%), Poor (60%), Unsatisfactory (50%) (02/09/2019)</p> <p>Number of Students who Participated in this Assessment:</p>	<p>Action: Students that take this level class are very motivated. Thus I would expect 100% success. I find that class participation at this level is sometimes difficult because of the lack of peers . So I try and keep them motivated by</p> <p>challenging them. (02/09/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Keeping the students motivated helped the environment of the class to engage all students into the project. (06/28/2019)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

1

Number of Students Who Successfully Met the Standard for this Assessment: 1

% of Success for this SLO: 100

Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef

Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Cheryl Dimson

ECC: ART 233:Graphic Design II

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Students will be able to document intermediate-level applications of visual culture, creative design processes, and problem solving skills to a variety of design problems.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/17/2014</p>	<p>Project - Using the provided book cover template or your own template (made to fit an actual book) you are to create a design that includes:</p> <p>Original conceptual image inspired by the content & subject of the book</p> <p>Integrate type and imagery into a cohesive narrative</p> <p>Use color to enhance conveyance of meaning</p> <p>Be sure to consider visual hierarchy principles for both Imagery and Typography</p> <p>Employ compositional skills in page layout design with the Typography, Grid, and Image</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>Students will be able to analyze and critique design projects based on intent and purpose, formal elements versus conceptual content, process and technique, aesthetic and expressive content, and preparation and presentation</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Assessment Tool: 10 points: Color, imagery, and composition, Attention to detail, type choices and layout.</p> <p>40% (6) scored 9-10</p> <p>27% (4) scored 8</p> <p>27% (4) scored 7</p> <p>6% (1) scored 5</p> <p>Most important finding showed students successfully understand and can apply sophisticated design principles and concepts into physical designs. Obstacle to success was time management and lack of process combined with poor attendance. (02/09/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 94</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Nicola Vruwink</p>	<p>Action: Require documentation of process submitted in stages as opposed to upon completion of project. (06/28/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Making the students show their process throughout the semester helped to improve their completed assignments. This helped them spread their work out instead of doing it last minute. (06/28/2019)</p>

ECC: ART 253:Illustration II

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																		
<p>SLO #2 Value and Perspective - Students will be able to effectively communicate visual ideas, narratives and opinions appropriately applying various advanced applications of narrative value role in terms of value key, value contrast, eye direction, and atmospheric perspective.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students were required to use previously acquired analytical and creative skills, and recently obtained ‘sequential/continuity’ competence to alter a composition in three different ways using narrative-value drawing techniques to:</p> <p>1) Manipulate atmospherics to vary the narrative implications effectively.</p> <p>2) Manipulate the dynamics combining varied energies in one stage (cat/mousetraps).</p> <p>3) Maintain an effective sense of depth without compromising the narrative value role; analysis of effectiveness of the overall visual theatre.</p> <p>In partial fulfillment of the required analytical core competencies for this class, the students were given 3 identical compositions on which they were required to display their understanding and command of value manipulation for effective visual theatre. These advanced students had to show a manipulation of focus for each image while maintaining an effective sense of depth (in this case using value contrasts for atmospheric perspective). These students were allowed more time than the one class session usually allowed, however none needed more than the 2 hours and 45 minutes typical of the class. (Active)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <table><tr><td>Shift. Atmospherics</td><td>3= 1</td><td>2= 1</td></tr><tr><td>1= 0</td><td>0= 0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Dynamism/FP</td><td>3= 1</td><td>2= 1</td></tr><tr><td>1= 0</td><td>0= 0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Series Unity</td><td>3= 2</td><td>2= 0</td></tr><tr><td>1= 0</td><td>0= 0</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Observable Patterns (Describe the patterns observed in the data.)</p> <p>N.B.: Typically it is a very small group of students who are enrolled in this advanced class, this semester had a total of 2 students. Ordinarily these students are high achievers, and are well prepared for the challenges of this class. Because of the two student status, a ‘pattern to observe’ is difficult this semester. I will proceed with the analysis as best I can.</p> <p>A In this midterm appraisal, students on the whole demonstrated a very strong competence with regards to the three illustration skills assessed: Shifting Atmospherics, Dynamics per Focal point, and Series Unity along with the attendant Sequential requirements.</p> <p>B Application and strategies for all three assessed skill-sets were competent or better. One student struggled slightly with consistency in atmospherics and Focal Point. This was mostly due to a tentative approach to value structure, there was a vague confusion of intent in the final image.</p> <p>C The other skill-sets: Series Unity, showed very strong comprehension and competence.</p> <p>D The amount of time allotted the midterm was sufficient as all appraisals were turned in well within the (optionally extended) time parameters.</p> <p>What are the implications of the data relative to this</p>	Shift. Atmospherics	3= 1	2= 1	1= 0	0= 0		Dynamism/FP	3= 1	2= 1	1= 0	0= 0		Series Unity	3= 2	2= 0	1= 0	0= 0		<p>Action: The specifics addressed here are somewhat unique to the field of illustration, (although they have many practical applications in varying fields following), and for most students of visual art these cannot be appropriately addressed in any prior or prerequisite classes. On a larger note, a uniform attitude towards assigning and rigorously requiring copious preliminary studies in any concept-based communicative art class would acclimate the student to expanding their explorations and applying learned visual strategies, as those assessed above, more successfully. (09/14/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Action: To address the issue above, it would benefit the student to require of them more time and consideration and mostly practice, the second student was in alignment with this SLO by the end of the class, or at least understood the mechanics in staging well, in not quite in practice yet. The instructor critique should continue to focus equally on viability of concept along with mechanics and staging. (09/14/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching</p>
Shift. Atmospherics	3= 1	2= 1																			
1= 0	0= 0																				
Dynamism/FP	3= 1	2= 1																			
1= 0	0= 0																				
Series Unity	3= 2	2= 0																			
1= 0	0= 0																				

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																								
	<p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will score: 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO</p> <p>These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 253:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manipulating Atmospherics (ability to manipulate the mood and atmospherics of the visual theatre by altering the value key decisions and effectively change the narrative) 2. Combining Dynamics (ability to effectively house contrasting energy dynamics on one stage in an appropriately narrative fashion) 3. Maintain Depth/Analysis (ability to maintain a believable sense of depth using atmospheric perspective while allowing for the mood and energy shifts per the demands of the narrative. Analysis of overall effectiveness of the visual theatre and adjustment strategy) <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (75%) Poor (70%) Unsatisfactory (69%)</p>	<p>course?</p> <p>The slight variation in results for the two students represent individual assertiveness and is in line with an expected growth arc. Overall the students had a strong understanding of all elements of the SLO in question. (04/24/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Richard P Ewing</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Richard P Ewing</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <table> <tr> <td>Manip. Atmospherics</td><td>3= 5</td><td>2= 0</td><td>1= 1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0= 0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Combining Dynamics</td><td></td><td>3= 6</td><td>2= 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>1= 0</td><td>0= 0</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Maintain Depth/Analysis</td><td>3= 4</td><td>2= 2</td><td>1= 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>0= 0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table> <p>Observable Patterns (Describe the patterns observed in the data.)</p> <p>N.B.: Typically it is a very small group of students who are enrolled in this advanced class, this semester had a total of 6 students. Ordinarily these students are high achievers, and are well prepared for the challenges of this class.</p> <p>A In this midterm appraisal, students on the whole demonstrated a very strong competence with regards to the three illustration skills assessed: Manipulating Atmospherics, Combining Dynamics, and Maintaining Depth with the attendant Analysis of the effectiveness of the visual theatre.</p> <p>B Application and strategies for all three assessed skill-sets were competent or better. Two students had a hard time maintaining depth with the use of high contrast elements in the background.</p>	Manip. Atmospherics	3= 5	2= 0	1= 1	0= 0				Combining Dynamics		3= 6	2= 0	1= 0	0= 0			Maintain Depth/Analysis	3= 4	2= 2	1= 0	0= 0				<p>Strategies</p> <p>Action: None necessary as the results show overall student learning outcomes are being met and with the above listed adjustments to the conceptual explorations in place, student learning should improve and excel. (09/14/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Action: The specifics addressed here are somewhat unique to the field of illustration, (although they have many practical applications in varying fields following), and for most students of visual art these cannot be appropriately addressed in any prior or prerequisite classes. On a larger note, a uniform attitude towards assigning and rigorously requiring copious preliminary studies in any concept-based communicative art class would acclimate the student to expanding their explorations and applying learned visual strategies, as those assessed above, more successfully. (04/01/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Action: To address the slight difficulty two students had combining the depth issue with their narrative value role, there really is no change to be made in teaching strategy. It is evident</p>
Manip. Atmospherics	3= 5	2= 0	1= 1																								
0= 0																											
Combining Dynamics		3= 6	2= 0																								
1= 0	0= 0																										
Maintain Depth/Analysis	3= 4	2= 2	1= 0																								
0= 0																											

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>C The other two skill-sets: Manipulating Atmospheric and Combining Dynamics, showed very strong comprehension and competence, and ALL students did very well in their analysis of the effectiveness of their strategies. The Dynamics category was especially strong.</p> <p>D The amount of time allotted the midterm was sufficient as all appraisals were turned in well within the (optionally extended) time parameters.</p> <p>(11/04/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Richard Ewing</p>	<p>that all the students understand the concept, but need only more time and discipline to practice the performance of what they understand theoretically. This is done over time on future projects and later classes. As the instructor, I will emphatically encourage practice and discipline and expound on the logic therein. It should be noted that the next assessment will be with a completely different group of students, and this slight issue may be non-existent. (04/01/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to having only one student enrolled this semester, this follow up has limitations, -- Spring 2017 semester (this class was shifted to spring semesters only from the previous fall semesters only schedule) I did however allow for more time for the student to land on her issues, but this particular student tended to get bogged down on concept and was also working within a flat illustration style that precluded depth as a strong staging element. We will look to an expected larger group of students in the spring of 2018 for a better follow up. . (06/13/2018)</p>
	<p>Project - Assessment (Describe the Course SLO Assessment.)</p> <p>Students were required to use previously acquired analytical and</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>creative skills, and recently obtained 'sequential/continuity' competence to alter a composition in three different ways using narrative-value drawing techniques to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Suggest specific shifting atmospherics 2) Manipulate the dynamics in energy conveyed per changing focal point. 3) Maintain Unity in the series while directing the eye in a purposeful sequence through the visual geography of all the images. <p>In partial fulfillment of the required analytical core competencies for this class, the students were given 3 identical compositions on which they were required to display their understanding and command of value manipulation for effective visual theatre. These advanced students had to show a manipulation of focus for each image while maintaining and advancing the continuity of the sequence of the phrase (in this case a compound sentence). These students were allowed more time than the one class session usually allowed, however none needed more than the 2 hours and 45 minutes typical of the class.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: These are the criteria that are used to determine a successful assessment for Art 253:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shifting Atmospherics (ability to manipulate the mood and atmospherics of the visual theatre by 		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>altering the value key decisions effectively in a sequential fashion throughout the series)</p> <p>2. Dynamics per Focal Point (ability to effectively match the conceptual energy level with the visual energy by adjusting the value contrast throughout the composition as the focal point shifts throughout the series)</p> <p>3. Maintain Series Unity (ability to make all images in series work together as a cohesive unit while allowing for the mood and energy shifts per the demands of the narrative)</p> <p>Students' achievement ratings for each criteria: Excellent (90%) Good (80%) Satisfactory (75%) Poor (70%) Unsatisfactory (69%)</p> <p>It is expected that 85% of students will score: 75% (satisfactory) or above on this SLO</p> <p>Additional Information: Date of Assessment: 4/24/2019</p>		

ECC: ART 262 :Intermediate Ceramics

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																																				
<p>SLO #2 Building and Forming - Students will show competency, at an intermediate level, in the basic building and forming techniques as it relates to ceramic art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students will use specific tools and skills, demonstrated in class, to create three pre-established vase forms: 1. Tall cylinder form, 2. Short round form, 3. Freeform Vase. These will be assessed for correct form and thickness, Height, and appropriate level of craftsmanship. Tools used: Sponge, Wooden Stick, Calipers, assorted ribs, Wire Tool, Potters Wheel</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: There are 4 areas of assessment: 1. Height 2. Thickness 3. Form 4. Craftsmanship</p> <p>Each student is assessed on a scale from 1. Poor 2. Average 3. Good 4. Exceptional</p> <p>Each vase form must be five inches or taller and conform to a pre-established shape demonstrated in class demo. Vase forms must be smooth and evenly thrown showing a reasonable level of craftsmanship with correct wall thickness of ¼ inch or less. Students have 3 weeks to complete task.</p> <p>I expect 80% or more to perform at the average or higher level</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Total students assessed: 10</p> <table><tr><td>Height:</td><td>0</td><td>Poor</td><td>0</td><td>Average</td><td>5</td><td>Good</td><td>5</td><td>Exceptional</td></tr><tr><td>Thickness:</td><td>0</td><td>Poor</td><td>0</td><td>Average</td><td>6</td><td>Good</td><td>4</td><td>Exceptional</td></tr><tr><td>Form :</td><td>0</td><td>Poor</td><td>0</td><td>Average</td><td>4</td><td>Good</td><td>6</td><td>Exceptional</td></tr><tr><td>Craftsmanship:</td><td>0</td><td>Poor</td><td>0</td><td>Average</td><td>7</td><td>Good</td><td>3</td><td>Exceptional</td></tr></table> <p>100% of all students performed at the Average or higher level.</p> <p>After detailed and clear demonstrations of the required skills, data shows that students understood and were able to execute the required task at a high performance level. 100 percent of the students performed at the average or higher level. A high number of students performed well on all four criteria due to their previous experience with clay. There was still a small number of students who struggled a bit, especially in the area of craftsmanship.</p> <p>It is clear from the data that students learned and were able to execute the assignment at a high level of success. They did, however struggle a bit with more technical parts of the assignment. In particular, a high level of craft challenged the students. More time will be needed to explain and demonstrate this part of the process. Also more time and practice on the student’s part will be needed to help them improve their skill. Making students aware of Youtube videos of throwing demonstrations could also help. The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing better internet access in the classroom as well as projection support for the ceramics area. Also allowing students to repeat the class at least one time would help students master the skills needed to excel in wheel throwing. One time through is too short of a time to master the skills needed to transfer to a four year school and</p>	Height:	0	Poor	0	Average	5	Good	5	Exceptional	Thickness:	0	Poor	0	Average	6	Good	4	Exceptional	Form :	0	Poor	0	Average	4	Good	6	Exceptional	Craftsmanship:	0	Poor	0	Average	7	Good	3	Exceptional	<p>Action: Will continue to provide more time for students to master the skills needed for this slo. Will continue to advocate for repeatability. (09/25/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
Height:	0	Poor	0	Average	5	Good	5	Exceptional																															
Thickness:	0	Poor	0	Average	6	Good	4	Exceptional																															
Form :	0	Poor	0	Average	4	Good	6	Exceptional																															
Craftsmanship:	0	Poor	0	Average	7	Good	3	Exceptional																															

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>compete with other more skilled students in the portfolio review process. (09/25/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Vince Palacios</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Total students assessed: 6</p> <p>Height: 0 % Poor 17 % Average 66 % Good 17% Exceptional</p> <p>Thickness: 0 % Poor 0 % Average 100 % Good 0% Exceptional</p> <p>Form : 0 % Poor 17 % Average 83 % Good 0% Exceptional</p> <p>Craftsmanship: 0 % Poor 33 % Average 50 % Good 17% Exceptional</p> <p>Total 8% of all students performed at the Exceptional level</p> <p>75% of all students performed at the Good level</p> <p>16% of all students performed at the Average level</p> <p>0% of all students performed at the Poor level</p> <p>100% of all students performed at the Average or higher level.</p> <p>After detailed and clear demonstrations of the required skills, data shows that students understood and were able to execute the required task at a high performance level. 100 percent of the students performed at the average or higher level. A high number of students performed well on all four criteria due to their previous experience with clay. There was still a small number of students who struggled a bit, especially in the area of craftsmanship.</p> <p>It is clear from the data that students learned and were able to execute the assignment at a high level of success. They did, however struggle a bit with more technical parts of the assignment. In particular, a high level of craft challenged</p>	<p>Action: With time and practice being the key to success, I will continue to request repeatability at least one time for each class to give students the time and exposure they need to succeed. One time through is not enough. (11/03/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Follow-Up: I Have continued to request repeatability for this course for greater skill mastery (06/13/2015)</p> <hr/> <p>Action: More detailed demonstrations and more time to complete the assignment. Time and practice are the real keys to success. (11/03/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: I have expanded my demonstrations and given students more time to complete assignments. Assessment next cycle should show improvement (06/13/2015)</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Project - Students will use specific tools and skills, demonstrated in class, to create three pre-established vase forms: 1. Tall cylinder form, 2. Short round form, 3. Freeform Vase. These will be assessed for correct form and thickness, Height, and appropriate level of craftsmanship. Tools used: Sponge, Wooden Stick, Calipers, assorted ribs, Wire Tool, Potters Wheel</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Standard and Target for Success: There are 4 areas of assessment: 1. Height 2. Thickness 3. Form 4. Craftsmanship</p> <p>Each student is assessed on a scale from 1. Poor 2. Average 3. Good 4. Exceptional</p> <p>Each vase form must be five inches or taller and conform to a pre-established shape demonstrated in</p>	<p>the students. More time will be needed to explain and demonstrate this part of the process. Also more time and practice on the student's part will be needed to help them improve their skill. Making students aware of Youtube videos of throwing demonstrations could also help. The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing better internet access in the classroom as well as projection support for the ceramics area. Also allowing students to repeat the class at least one time would help students master the skills needed to excel in wheel throwing. One time through is too short of a time to master the skills needed to transfer to a four year school and compete with other more skilled students in the portfolio review process. (09/08/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Vince Palacios</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

class demo. Vase forms must be smooth and evenly thrown showing a reasonable level of craftsmanship with correct wall thickness of ¼ inch or less. Students have 3 weeks to complete task.

I expect 80% or more to perform at the average or higher level

ECC: ART 275 :Jewelry Casting

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Synthesis of Design Principles - Students will be able to synthesize, and apply the principles of Jewelry design and appropriate casting practices to create an original finished jewelry object.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Students will design and create cast a ring. The ring form is determined by the student's original wax model. The ring must be incorporate functional considerations of proper sizing and appropriate weight. Students have 4 weeks to complete the task</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of the students will score 75% or higher. These are the criteria used: Design and Visual Quality (application of proportion and balance in the wax model) Casting Success (ability to achieve a completed casting without porosity) Fit (ability to size the ring within a specified tolerance) Craftsmanship (quality and consistency of selected surface type)</p> <p>Students' achievement rating for each criteria: Excellent (=90%) Good (80-89%) Satisfactory(70-79%) Poor(=69%)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 23 students from 3 sections were assessed Design and Visual Quality: Excellent 35% Good 47% Satisfactory 15% Poor 3%</p> <p>Casting Success: Excellent 30% Good 32% Satisfactory 21% Poor 17%</p> <p>Fit: Excellent 47% Good 43% Satisfactory 9% Poor 0%</p> <p>Craftsmanship: Excellent 39% Good 43% Satisfactory 8% Poor 3%</p> <p>With 92.25% of the students achieving a 75% or higher score, the results show that most students are able to comprehend and apply the skill and design challenges of the assessment instrument. The "Casting Success" data reveals the highest amount of "Poor" results. Because of the nature of the Casting process, "Poor" as an indicator for complete failure. Students achieving this outcome were required to repeat the process, repetition resulted in improvements in the areas of "Fit" and "Craftsmanship" (09/11/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Irene Mori</p>	<p>Action: Finally, the institution can support student success by maintaining adequate heating and cooling within the classroom environment. Repair or replacement of the HVAC unit in the classroom has been requested and is an on going issue, current strategies have not resulted in a solution. Given the existing (and understandable) limitations, a new approach needs to be taken by the institution to solve this very basic problem. (09/11/2015) Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Students enrolled in Art 275 have one semester or two semester of previous experience. To fully master the casting process, more time should be allotted for practice. Although 92% of the students scored Satisfactory or above, in the professional field "Excellent" is the expected level. To achieve this, the student needs more course levels and access to Open studio Lab time. (09/11/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>
	<p>Project - Students will design and create cast a ring. The ring form is determined by the student's original wax model. The ring must be</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met 45% of students successfully completed 4 of the 4 project</p>	<p>Action: Evaluate the difficulty level of the course projects in order to provide more depth in ability and understanding of course content.</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>incorporate functional considerations of proper sizing and appropriate weight. Students have 4 weeks to complete the task</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of the students will score 75% or higher.</p> <p>These are the criteria used:</p> <p>Design and Visual Quality (application of proportion and balance in the wax model)</p> <p>Casting Success (ability to achieve a completed casting without porosity)</p> <p>Fit (ability to size the ring within a specified tolerance)</p> <p>Craftsmanship (quality and consistency of selected surface type)</p> <p>Students' achievement rating for each criteria:</p> <p>Excellent (=45%)</p> <p>Good (51%)</p> <p>Satisfactory(5%)</p> <p>Poor(0)</p>	<p>evaluation criteria. 51% successfully completed 3 of the 4 criteria, and 5% were able to complete successfully 2 of the 4. No student scored Poor. 94% of the students evaluated scored at the Excellent or Good level, with 5% scoring at Average.</p> <p>The high success rate shows that the student is understands the project material and is able to apply basic principles of visual design and function. Students were given multiple chances to cast their project, this option contributed to the high success rate. Given the high level of success rate, the next time this SLO is assessed, the possibility of a evaluating a more complex project may be considered.</p> <p>(10/10/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Irene Mori</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Irene Mori</p>	<p>(10/10/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2 Terminology - Students will be able to define and explain terminology, methods and materials, appropriate to the jewelry casting.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - The student was shown a lost wax cast ring. After viewing the student was then asked to describe in a written document the methods, material and proper sequence used to create the object using the appropriate terminology.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>Based on a Rubric it is expected that at least 75% of the students will score 3 or above</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>27 students or 67% scored 4 or outstanding on the Rubric, 9 students or 23% scored 3 or Good on the Rubric, 3 students or 8% scored 2 or Needs improvement, 1 student or 3% scored 1 or Poor. 90% of the students scored 3 or above on the Rubric. This high percentage is due to the way the course is structured with a number of repetitions of the lost wax casting techniques. Student who scored Needs to Improve or Poor had language difficulties which was shown in a written document. However the students' project showed understanding of the process. (09/11/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Irene Mori</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students were given a multiple choice quiz in which they were to select appropriate methods and terminology to describe the proper sequence and techniques required to create a casting ring</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 75% or above</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>18 students or 78.3% meet the passing score of 70% for the quiz. 5 students or 21% scored lower than 70%. 11 students or 36% scored 70-88%, while 7 students or 31% scored 89%-100%. Of the 7 students who did not meet the standard, 3 of the 5 students or 12 % scored below 50% on the quiz. The quiz was given shortly after mid term, perhaps if the quiz was given later in the semester when student had more hands on experience with the casting process, the scores would have improved. To improve scores at practice quiz may also prove helpful. (10/16/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 78</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Irene Mori</p>	<p>Action: In order to improve scores of students not meeting a passing standard on the quiz I will write and administer a practice quiz (10/16/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ART 283 :Bronze Casting

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #2 Construction and Modeling - Students will be able to show intermediate-level competency in the construction, modeling, mold making, and casting techniques of bronze casting.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Project - Through assessed demonstrations, students will show competency, at an intermediate level, in the construction, modeling, mold making and casting techniques as it relates to bronze casting.</p> <p>The four assessment tools will be: Modeling to Object Wax Construction Mold Making Casting</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: There will be four areas of assessment: Modeling to Object Wax Construction Mold Making Casting</p> <p>Each student is assessed on a scale from 1. Poor 2. Average 3. Good 4. Exceptional The sculpture must use all 3 aspects to compose a work that integrates the 4 criteria into an object of Visual Quality. The Assessment Standard will be 80% of the students receiving a score of 3 or higher.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>The First project in the Bronze Class in the Construction and Modeling project, and it involves designing and building a "Kiln God".</p> <p>In this project students design a "lucky Charm" for good fortune in the Bronze Castings.</p> <p>Its construction is a combination of organic and manufactured goods that are easy to burn within a kiln, with the addition of hand modelled wax components sculpted directly onto the construct, or sculpted in wax separately and then attached before the waste mold making process. The grading process is based on a 0-4-point scale.</p> <p>In this class we had a total of: 25 students beginning the project, with a total of 17 completing it. Of those 17; 16 students received points in the 3-4-point range, thus success 1 student received 2 points. Thus 67% of the students that initially started the project successfully completed it. If one factors out the students that chose to drop the course, one would find that of the remaining students 94% of them were successful, and the other student missed the goal by one point. (08/19/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 88</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>This assessment is based on one course, with 29 students. 14 of the students received a score of 4, 48%</p>	<p>Action: It is clear that the students that stay with the project ultimately have a very high degree of success. It is also clear that the students that enter the class with more than just the one pre-requisite classes, but several studio classes particularly in the Three Dimensional areas, are more familiar with delayed gratification and more comfortable with a higher level of struggle. They too regularly demonstrate a higher level of modeling and construction skills, along with a higher degree of problem solving experience. Although I have had many students have great success in this class with the minimal of pre-requisites, I will encourage students with less experience to take more beginning Three Dimensional courses to increase their basic skills and improve the classes rewards.</p> <p>(08/19/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: The First project in the Bronze Class in the Construction and Modeling project, and it involves designing and building a "Kiln God".</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>12 students received a score of 3, 42%</p> <p>There were no students to receive a score of 2.</p> <p>While 3 students did not finish the process, so a being recorded as receiving a 1 for this SLO evaluation process, 10%</p> <p>The Target Standard of 80% was met, with students scoring in the 3 and 4 range totaling 90%</p> <p>(09/23/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin</p>	<p>In this project students design a “lucky Charm” for good fortune in the Bronze Castings.</p> <p>Its construction is a combination of organic and manufactured goods that are easy to burn within a kiln, with the addition of hand modeled wax components sculpted directly onto the construct, or sculpted in wax separately and then attached before the waste mold making process. The grading process is based on a 0-4-point scale.</p> <p>In this class we had a total of: 25 students beginning the project, with a total of 17 completing it. Of those 17;</p> <p>16 students received points in the 3-4-point range, thus success 1 student received 2 points. Thus 67% of the students that initially started the project successfully completed it.</p> <p>If one factors out the students that chose to drop the course, one would find that of the remaining students 94% of them were successful, and the other student missed the goal by one point.</p> <p>(08/19/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Student success was above desired goal. Questions remain whether students in the future will enter this course with as strong of skill sets, due mostly to lack of repeatable studio courses. Possible solution would be to add</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			<p>Open Labs, like those in English and Math. (09/23/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Well, the labs haven't happened. Basically a revision of the course projects was required, so that students could have success in a one semester experience. Thus, the focus went from casting bronze in three very different kinds of molds, to a focus on casting in the most contemporary, Ceramic Shell. By doing this, it created a more project oriented class, with reduced focus on a broader range of Materials and Methods. Overall the transition went well. (09/12/2017)</p>
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>This assessment is based on one course, with 29 students. 14 of the students received a score of 4, 48% 12 students received a score of 3, 42% There were no students to receive a score of 2. While 3 students did not finish the process, so a being recorded as receiving a 1 for this SLO evaluation process, 10% The Target Standard of 80% was met, with students scoring in the 3 and 4 range totaling 90% (09/11/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p>	<p>Action: The high success rate was not a surprise. Bronze Casting is the capstone 200 level course for the Sculpture area. Most of the students involved in this SLO have had several sculpture and other Three Dimensional art courses. Most of these students are the last of the students whom benefit from the repeatability of courses, now defunct. It would be my estimation that in the near future, scores may drop due to a lack of repeatability. On the subject of having a few students not complete the SLO due to the length of the project process, so adjustments may need to be made.</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>I will note that 10% is roughly the standard drop rate for my 200 level sculpture courses.</p> <p>In the future, open labs or other methods to overcome the lack of repeatability may need to be implemented if we are to continue the high level of Craft Skills associated with the Bronze Casting Class, and the Art Department in general.</p> <p>These skill set and experiences give our students the opportunities to transfer to some of the higher education institutions in the country. It would be a crime to not provide them with that kind of opportunity.</p> <p>(09/11/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: Based on the concerns I had of repeatability, significant modifications were made to curriculum which help to overcome many of the concerns stated in the action section. Focus is being placed on contemporary methods of production which simplifies the range of skills students need to learn during the semester. (10/14/2015)</p>

ECC: ART 288 :Printmaking II - Etching, Relief, and Lithography

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #2 Analyze and Critique - Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique at an intermediate-level etching, relief, and lithographic prints using course-specific terminology.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - In an interactive critique format, students will present prints and demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique them using course specific terminology.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 75% of students will demonstrate fair use of course specific terms and be able to complete in depth analysis of artwork.</p> <p>Rubric: Student demonstrated Excellent use of course specific terms and in depth analysis of artwork (4) Student demonstrated Good use of course specific terms and in depth analysis of artwork (3) Student demonstrated Fair use of course specific terms and in depth analysis of artwork (2) Student demonstrated Poor use of course specific terms and in depth analysis of artwork (1) Student was unable to demonstrate use of course specific terms and in depth analysis of artwork (0)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met 3 students total participated. 3 students received a 4/excellent (100%) (10/12/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Katherine Sheehan</p>	<p>Action: Engaging students in critique and self-analysis can be challenging. Exposure to outside artwork through slides, readings, and field trips are/can be used to encourage to participate in an expanded dialogue about artwork (10/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will present their work at the end of a project to the class. They will use course specific terminology in their presentation. They will evaluate their own work and that of their classmates, as</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met 3 students were assessed. The rubric attached above shows the criteria for assessment in student critique. 2 students scored 5 (excellent) i in their ability to use course</p>	<p>Action: Due to the complexity of printmaking processes, student would benefit from the option of repeating the course more than twice, as the mastery of printmaking skills is a long process.</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>assessed by the rubric to follow</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 3 or above on this SLO</p> <p>Additional Information: Grading rubric as follows:</p> <p>El Camino College, Spring 2019 ART 288, Etching/Lithography Section #5229, 3 units T/TH 9:30 AM-12:40 PM Instructor- Katherine Sheehan Office hours: By appt, Rm. Art B-217 Office Phone: 310-660-3593, ex. 4107 E-mail: ksheehan@elcamino.edu</p> <p>Print Project Critique Terminology Rubric Due: TBA</p>	<p>specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric</p> <p>1 student scored 4 (good) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric (10/29/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Katherine Sheehan</p>	<p>Because of the equipment and chemical intensive nature of the printmaking process, most of this work can only be done in the Print Shop under qualified supervision.</p> <p>The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing funding or support for a Print Shop technician and open studio hours outside of regular class time for students to work in the Print Shop. I periodically hold open studio periods on Fridays throughout the semester (about 6 hours, 3-5 times a semester), but regular access to the facilities supported by the ECC in addition to class time for students, would be greatly beneficial to their work. (08/31/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>
	<p>Excellent Good</p> <p>Average Below Average</p> <p>Poor</p> <p>(5) (4) (3)</p> <p>(2)</p> <p>(1)</p> <p>Technical</p> <p>Inking</p> <p>Craftsmanship</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Registration		
	Aesthetic		
	Effective Composition		
	Full range of values		
	Diverse range of marks		
	Conceptual		
	Ideas (as related to assigned theme)		

ECC: ART 289 :Silkscreen/Lithography

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
SLO #1 Planographic Methods - Students will be able to create an edition of prints that use stone and aluminum plate lithography methods and screen printing to create images. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/05/2013	Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will present their work at the end of a project to the class. They will use course specific terminology in their presentation. They will evaluate their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by the rubric to follow Standard and Target for Success: Based on Rubric: "It is expected that 80% of students will score 3 or above on this SLO." Additional Information: Grading rubric as follows: Print Project Critique Terminology Rubric Due: TBA <div> <div>Excellent</div> <div>Good</div> <div>Average</div> <div>Below Average</div> <div>Poor</div> </div> <div> <div>(5)</div> <div>(4)</div> <div>(3)</div> <div>(2)</div> <div>(1)</div> </div> Technical Inking Craftsmanship Registration	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Summer 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met 22 students were assessed. The rubric attached above shows the criteria for assessment in student critique. 4 students scored 5 (excellent) i in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric 18 students scored 4 (good) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric (07/24/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Katherine Sheehan	Action: Due to the complexity of printmaking processes, student would benefit from the option of repeating the course more than twice, as the mastery of printmaking skills is a long process. Because of the equipment and chemical intensive nature of the printmaking process, most of this work can only be done in the Print Shop under qualified supervision. The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing funding or support for a Print Shop technician and open studio hours outside of regular class time for students to work in the Print Shop. I periodically hold open studio periods on Fridays throughout the semester (about 6 hours, 3-5 times a semester), but regular access to the facilities supported by the ECC in addition to class time for students, would be greatly beneficial to their work. (08/31/2020) Action Category: Program/College Support

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Aesthetic		
	Effective Composition		
	Full range of values		
	Diverse range of marks		
	Conceptual		
	Ideas (as related to assigned theme)		
SLO #2 Analyze and Critique - Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique lithographic and screen prints using course-specific terminology. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/05/2013	Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will present their work at the end of a project to the class. They will use course specific terminology in their presentation. They will evaluate their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by the rubric to follow Standard and Target for Success: Based on Rubric: "It is expected that 80% of students will score 3 or	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Summer 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met 22 students were assessed. The rubric attached above shows the criteria for assessment in student critique. 4 students scored 5 (excellent) i in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric	Action: Due to the complexity of printmaking processes, student would benefit from the option of repeating the course more than twice, as the mastery of printmaking skills is a long process. Because of the equipment and chemical intensive nature of the printmaking process, most of this work can only be done in the Print

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>above on this SLO.”</p> <p>Additional Information: Grading rubric as follows:</p> <p>El Camino College Screen printing, ART 290 Summer 2019 M-TH, 1 PM -5 PM Instructor- Katherine Sheehan Office hours: M-TH, 1-5 PM E-mail: ksheehan@elcamino.edu Office Phone: 310-660-3593, ex. 4107</p> <p>Print Project Critique Terminology Rubric Due: TBA</p> <p>Excellent Good Average Below Average Poor</p> <p>(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)</p> <p>Technical</p> <p>Inking</p> <p>Craftsmanship</p> <p>Registration</p>	<p>18 students scored 4 (good) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric (07/24/2019)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 100</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Katherine Sheehan</p>	<p>Shop under qualified supervision.</p> <p>The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing funding or support for a Print Shop technician and open studio hours outside of regular class time for students to work in the Print Shop. I periodically hold open studio periods on Fridays throughout the semester (about 6 hours, 3-5 times a semester), but regular access to the facilities supported by the ECC in addition to class time for students, would be greatly beneficial to their work. (08/31/2020)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Aesthetic		
	Effective Composition		
	Full range of values		
	Diverse range of marks		
	Conceptual		
	Ideas (as related to assigned theme)		
SLO #3 Portfolio - Students will prepare a portfolio of prints that demonstrate the fundamental skills needed to succeed in advanced level printmaking courses. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2018-19 (Spring 2019) Input Date: 12/16/2013	Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will present their work at the end of a project to the class. They will use course specific terminology in their presentation. They will evaluate their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by the rubric to follow Standard and Target for Success: Based on Rubric: "It is expected that 80% of students will score 3 or above on this SLO." Additional Information: Grading	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2018-19 (Summer 2019) Standard Met? : Standard Met 22 students were assessed. The rubric attached above shows the criteria for assessment in student critique. 4 students scored 5 (excellent) i in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric 18 students scored 4 (good) in their ability to use course specific terminology in their critique presentation and	Action: Due to the complexity of printmaking processes, student would benefit from the option of repeating the course more than twice, as the mastery of printmaking skills is a long process. Because of the equipment and chemical intensive nature of the printmaking process, most of this work can only be done in the Print Shop under qualified supervision.

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>rubric as follows:</p> <p>El Camino College Screen printing, ART 290 Summer 2019 M-TH, 1 PM -5 PM Instructor- Katherine Sheehan Office hours: M-TH, 1-5 PM E-mail: ksheehan@elcamino.edu Office Phone: 310-660-3593, ex. 4107</p> <p>Print Project Critique Terminology Rubric Due: TBA</p>	<p>evaluation of their own work and that of their classmates, as assessed by above rubric (07/24/2019) % of Success for this SLO: 100 Faculty Assessment Leader: Joe Hardesty Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Katherine Sheehan</p>	<p>The Program or College could support these recommendations by providing funding or support for a Print Shop technician and open studio hours outside of regular class time for students to work in the Print Shop. I periodically hold open studio periods on Fridays throughout the semester (about 6 hours, 3-5 times a semester), but regular access to the facilities supported by the ECC in addition to class time for students, would be greatly beneficial to their work. (10/29/2019) Action Category: Program/College Support</p>
	<p>Excellent Good Average Below Average Poor</p> <p>(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)</p> <p>Technical</p> <p>Inking</p> <p>Craftsmanship</p> <p>Registration</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Aesthetic		
	Effective Composition		
	Full range of values		
	Diverse range of marks		
	Conceptual		
	Ideas (as related to assigned theme)		