

Assessment: Course Four Column

FALL 2016



El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Art

ECC: ART 142 :Digital Photography

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
SLO #1 Non-Destructive Editing - Using image manipulation software, students will use non-destructive editing techniques to correct, improve, alter, and combine original photographs. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 12/16/2013 Inactive Date: Comments::			
SLO #2 2D Design Concepts - Students will apply 2D design concepts in the execution of original digital photographic artworks. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Input Date: 12/16/2013 Inactive Date: Comments::	Project - Our Project for the SLO assessment was titled, "Spirit Photography" The learning objectives were as follows: Student were to use technical, aesthetic/design and conceptual skills for this project. Students will use design elements and principles to create a dynamic composition Standard and Target for Success: Student projects were graded based on a 10 point system. 3 points for composition, 2 points for technical skills, 2 points for complexity, and	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Met These grades were specifically for the Spirit photography Project. Students were to apply 2D design concepts in the execution of original digital art work. Student apply 2-D design concepts in the execution of original digital photographic artworks to create a successful composition: 16 students (Art 142 Digital Photography) 3 earned 10/10.....18% 5 earned 9/10.....31% 8 earned 8/10.....50%	Action: Encourage more participation in critiques by having in-progress critique groups prior to finished projects and final critique (02/14/2017) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: The next time I teach this class, I will have students meet in small groups for in-progress critiques to help them participate more (02/14/2017) Action: Add more Photoshop

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions															
	<p>Craftmanship/execution and 3 points for concept. I expected at least 85% of students to score above 7 points. A successful project made good use of compositional elements, negative and positive space, good use of Photoshop adjustment tools to improve tone, contrast and alter color, as well as demonstrate value relationships: maintaining consistent light and shading across the composite to create a digital photograph using 2D design elements and principles to create dynamic composition.</p> <p>Students were graded based on a 10 point system. 3 points for composition, 2 points for technical skills, 2 points for complexity, and Execution and 3 points for concept. I expected at least 85% of students to score above 7 points. The successful project made good use of compositional elements, negative and positive space, line and tone quality with consistent light and shading across the composite.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>In preparation for this project, students completed exercises in digital camera functions and technical computer software as well as exercises, lectures, and discussions on concepts pertaining to compositional elements in design. (02/13/2017)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Andrea Micallef , Joyce Dallal Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Andrea Micallef , Joyce Dallal</p>	<p>tutorials, basic and advanced (02/13/2017) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>															
<p>SLO #3 Digital Camera Operation - Students will demonstrate correct digital camera operation in the planning and execution of a complex photographic composite requiring multiple images specifically composed for digital manipulation. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-</p>	<p>Project - Assessment was the final project, which is to plan and execute a composite image inspired by a photographer from the “Digital Darkroom” exhibition held at the Annenberg Space for Photography. This involves conceptualizing the idea and sketching it out, planning the shots and then shooting them,</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>w-i-p in class presentation</th><th>T-sftwre mastery LATE</th><th>aesthetic TOTAL</th><th>conceptual %</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>419</td><td>490%</td><td>4</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>318</td><td>486%</td><td>4</td><td></td></tr></table>		w-i-p in class presentation	T-sftwre mastery LATE	aesthetic TOTAL	conceptual %	3	419	490%	4		3	318	486%	4		<p>Action: Add advanced levels to the course to allow students more time to practice skills needed to develop portfolio quality work. (12/12/2015) Action Category: Curriculum Changes Action: Begin teaching</p>
	w-i-p in class presentation	T-sftwre mastery LATE	aesthetic TOTAL	conceptual %														
3	419	490%	4															
3	318	486%	4															

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results					Actions
15 (Fall 2014), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) Input Date: 12/16/2013 Inactive Date: Comments::	and finally manipulating them in Photoshop to create the composite.	3	3	3	4	4	compositing skills earlier in the semester (12/12/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies <hr/> Action: Place more emphasis on work-in-progress by giving it more points and making the work-in-progress critique a hard deadline. (12/12/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
	Standard and Target for Success:	3	3	3	4	4	
	Rubric: 4=excellent 3=good 2=fair	2	3	3	4	4	
	1=poor 0=not turned in in each of 4 areas: technical (camera & software mastery), aesthetic	2	16	76%	3	3	
	(design/composition), conceptual	2	16	76%	4	3	
	(idea & originality), presentation		16	76%	4	3	
	(printing & matting and posting on blog) + 3pts for work-in-progress milestone. 19 pts total.		4	4	4	4	
	Standard for success: A successful project demonstrates an original idea (conceptual), effective camera operation and software usage	2	16	76%	4	2	
	(technical), effective 2D design		15	71%	4	2	
	aesthetic decisions, and ability to meet deadlines and present the work professionally (work-in-progress + presentation). Success in each area is determined on the above point scale of 0-4pts.		3	4	3	2	
	Target for success: It was expected that 50% of the students would get 17 (80%) or above.	3	15	71%	4	4	
			3	4	4	2	
			3	4	4	2	
			4	4	4	2	
			14	67%	3	3	
			3	3	4	3	
			13	62%	3	3	
			3	3	4	3	
			13	62%	3	2	
			2	2	3	2	
			12	57%	2	4	
			3	1	2	4	
			12	57%	2	4	
	Additional Information:		1	2	4	3	
			10	48%	4	1	
			2	3	4	1	
			10	48%	3	4	
			1	2	3	4	
			10	48%	3		
			2	3	3		
			8	38%			
		2					
			2	10%			

The results were much lower than anticipated. Only 20% of

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

students achieved a score of 17 (80%) or above. Just over 50% achieved a score of 15 (70%) or above. One pattern that is evident is that the majority of students who scored above 70% also turned in the work-in-progress, thereby benefitting from an early critique and showing that they were managing their time well. The column with the lower scores was the technical grade, which upon reflection is indicative of a beginning student. With more practice, the technical skills will improve. Perhaps my expectations were inflated given the time constraints of the semester and the amount of material to cover. It doesn't allow time for students to practice the skills enough once they have been introduced to them in class.

(02/09/2015)

% of Success for this SLO:

Faculty Assessment Leader: Joyce Dallal

Faculty Contributing to Assessment:

ECC: ART 205A:History of Asian Art - India and Southeast Asia

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to analyze and explain content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of Indian and Southeast-Asian art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Object Identification Quiz of three questions, each worth three points, for a total of nine points on the quiz.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Standard performance would be 6.7 points (75%), while target performance is 7.2 points (80%).</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Fifteen of fifteen enrolled students participated in the SLO quiz. The average score was 6.4 points, below the standard performance. High scores were made addressing historical and geographical content, however low scores were made on the chronological content of the object identification. The SLO quiz was administered in the third week of the semester, so more emphasis should be made in the course instruction on specific chronology before the students take the first exam in the eighth week of the term. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Lucy Alamillo</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Juliann Wolfgram</p>	<p>Action: Follow up with similar assessment in the 13th week of class to measure change from first SLO assessment. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>
<p>SLO #2 Comprehend and Critique: - Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend and critique Indian and Southeast-Asian art works in terms of form, medium, and style.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p>	<p>Term/Research Paper - An expository essay based on formal and iconographical analysis of an artwork observed at a local museum.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 85% of students will score 75% or above on this SLO.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Twenty-eight students were enrolled in the course; Twenty-three participated in this assessment. The standard was met. 23 students achieved 75% or higher. In fact, 10 of those (half of participants) achieved a 90% and above. Eight students achieved a score of 80% or higher, therefore scoring above average. Five were 75-79%. The other 5 did not participate. These 5 enrolled students did not submit papers, therefore received O/F grade and/or received an "Incomplete" and were not considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Overall, all of the students were successful in their ability to comprehend and critique artworks in terms of form, medium, and style which are the necessary skills 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</p>	<p>Action: Continue this assessment as instructed and assigned with supplemental information on formal essay writing and resources for writing support. (05/26/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>greater difficulty articulating the information in an organized manner due to inexperience with formal or proper essay writing. (05/26/2017)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Lucy Alamillo</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p>	
<p>SLO #3 Communication - Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate ideas about Indian and Southeast-Asian art verbally or by written methods.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p>	<p>Term/Research Paper - Students were given a choice to write an approximately 5 page expository essay on either an example of contemporary or ancient work of art from India. The ancient option was specifically an artwork chosen from the Norton Simon Museum of Art. The purpose of the assignment is to analyze a work of art in relation to the iconographical concepts introduced in the course.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80 % of the students will score 75% or above on the paper including all of the above elements. (80% of the students will score 100-75 out of 100 possible points.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Forty-two students were enrolled in the course; thirty-eight participated in this assessment. The standard was met. 34 students achieved 75% or higher. In fact, 17of those (half of participants) achieved a 90% and above. Ten students achieved a score of 80% or higher, therefore scoring above average. Three were 75-79%. Six were in the 60-74% range and the other 5 did not participate. These 5 enrolled students did not submit papers, therefore received 0/F grade and/or received an "Incomplete" 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. Though this data indicates that students did meet the primary goals of the assessment, I think a narrower assessment focusing on only one of either the historical, contextual or iconographical components of an artwork would prove more successful. (02/24/2016)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Lucy Alamillo</p>	<p>Action: Provide a prompt earlier in the semester with narrower guidelines and without an option of choosing the type of essay content. Also, practice essay structure in short assignments or an in-class workshop (09/24/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

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

Faculty Contributing to Assessment:

ECC: ART 208:History of American Art

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Analysis of Content - Students will be able to analyze and explain content through the historical, geographical, and chronological context of American art.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p>	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration -</p> <p>Twenty minute group presentation on a theme of contemporary art. Students will be assessed on a 3-point scale</p> <p>1-doesn't meet standard 2 - meets standard 3 - exceeds standard</p> <p>according to three criteria: historical context, geographical context, and chronological context</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 90% of students will achieve a 2 or better.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> <p>Related Documents: SLO #1 content and context rubric.docx</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>15 students participated in the group presentations on a theme in twentieth-century American art. Each students in the group was graded individually. The ratings ar as follows: Historical context-46% met the standard, 53% exceeded the standard Geographical context - 80% met the standard, 20% exceeded the standard Chronological context - 13% didn't meet the standard, 53% met the standard, and 33% exceeded the standard</p> <p>Overall the standard was met, but not in chronological context specifically. This could be because the assignment was more theme-based. Some were able to still make connections of influence between the artworks, resulting in a better presentation. I can change the assignment guidelines to emphasize the necessity of creating a chronology among the thematic artworks chosen.</p> <p>Overall, a more objective assessment would be helpful as there are too many subjective areas in these assignments. (12/05/2016)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Karen Whitney</p>	<p>Action: Find more objective assessment method. (01/31/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Revise assignment guidelines to emphasize a chronological connection between artworks. (01/31/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2 Comprehend and Critique -</p> <p>Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend and critique American art works in terms of form, medium, and style.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students will answer the following questions in an in-class quiz:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the medium of the chosen art work and, in no more than three to four sentences, describe the artist's technique. 2. In no more than three to four sentences, discuss the form (style) of 	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>16 students participated in this assessment. The standard was met.</p> <p>Question #1: 6% poor, 31% average, 63% good Question #2: 6% poor, 13% average, 81% good Question #3: 6% poor, 63% average, 31% good</p>	<p>Action: Change questions for greater clarity and more consistency in answers. (11/28/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <p>Follow-Up: For the last assessment, I used an entirely</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Input Date: 12/16/2013 Inactive Date: Comments::</p>	<p>the chosen art work using terms such as representational, realistic, abstract, non-objective, objective, and installation.</p> <p>3. In one paragraph, describe the chosen art work in terms of the application of all or part of the following: line, color, space, shape, texture, light, value, rhythm, balance, scale, proportion, emphasis, unity and variety.</p> <p>Student answers will be graded on a 3-point scale, 1=poor, 2=average, 3=good</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 90% of students will achieve a 2 or better.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>Analysis: Based on the data, students seem to understand the concepts behind question #2 best: style. This is not surprising as material is organized according to chronologically based styles so this idea is reinforced often. Question #1 on medium/technique was their second most successful. This is also to be expected because we discuss the medium of each work. Even though students did generally well, I believe they would do better with a re-wording of this question as some of the answers were vague thus leading to imperfect data.</p> <p>The area students struggled most with was question #3 on form. This could also be improved by rewriting the question to clarify expectations. It was a question that required a write-in answer, but some students gave a very brief answer while others took more time to give a complete analysis of form. Rephrasing the question to require students to respond to at least 5 of the elements and principles could lead to better answers/results. I also think, however, that this is the area of the course where I spend the least amount of time. I focus more on historical context instead of formal analysis.</p> <p>While I will make some changes to the assessment next time around, I would like to continue with the same general structure and standard because the sample size was so small here. (05/15/2014)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Related Documents: Art 208 SLO #2 assessment.docx</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Not Met 7 groups of students participated in this assessment. Each group had 4-5 students each. Total students evaluated was 34.</p> <p>Student presentations were rated in terms of their</p>	<p>different method, assessing their understanding of form, medium, and style. In this way, the phrasing of the question was not important and students knew the different types of information to include in their presentation. (12/11/2014)</p> <p>Action: Create a short in-class or take-home assignment that requires a formal analysis, approx mid-way through the semester to reinforce ideas that are initially introduced at the beginning of the semester. (11/28/2014) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: The assignments for this class were completely re-organized for this semester, so the single additional assignment on form was not done. Instead, I attempted a flipped classroom for the last unit as an experiment. In their assignments, form, medium, and style of a particular type of 20th century art was part of their final project. The reinforcement of these concepts therefore was accomplished in a more holistic approach. (12/12/2014)</p> <p>Action: Require more thorough research and demonstrated understanding of the variety of media used in American Art. Rewrite presentation prompt to reflect this. (12/11/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students will present as a group on a thematic topic. Among other historical and cultural contexts that should be given, students should address style, form, and medium in relation to their chosen/assigned artworks.</p>		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Groups will be given a score on a three-point scale for each area. 1=poor demonstration of trait 2= average demonstration of trait 3=strong demonstration of trait Standard and Target for Success: 70% of the students will receive a 2 or better in each area. The presentation is a more holistic assessment and may be more challenging, therefore the standard is lower than with an objective exam. Additional Information:</p>	<p>demonstration of knowledge in the three areas: form, medium, and style. Group #1: 2, 3, 3 Group #2: 1, 1, 2 Group #3: 1, 2, 2 Group #4: 2, 1, 3 Group #5: 1, 2, 3 Group #6: 3, 3, 3 Group #7: 2, 1, 3</p> <p>For demonstration of form, the overall mean was 1.7, 57% met the standard. For demonstration of medium, the overall mean was 1.9, higher but still only 57% met the standard. For demonstration of style, the overall mean was 2.7, 100% of students met the standard in this area.</p> <p>Performing better in style makes sense for an art history class as it takes form and gives it historical context including influence from other artists. The students excelled at this but were not as proficient in discussing the various media or formal traits (line, color, illusion of space, etc..). While many students did discuss media such as murals, lithographs, and woodcuts, it was not consistently addressed. Formal analysis, while most basic, was overlooked for more contextual understanding of form (style). (12/08/2014) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Karen Whitney Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p>	<p>Action: I believe the Art History faculty need to review this SLO and decide whether or not form should be assessed separately from style in art history courses. In art history, chronological evolution of style is the context for form. Perhaps the SLO should read something like this: Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend and critique American art works in terms of the formal attributes of medium and style. (11/02/2015) Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

SLO #3 Communication - Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate ideas about American art verbally or by written methods.

Course SLO Status: Active

Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2019-20 (Spring 2020)

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

Input Date: 12/16/2013

Inactive Date:

Comments::

ECC: ART 282 :Life Sculpture

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 Terminology and Processes - Students will be able to understand and explain the terminology, processes, and historical and contemporary concepts related to the creation of figurative sculpture works at an intermediate level.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Fall 2013), 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p>	<p>Project - Through assessed demonstrations, students will show competency, at an intermediate level, in the terminology and processes as it relates to life sculpture.</p> <p>The assessment tools will be: Armature design and construction Application of construction materials, clay, to build the basic form. Modeling Techniques, including: Gesture, proportion, surface details.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: There will be Three areas of assessment: Armature Design and Construction Application of construction materials Modeling Techniques 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 3 criteria into a Life Sculpture of Visual Quality. The Target outcome is for 80% of the students to score in the 3 to 4 point range</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Out of 16 students: 10 students produced a score of 4 2 students produced a score of 3 The remaining 4 students failed to complete the evaluation process through Withdrawing from the course before a complete evaluation could be determined.</p> <p>Thus what remains is that: 62.5% of the 16 students who began the assessment gained a score of 4 or exceptional. This score is slightly higher than last assessment. In part to the high quality of student skill coming into the course, along with student focus. 12.5% of the 16 students gained as score of 3, good. With was lower than the previous assessment. The total % of students gaining a score of 3 or 4 was 75%, which is slightly below both the target outcome, 80%, and the score from last evaluation, 82.5%. Although the total % was lower, I do not believe that the 75% represents a lack of success in terms of the students finishing the course. The two main factors for the reduction are that 4 of the 16 students Withdrew from the course. Thus, the issues are more with student retention, and/or the length and depth of the assessment process, which covers a periods several weeks. A shorter version of this assessment tool may be required. (02/03/2015)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Fall 2013)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>On a score of 0-4; 57% of the students scored a 4</p>	<p>Action: I propose to shorten the time frame on the assessment method so that it take one or two class periods, Vs the present evaluation that takes several weeks. (12/15/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: For the 18% with modest growth, more in class discussion and one on one dialog may be required. (12/05/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		25% of the students scored a 3 18% of the students scored a 2 In total 82% of the students had good results. (12/05/2013) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None	Strategies
SLO #2 Construction and Modeling - Students will be able to show intermediate-level competency in the construction and modeling techniques related to life sculpture. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Fall 2013), 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 12/16/2013 Inactive Date: Comments::	Project - Through assessed demonstrations, students will show competency, at an intermediate level, in the construction and modeling techniques as it relates to life sculpture. The assessment tools will be: Armature design and construction Application of construction materials, clay, to build the basic form. Modeling Techniques, including: Gesture, proportion, surface details. Standard and Target for Success: There will be Three areas of assessment: Armature Design and Construction Application of construction materials Modeling Techniques 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 3 criteria into a Life Sculpture of Visual Quality. The Target outcome is for 80% of the students to score in the 3 to 4 point range Additional Information:	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Fall 2013) Standard Met? : Standard Met There will be Three areas of assessment: Armature Design and Construction Application of construction materials Modeling Techniques 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 3 criteria into a Life Sculpture of Visual Quality. The Target outcome is for 80% of the students to score in the 3 to 4 point range (12/05/2013) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None	Action: I think the standard may need to be raised. I will determine what the standard should be after the next round of SLO testing. No further action is needed in this section until data is taken again in 2017 (12/05/2014) Action Category: SLO Assessment Process Follow-Up: After 3 years of SLO assessment, I have determined that 80% baseline is more appropriate. I have made the change and will look at it again at the next assessment. (05/17/2017) Action: This assessment was for 1 class with 21 students participating. Of these, 11 students scored 4 points <div>6 students</div> <div>scored 3 points</div> <div>4 students</div> <div>scored 2 points</div> <div>No students</div> <div>scored 1 point</div> In total 17 students out of 21 scored a 3 or higher; Which is 81% (09/11/2014) Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Project - Have students create a sculpture based on a live human to determine whether students in this course performed at an intermediate-level of competency in the construction and modeling techniques related to the successful creation of life sculptures.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 75 percent of students will be able to successfully complete the assessment.</p> <p>Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Skill in observation of subject 2. Craft in modeling the representation of the model 3. Student developing a narrative or theme of the model 4. Modeling the concept effectively onto the life study <p>Students received points for each criteria: 4 points - Excellent; 3 points - Good; 2 points - Poor; 1 point - Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the initial class, from week 3 onward; Seven students performed the assignments with at 4 Six students performed the assignments with a 3 Only one student failed the assignments by dropping the course.</p> <p>Of the students who completed the course, the average was 3.54 points, or an 88.5% success rate. (02/10/2016)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p>	<p>Action: Because this is a skills-based course, students need more time to work with sculpting from a live model. I suggest the expansion of course offerings to include A, B, C and D levels to the course that could be offered concurrently since the subject of the live model would be the same for each course. (02/10/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>
<p>SLO #3 Design, Manufacturing, and Finishing - Students will be able to show intermediate-level competency in the design, manufacturing, and finishing techniques in figurative sculpture.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Fall 2013), 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/16/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p>	<p>Project - Through assessed demonstrations, students will show competency, at an intermediate level, in the design, manufacturing, and finishing techniques as it relates to life sculpture.</p> <p>The assessment tools will be: Armature design and construction Application of construction materials, clay, to build the basic form.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>The Students were assessed through and end of the semester critique of their completed projects.</p> <p>On a scale of 0-4, where 4 is excellent, 3 good, 2 passing, 1 poor and 0 fail; 64% of the students scored excellent 20% of the students scored good and 16% of the students scored a 2 or below.</p> <p>The original goal was to have a 70% percent success rate for</p>	<p>Action: Raise the assessment level to 80% rather than the 70% baseline. (05/17/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>Comments::</p>	<p>Modeling Techniques, including: Gesture, proportion, surface details. Standard and Target for Success: There will be Three areas of assessment: Armature Design and Construction Application of construction materials Modeling Techniques 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 3 criteria into a Life Sculpture of Visual Quality. The Target outcome is for 80% of the students to score in the 3 to 4 point range Additional Information:</p> <p>Project - Meaning and purpose are the inspirations of life. In this assessment I am looking to determine whether students in this course performed at an intermediate-level of competency in the construction and modeling techniques related to the successful creation of life sculptures. Looking @ the work produced, There are improvements in the "voice" of the student's ideas, as</p>	<p>scores of 3 or 4. This class scored 84% success rate for scores of 3 or 4. The assessment of these scores was based on the work's design and construction foundational skills. In addition, students with scores of 3 or higher's work need to demonstrate an intermediate level of the modeling skills of; Gesture, proportions, and surface design details, as they relate to advancement of creative expression within the figurative object. The high level of success demonstrates clear instruction and process communication. Students were actively engaged in the discussion and execution of their projects. Their success shows a clear understanding of the objectives stated in the lesson. (05/16/2017) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Fall 2013) Standard Met? : Standard Met Based on a 0-4 scale; 48% scored a 4 45% scored a 3 11% scored a 2 This also well exceeded the 70%. I will re-assess this goal during the next SLO. (12/05/2013) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Russell McMillin Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p>	<p>Action: No new action plan needed at this time. I will compare these results with those of the next SLO, and determine where the 70% rate should be raised. (12/05/2015) Action Category: SLO Assessment Process</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>expressed in their sculptures.</p> <p>When we had repeatability, the first semester was more grounded in Foundation, 12 weeks of French Academy style Model study/Anatomy.</p> <p>As the students progressed, more time was allowed to self-expression.</p> <p>Presently, with only 1 semester to train, the issue of whether to keep it strongly focused on observation skills, or to broaden the time spent on using the figure as a vehicle of expression.</p> <p>This semester I increased the expression of time from 4 weeks to 8 weeks. - Splitting the two disciplines in half.</p> <p>The overall result has been positive- Yes, some sacrifice, especially in refined details, was sacrificed for the student to develop more expression of ideas in their work.</p> <p>To this end, I believe this semester shows that the greater good is served with a balanced compromise.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>Rubric:</p> <p>Phase 1: The Class Study.</p> <p>Evaluation Methods;</p> <p> A. Skill in Observation of Subject</p> <p> B. Craft in modeling the representation of the model.</p> <p>Phase 2: Morphing.</p> <p> Evaluation Methods:</p> <p> A. Student developing a narrative or theme for express</p> <p> B. Modeling the concept effectively onto the life study.</p>		

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

Additional Information: