

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2017



El Camino: PLOs (FA) - Dance

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #2 Terminology, Skill and Artistry - Students will possess a mastery of the terminology, technical skill, and the performance artistry of the specific theatrical dance styles.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 10/04/2013</p>	<p>Performance - Students were given terminology through a series of movement combinations that were then developed into dance routines specific to the class and the designated technique. These routines were then rehearsed and ultimately performed in a final dance class presentation concert. This concert was performed on a stage addressing the technical skill of the specific dance styles with an audience present in order to address the performance artistry.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Complete understanding: Dance 110-51.85%, Dance 120A-45.00%, Dance 120B-100%, Dance 130A - 41.67%, Dance 130B - 33.33%, Dance 140 - 63.64%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 75.00%, Dance 220A - 60.00%, Dance 220B - 50.00%, Dance 230A - 100%, Dance 230B - 100%, Dance 261 - 100%, Dance 262 - 100% Proficient understanding: Dance 110 - 33.33%, Dance 120A - 50.00% Dance 130A - 41.67%, Dance 130B - 33.33%, Dance 140 - 27.27%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 12.50%, Dance 220A - 20.00%, Dance 220B - 50.00% A Basic understanding: Dance 110 - 14.81%, Dance 130A - 8.33%, Dance 140 - 9.09%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 12.50%, Dance 220A - 20.00%,</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <p>Complete understanding: Dance 110-51.85%, Dance 120A-45.00%, Dance 120B-100%, Dance 130A - 41.67%, Dance 130B - 33.33%, Dance 140 - 63.64%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 75.00%, Dance 220A - 60.00%, Dance 220B - 50.00%, Dance 230A - 100%, Dance 230B - 100%, Dance 261 - 100%, Dance 262 - 100% Proficient understanding: Dance 110 - 33.33%, Dance 120A - 50.00% Dance 130A - 41.67%, Dance 130B - 33.33%, Dance 140 - 27.27%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 12.50%, Dance 220A - 20.00%, Dance 220B - 50.00% A Basic understanding: Dance 110 - 14.81%, Dance 130A - 8.33%, Dance 140 - 9.09%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 12.50%, Dance 220A - 20.00%, (01/23/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Daniel Berney</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Elizabeth Adamis, Jennifer LaCuran, Jill Jensen, Amy Allen, Michelle Funderburk</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: DANCE 110, 102A, 120B, 130A, 130B, 140, 161, 162, 220A, 220B, 230A, 230B, 261, 262,</p>	<p>Action: The technical application and terminology understanding is needed much earlier in courses in the semester and program in order to better support the culminating performing elements of the program. (06/30/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: This is the second cycle of this PLO based on the technique classes which culminates in a series of final dance class performances in a live concert environment. The preparation was recommended to begin earlier in the semester which showed through this assessment process that the resulting data was proof of it's effectiveness. (01/28/2018)</p>

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Dance 220A - 20.00%, Dance 220B - 50.00% A Basic understanding: Dance 110 - 14.81%, Dance 130A - 8.33%, Dance 140 - 9.09%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 12.50%, Dance 220A - 20.00%,</p> <p>Related Documents: Dance PLO 2 Assessment results Fall 2014.pdf</p> <p>Performance - Students were given terminology through a series of movement combinations that were then developed into dance routines specific to the class and the designated technique. These routines were then rehearsed and ultimately performed in a final dance class presentation concert. This concert was performed on a stage addressing the technical skill of the specific dance styles with an audience present in order to address the performance artistry.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Complete understanding: Dance 110-56.25%, Dance 120A-36.36%, Dance 120B-100%, Dance 130A - 41.67%, Dance 130B - 33.33%, Dance 140 - 33.33%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 53.85%, Dance 220A - 66.67%, Dance 220B - 50.00%, Dance 230A - 100%, Dance 230B - 100%, Dance 240 - 80%, Dance 261 - 100%, Dance 262 - 100% Proficient understanding: Dance 110 - 31.25%, Dance 120A - 36.36% Dance 130A - 41.67%, Dance 130B - 33.33%, Dance 140 - 33.33%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 30.77%, Dance 220A - 22.22%, Dance 220B - 50.00%, 240 -</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Standard Met: Standard Not Met Compared to the results from the previous PLO#2 assessment data, (fall 2013) the overall results are much improved. However even with overall data improvement in the three primary categories (complete understanding, proficient understanding, and basic understanding) the results for the highest (complete understanding) were not as notable. It should be noted that with the loss of repeatability regarding technique classes the students do not have the advantage of skills development and therefore are forced to assimilate vocabulary and specific technique codification while developing skills required to effectively perform a final presentation replicating the combinations as taught. (01/28/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Daniel Berney Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Daniel Berney, Kanisha Bennett, Angela Jordan, Elizabeth Adamis, Jessica Kondrath, Val Cabag, Karin Jensen,</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Dance 110, Dance 120A, Dance 120B, Dance 130A, Dance 130B, Dance 140, Dance 161, Dance 162, Dance 220A, Dance 220B, Dance 221, Dance 230A, Dance 230B, Dance 240, Dance 261, Dance 262</p> <p>Related Documents: DancePLO_2_fa2017_all.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance110.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance120A.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance140.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance162.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Continue to develop the final performance combinations in conjunction with the vocabulary and codification in order to reinforce the material in a timely manner. Ultimately the amount of material presented may be compromised since the reinforcement of less material will allow for a more presentable final performance. (06/30/2018) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>20% A Basic understanding: Dance 110 - 12.50%, Dance 120A - 27.27% Dance 130A - 8.33%, Dance 140 - 33.33%, Dance 161 - 33.33%, Dance 162 - 15.38%, Dance 220A - 11.11%,</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>DancePLO_2_fa2017_all.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance110.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance120A.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance140.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance162.pdf DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance220A.pdf</p>	DancePLO_2_fa2017_Dance220A.pdf	

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2017



El Camino: PLOs (FA) - Film/Video

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #1 Production Equipment - Upon completion of the program, students will demonstrate basic skills needed to operate production equipment to produce short films.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 10/04/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - I accidentally erased this assessment from Fall 2015 when I was working on a Spring assessment. 9.23.16. To my recollection, the assessment was based on a 100 question objective exam that covered the fundamentals of using production equipment: cameras, lighting/grip, audio.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Because Film 234 is a advanced production course, the standard was set relatively high compared to an introductory course. Thus, the standard set was that 100% percent of the students would score at least 70% or higher on the exam given they had prior production experience in the prerequisite class, had practiced production techniques aligned with PLO #1 throughout the semester, and taken previous exams that tested their knowledge of production equipment theory and practice.</p> <p>As this was an objective exam, a traditional percentage scale was used to score the assessment: 100%</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>22 students were assessed. The range of scores 97% correct by two students to 81% by two students. The average score for the group was 88% correct. The target and standard were met. The most important finding was that this culminating exam thoroughly tested the students on the theory and practice of filmmaking fundamentals that they experienced throughout the semester in hands-on small group projects and shoots and verified improvement. At mid semester, a similar assessment was conducted the range of success was a high of 97% one student, to a low of 65% one student, with 3 students scoring below the benchmark of 70%. Compared to the pretest, all but one student improved and that student only slipped from a A- to a B+ because of several absences due to excused illness. Importantly, the student who scored the lowest on the pretest improved from 65% to 92%. The last 8 weeks of the semester saw all students improve in the requisite skills evidenced by their group work, direct observation in lab projects and through the culminating exam. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 120, Film 122, Film 128, Film 234, Film 236</p>	<p>Action: In future assessments, the continued presence of a qualified teaching assistant is imperative to the success demonstrated in this assessment. Due to a slight increase in funding (5 hours per week) the students in Film 234 had the benefit of a TA, Chris Maldonado, who earned his AA in Film at El Camino and his BA in Film Production from CSULB. Thus, it was like having two qualified instructors in the class at all times. Additionally, the TA was able to meet with students outside of scheduled class time to review production practices. Unfortunately these additional hours were cut late in the semester, but he volunteered to finish the semester on his own time and for the benefit of our students.</p> <p>In order to keep these success rates and prepare our production students for continued successful transfer to competitive BA</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>-93% = A, 92%-90% A-, 89%-87% B+, 86%-83% B, 82%-80% B-, 79%-77% C+, 76%-73% C, 72%-70% C-, 69%-67% D+, 66%-63% D, 62%-60% D-, 59% and below F. The assessment was not curved.</p> <p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Covering Scenes with Double-System Sync Sound</p> <p>Prior to this project, students in Film 122 had been introduced to the equipment used to produce short films in all of our production classes. This included the Panasonic HMC-150 HD camera, Sekonic L-398 Studio Incident Light Meter, Manfrotto 5036 Fluid Head Tripod, Tascam DA-40 Audio Recorder, Audio-Technica Shotgun microphones and basic lighting and grip gear. Prior to this assessment, working in groups of 4-5 students had completed 3 camera labs, a nondialog 30 second commercial, shot a nondialog master scene from a provided scenario, and developed and shot a short film based on the</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 23 students assessed, 18 achieved a score of 8 or higher, or 78%. The average score was 8.8 of 10 points or 88%. If the 4 students who got deductions for being absent, late to a production meeting, late to set, or violating a set protocol such as using a cell phone were excluded from the sample, then the target rate for success would have been approximately 84%. Overall, like in previous assignments all of the students demonstrated fundamental skills operating the equipment and using the software, while several students consistently struggled with the professional side of filmmaking: being on time and follow protocols while on set or when working in post. (09/23/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Laura Almo</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 121, 122, 232, 234, 236</p>	<p>programs, TA need to be restored and expanded, not cut capriciously. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: For Fall 2016, Film 234 Camera & Lighting, was moved from its usually time slot 9:30-noon on Tuesday/Thursday to Fridays at 9:30am to 2:50pm. This was changed to take advantage of holding the class in a true lighting studio for the first time, Theatre 151. Additionally, 5 hours of TA time were allocated to the class to support the instructor. (09/23/2016)</p> <p>Action: Over the last few years, more students than ever are coming to our program with some production skills learned in high school courses or from being self-taught. While this yields students who typically have some facility with production equipment, particularly editing software, they often exhibit poor set protocols or learned bad habits such as shooting with their own cameras but not really understanding how the image is captured. Thus, more time early in the semester could be devoted to how to behave professionally on set and in post and in the initial 3 camera labs to offer the students the opportunity to bring in their own equipment, on a limited basis, to shoot labs in a controlled fashion. (09/23/2016)</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>premise of a character losing an important object. All postproduction picture and sound was acjoeved using Final Cut Pro X version 10.2.3.</p> <p>The groups were familiar with basic crew positions and set protocols, techniques of cinematography: depth of field, camera angles, lighting styles, exposure concepts, shot composition and framing. They had practiced concepts of invisible editing, montage, and fragmented or disjunctive editing. This assessment was designed to practice what they had been studying and apply their skills to plan and shoot a short dialog scene in a controlled fashion within the timeline established by the instructor.</p> <p>Each group scouted and secured a location and were to shoot their interpretation of the provided script three ways:</p> <p>1) Shoot the scene using master scene technique and dialog. (The objective was to capture the scene with a plan that yielded continuity editing-the invisible style-similar to the Vote for Hernandez exercise they had done earlier in the semester).</p> <p>2) At a new location, shoot the entire scene using a single long take with dialog combining camera and talent movement.</p>		<p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>3) Shoot the scene as a montage that rejects continuity and disrupts the filmic space and time but not the continuity of the dialog.</p> <p>One class session was devoted to preproduction planning, two sessions for shooting the script, one session for editing and one session for screenings/critiques.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: By the 12th week of the semester, 75% of the students should be able to demonstrate the basic technical skills to cover a scene using double-system audio. 75% was set as the target as this was the first project that used audio gear on location. A 10 point scale was used to determine if students met the standard with as 8 or higher established a the benchmark for successfully demonstrating facility with the production and post production equipment required for capturing and editing the scene 3 different ways.</p> <p>Project - Working in small groups of 4-5, Film 122 students were assigned a variety of short projects involving hands-on film production skills including use of digital cinema camera, tripod, light meters, bounce cards and nonlinear editing software. Preliminary exercises were designed to develop the students' basic knowledge of cinematography and how to capture the image as well as capture shot material into a computer for editing. Exercises then</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Students performed well on all 3 projects and in all cases met the target of scoring at least 8 of 10 points. The average score for The Lost Object was 9.5, The Master Scene was 9.5 and for Double System Sync Sound was 8.5. Direct observation of the groups was the method of assessment. (05/08/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 122, Film 128, Film 232, Film 234, Film 236</p>	<p>Action: Shooting in a controlled environment such as a professional lighting studio or sound stage would make for a better assessment where students could be observed more closely without the instructor having to bounce between groups shooting on location throughout campus. (05/08/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>segued into projects where the groups added creative content based on strict assignment patterns. 3 projects specifically tested the PLO: The Lost Object, The Master Scene, and Double System Sync Sound.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Based on a 10 point scale, each group would achieve at least a score of 8. Since filmmaking is a collaborative activity, if a group scored an 8, then that score was given to each student regardless of the job function they performed on a given project. Points were deducted for failure to follow established set protocols, being late to set, lack of professionalism on set, misuse of equipment, substandard cinematography when appropriate.</p> <p>Additional Comments: The process of preproduction, production, postproduction and screening/critique was followed for all projects to emulate a professional approach to shooting a controlled film project.</p> <p>Essay/Written Assignment - 15 question written final exam that covered fundamentals of operating the production camera, light meter, and editing software used throughout the semester. Students were to respond with precise, step by step instructions on how to use or operate the hardware/software in each question.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It was expected that 80% of the students would score 75% or higher on the exam.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>84% of the students scored higher than 75% of the exam. Of the 3 students that scored below the target, 2 scored 72%- and these 2 had irregular attendance patterns. The 3rd student who scored below the target earned a 68%. This was a surprise because this student attended all classes and participated regularly in all the labs-perhaps just an off day. In sum, the average score for the class was an 81%. (09/07/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 122, 121, 128, 232, 234, 236,</p>	<p>Follow-Up: The recent 2 year CTE Review cites the critical need for a proper production infrastructure backed by data from the LA Economic Foundation. Unfortunately, professional studio space, to compliment our recently acquired professional cinema gear, does not appear to be in the plans for the new Fine Arts building. (05/08/2018)</p> <p>Action: Additional review time will allotted for exam should this assessment be used again in the future. Additional staffed lab hours will be allocated near the end of the semester so students can come in and practice with the production equipment. (10/06/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2017



El Camino: PLOs (FA) - Music

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #1 Analyzing Music - Upon completion of the program students will be able to analyze music example recordings based on elements of music including form, style, rhythm, harmony, melody, timbre, texture, and dynamics, with an intermediate level of proficiency.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 02/11/2015</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Courses that participated in this PLO were Music History (Music 215B), Music Appreciation (Music 111), and Music Cultures of the World (Music112). All of the students were asked to respond to a Critical Listening PLO. Students were asked to listen to an 'unknown' piece of music by Mozart (one that had not been covered in any of these classes) and answer questions regarding the 7 elements of music (rhythm, melody, harmony, instruments, dynamics, form, and texture), and then decide upon the genre (type of piece – opera, symphony, etc.) and the era (Classical, Romantic, etc.).</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It is expected that all 80% of students will score 70% or higher.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>98 students took this PLO with only 21% of the students (mostly in 215) answering that they were a declared music major. This is not surprising since Music 111 is designed as a Gen Ed class for non-music majors and Music 112 is in the Honors Transfer Program and not a part of the music degree program. The additional questions support this data since only 22 % were thinking of declaring as a music major, and only 30% were considering transferring to a 4-year school as a music major. For most of the elements, the students scored well above average. In the meter, tempo, harmony, ensemble, and overall sound, the scores ranged from 77% up to 97%. For instruments, the percentage was 100%. A few of the elements had an average scoring -- for example, regarding melody, the percentage of correct answers was 64%, dynamics was 70%.</p> <p>The era and the genre, both essential questions, had a nearly 84% correct scoring. These questions are often seen as a 'gauge as to whether or not a student can critically listen to a piece of music (elements) and then accurately decide on the type of piece (genre) and the era of composition (Middle Ages, Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, early 20th c., late 20th c.).</p> <p>The results were quite surprising in that so many of the students did very well and, when they were 'incorrect' they were often very close. For example, in the dynamics question we ask them to determine the highest dynamic level they heard in the piece (ff, f, mf, mp, p, pp) and the</p>	<p>Action: The students did quite well on the exam, and we will continue to refine the music listening examples and genre study information for each class. (03/02/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>lowest. While 51% said the correct high dynamic level was mf, 10% said it was f (one level above) and 15% said it was mp (one level below).</p> <p>Since the test is given in different rooms, at different times, it is entirely possible that the dynamic levels were not controlled properly. This is something we will have tried to work with since the last PLO, and we have been more successful this time. (03/02/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: James Hurd Faculty Contributing to Assessment: W. Doyle Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Music 111, 112H, 215</p>	
<p>PLO #2 Forms of Movement - Upon completion of the program students will be able to analyze and explain the form of a movement from a Classical Era piano composition by constructing a diagram of form and demonstrating an intermediate level of skill in harmonic analysis using Roman numerals.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 02/11/2015</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Fall 2014: Mus 103B (Music Theory and Musicianship II). Students were asked to look at (and listen to) two short musical excerpts written by Mozart. Both excerpts were period structures. Students were then asked to answer questions relating to cadence types, diagram form, and label chords with Roman numerals.</p> <p>Mus 203 (Music Theory and Musicianship III). Students were asked to look at (and listen to) a part of a movement from a piano sonata written by Haydn. The excerpt was in continuous ternary form and featured secondary chords in addition to diatonic harmony. Students were then asked to answer questions relating to cadence types, form, and harmonic analysis (with Roman numerals).</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It is expected that 80% of students will score 70% or higher.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Mus 103 B:</p> <p>17 students took this PLO assessment in Music 103B. Over 64% of the students are declared music majors and over 82% expressed interest in earning an AA (or AA-T) degree. These numbers are not surprising since this class is the second semester theory and musicianship course designed for music majors. Over 88% were interested in transferring to a four-year program as a music major. However, only about 41% were currently enrolled in the Applied Program and over 76% spent 6 or fewer hours in the practice rooms per week. Students need to understand that their acceptance into most four-year music programs is contingent upon successful audition on their instrument (or voice). Music counselors need to begin making this a part of the information they pass along to music students. The highest score was 28.5 out of 29 possible points (98%) The lowest score was 15.5 out of 29 possible points (53%) The average score (17 students) was 77.8%</p> <p>Mus 203 (Music Theory and Musicianship III)</p> <p>Five students took this PLO assessment. 80% were declared music majors and 80% were intending to pursue an AA (or AA-T) degree in music. 100% intended on transferring to a four-year school as a music major. However, only 40% were enrolled in the Applied Music Program. Like the previous</p>	<p>Action: In the future, I may include more examples relating to the building blocks of musical form (phrases, period structures, etc.) throughout the course, not just during the time when that specific subject is studied. In addition, I will continue stressing the importance of paying attention to the details, such as reading the proper clef or noting the correct chord inversion.</p> <p>(02/09/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: I created a two page handout that contains several musical examples which are useful when studying phrases, cadences, and period structures. I have also been stressing the importance of paying attention to details such as reading the proper clef or noting the correct chord inversion (bass note and symbol). (03/05/2018)</p>

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>assessment, students must understand the importance of the audition when applying for four-year institutions in the area of music.</p> <p>The highest score was 16 out of 18 possible points (89%, two students)</p> <p>The lowest score was 11 out of 18 possible points (61%, two students)</p> <p>The average score was 76.6%</p> <p>Findings indicate that students met the standards of the PLO.</p> <p>Weaknesses were related to building blocks of musical form.</p> <p>Strengths were related to identifying musical elements. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Patrick Schulz</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Music 103B, Music 203</p>	
	<p>Multiple Assessments - Fall 2017:</p> <p>To assess this PLO, I asked students in the two highest levels of music theory to complete related work (a homework assignment, a take-home exam, and a final analysis project) since they represent students who are likely about half way through the program and students who are nearly completed with the music program at El Camino College. Students in Music 103B: Theory and Musicianship II completed an assignment relating to the building blocks of musical form (cadences, phrases, and period structures) and students in Music 203: Theory and Musicianship III completed a take-home midterm exam addressing small form (binary, ternary, and rounded binary forms) and a final project covering sonata form. In the Music 103B assignment, students</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Results: Music 103B Assignment (building blocks of form)</p> <p>Raw Scores (listed from lowest to highest): 41%, 50%, 61%, 64%, 64%, 79%, 84%, 84%, 86%, 88%, 89%, 93%, 95%, 95%, 96%, 96%, 96%, 96%, 96%, 96%, 98%, 98%, 100%, 100%, 100%, 100%</p> <p>Total Responses: 26</p> <p>Average Score: 86.3%</p> <p>Highest Score: 100% (four students)</p> <p>Lowest Score: 41%</p> <p>Comments: 20 out of 26 students (77%) scored 80% or above on this assessment. 5 out of 26 students (19%) scored below 70% (a grade of "D" or "F").</p> <p>Results: Music 203 Take-Home Midterm (small form)</p> <p>Raw Scores (listed from lowest to highest): 67%, 69%, 72%, 72%, 72%, 72%, 78%, 78%, 78%, 78%, 78%, 81%, 86%, 89%, 100%</p> <p>Total Responses: 15</p> <p>Average Score: 78%</p>	<p>Action: I will keep reviewing the building blocks of form in the Music 103B class (learned initially in Music 103A). In addition, it will be necessary to spend a little more time teaching the first part of Chapter 20 (binary, ternary, and rounded binary forms) to students in Music 203. It may also be necessary to review these concepts throughout the semester, perhaps before discussing sonata form. Further musical examples composed in binary, ternary, and rounded binary forms will be helpful for students to analyze. They can also practice Roman numeral analysis while learning and reviewing these small forms. (03/05/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>labeled cadences, diagrammed period structures, and labeled Roman numerals in select measures of Mozart's Piano Sonata in B-Flat Major, K. 333, third movement, mm. 1-8 and Beethoven's Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 13, third movement, mm. 1-8. Music 203 students were given a take-home midterm exam. They were assigned Haydn's Piano Sonata No. 54, first movement, mm. 1-24 and were asked to label cadences, analyze several chords with Roman numerals, identify the form, and describe differences between the A and B sections. Near the end of the semester, students in Music 203 were asked to create a sonata form diagram for Mozart's Piano Sonata in F Major, K. 332 (first movement) and label chords in mm. 1-5, 11-44, 56-67, and 106-132 with Roman numerals.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It is expected that 85% of the students will score 70% or above.</p> <p>Related Documents: Music103B_PLO.docx Music203_FinalProjectPLO.docx Music203_PLO.docx</p>	<p>Highest Score: 100% Lowest Score: 67% Comments: Only 4 out of 15 students (27%) scored 80% or above on this assessment. However, 13 out of 15 students (87%) scored 70% or above (earning a grade of "C" or better). Only two students (13%) scored under 70%.</p> <p>Results: Music 203 Final Project (sonata form) Raw Scores (listed from lowest to highest): 73%, 79%, 79%, 83%, 84%, 84%, 84%, 84%, 86%, 88%, 92%, 93%, 93%, 96%, 96%, 96%</p> <p>Total Responses: 16 Average Score: 86.9% Highest Score: 96% (three students) Lowest Score: 73% Comments: 13 out of 16 students (81%) scored 80% or above on this assessment. All students (100%) scored above 70% (a grade of "C" or better).</p> <p>Form is primarily discussed in Chapter 10 (Cadences, Phrases, Periods, and Sentences) and Chapter 20 (Larger Forms) in the Kostka/Payne/Almén Tonal Harmony textbook, which is used for Music 103A, Music 103B, and Music 203 (Theory and Musicianship I, II, and III) at El Camino College. Students learn most of Chapter 10 in the Music 103A class, review these concepts in Music 103B, and learn most of Chapter 20 in the Music 203 class. According to the results of the three assessments administered in Music 103B and Music 203, students were successful overall in regards to identifying the building blocks of form (cadences, phrases, and period structures), small form (binary, ternary, and rounded binary), and the primary parts of a movement in sonata form. Students were also successful overall analyzing chords with Roman numerals. The small form assessment (take-home midterm) in the Music 203 class had the lowest average score (78%), and only 27% of students scored 80% or above. However, 87% did score 70% or higher (a "C" or better). 77% scored 80% or above on the building blocks of form assessment, and</p>	

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		81% scored 80% or above on the sonata form assessment. (03/05/2018) Faculty Assessment Leader: Patrick Schulz Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Music 103B, Music 203	
PLO #3 Performing - Upon completion of the program students will be able to demonstrate intermediate mastery in their performance of two collegiate level pieces from contrasting styles, observing accurate pitches, rhythms, and interpretative markings. PLO Status: Active PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 10/04/2013	Performance - Over 200 students' performed vocal or instrumental repertoire in solo and ensemble classes. Evaluations were based on the following measurements Note accuracy 75% Good-Excellent Rhythm accuracy 79% Good-Excellent Tempo consistency 77% Good-Excellent Dynamics 76% Good-Excellent Articulation 79% Good-Excellent Standard and Rubric: it was expected that 80% of the students would score 70% or higher	Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Standard Met: Standard Met 66.67% of the students who took the survey have taken theory courses at the college. (81% had not taken the theory classes in the previous 2015 PLO).This is significant, because the Theory sequence is part of the AA-T degree for music. This finding shows that students, over the past three years, are better informed about degree requirements. In addition, only 31.45% of the students had taken Music History classes. Music History is a core part of any music curriculum, and is part of our Music AAT and AA degree. We detect a slight increase from the 2015 assessment. Only 9.33% of the students had auditioned for a music scholarship at ECC, which is interesting in light of the music major percentage. However, 62.34% of the survey respondents are aware of music scholarships at El Camino College. This gap may be partly due to some of the students' level of proficiency on their instrument or voice; they may not yet have achieved the high degree of musicianship necessary to audition for these scholarships. It may also be due to the fact that the course requirements for scholarship eligibility may not yet have been met. The survey included questions on the students' educational experience at ECC. 39.87% of the students who took the survey are declared music majors. 44.74% have completed an educational plans, 47.37% are intending to graduate with an AA or an AAT degree, and 48.30% are intending to transfer to a 4-year school as a music major. These percentages have slightly increased since 2015, which reflects an improvement in the direction of an Ed plan. As for the Applied program, only 28.29% of the students are currently enrolled in our Applied Program, which is targeted	Action: Explore expansion of course offerings of core classes to aid the music major in fulfilling their educational plan and meet all the requirements to transfer in a timely fashion. (03/01/2018) Action Category: Curriculum Changes

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>at music majors. This remains the same as our PLO of 2015. Applied students are declared as Music majors by the second semester, which has become a requirement since our last assessment due to the AAT Degree. However, 62.75% of the students indicated an interest in the Applied Program, which is an increase from the 2015 percentage of 55%. This seems to indicate that students have been encouraged to audition for the Applied program by the music faculty with 26.76%. A large number of our freshman may not yet have achieved the level of proficiency needed to enter this program, so they are developing their skills with the music course offerings of voice, piano and musicianship classes.</p> <p>Our results indicate similar strengths from the previous assessment in the following areas: Excellent Faculty and staff. Students are pleased with the entire music faculty and their dedication to student success. Students appreciate the encouragement to achieve high quality work, both rapidly and correctly. Outstanding performance ensembles. Excellent preparation for many opportunities in the field of music. Accessibility for the community.</p> <p>Areas of WEAKNESSES are: Students are not happy with the repeatability restrictions placed on courses that help them build their musical skills, including performance ensembles and the Applied Music Program. Even though, non-credit courses for the "Older Community" were attached to the credited ensembles, many skill courses could benefit from the same strategy. Advertisements for events need improvement, along with efficient registrations, practice rooms and equipment's upgrading. A limited number of core classes are offered at desirable times: evening and weekends. Lack of funding(concert revenue to other disciplines). Lack of diverse levels of class offerings(beginning to</p>	

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>advanced, no intermediate).</p> <p>(03/01/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Joanna Nachev</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin Blickfelt, Polli Cahmber-Salazar, Jon Minei, Dane Teter</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Music 253, Mus 555, Mus 120, Mus 131B, Mus 127A, Mus 147A, Mus 147B, Mus 231A, Mus 231B, Mus 232, Mus 265, Mus 268, Mus 565, Mus 570</p> <hr/> <p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>81% of the students who took the survey had taken no theory courses at the college. This is significant, because the Theory sequence is part of the AA-T degree for music. This finding suggests that students need to be better informed about degree requirements.</p> <p>81% of the students who took the survey had taken no theory courses at the college. This is significant, because the Theory sequence is part of the AA-T degree for music. This finding suggests that students need to be better informed about degree requirements.</p> <p>In addition, 70% of the students had taken no Music History classes. Music History is a core part of any music curriculum, and is part of our Music AA degree. Only 6% of the students had auditioned for a music scholarship at ECC, which is interesting in light of the music major percentage. However, 46% of the survey respondents are aware of music scholarships at El Camino College. This gap may be partly due to some of the students' level of proficiency on their instrument or voice; they may not yet have achieved the high degree of musicianship necessary to audition for these scholarships. It may also be due to the fact that the course requirements for scholarship eligibility may not yet have been met.</p> <p>In the survey portion of the Music PLO Performance Assessment students answered several questions about their educational experience at ECC. 42% of the students who took the survey are declared music majors, and 43%</p>	<p>Action: Lack of repeatability is limiting student's successful skill development. (02/09/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>have the intention to transfer to a 4-year school as music majors. Interestingly, only 28% of the students are currently enrolled in our Applied Program, which is targeted at music majors. At this time, students in the Applied Program are strongly encouraged to declare as Music majors. When our Associate of Arts Degree with the an imbedded AAT degree is finalized, then our Applied Music students will be required to declare as Music Majors. However, 55% of the students indicated an interest in the Applied Program. This seems to indicate that students need to be encouraged to audition for the Applied program; however it may also suggest that some of these students may not yet have achieved the level of proficiency needed to enter this program.</p> <p>Strengths indicate that the majority of students have achieved competency in performance.</p> <p>Weaknesses relate to students' inability to repeat performance classes to raise their level of competency even though they clearly have the aptitude for it.</p> <p>(02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Dr. Nacheff</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Dr. Teter and Mrs. Wood</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Mus 253, 555, 120, 220, 131A, 131B, 231A, 231B, 232, 265, 268, 565, 570</p>	
	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration -</p> <p>Over 200 students' performed vocal or instrumental repertoire in solo and ensemble classes.</p> <p>Evaluations were based on the following measurements</p> <p>Note accuracy 88% Good-Excellent</p> <p>Rhythm accuracy 87% Good-Excellent</p> <p>Tempo consistency 90% Good-Excellent</p> <p>Dynamics 88% Good-Excellent</p> <p>Articulation 87% Good-Excellent</p>		

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-------------	--	----------------	----------------

Standard and Rubric: It was expected that 80% of the students will perform at 75% or better.