

# Art Department Assessment Report to [learningassessment@pcc.edu](mailto:learningassessment@pcc.edu)

2011-2012

Prepared by Elizabeth Bilyeu, Art SAC Chair

June 2012

*Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C (LDC/DE)) or 6B (CTE) of the Program Review Outline*

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from outcome assessments carried out in 2010-2011. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.

This year (2011-12), Art Department changes have focused mostly on exploring and improving the assessment process, and less on any in-depth curriculum or overarching programmatic changes. Based on feedback from our peer review last year (see chart below) and SAC subcommittee meetings with Assessment Coach Gabe Hunter-Bernstein, we completely revamped our assessment process this year. We asked direct/indirect assessment questions three different times to hundreds of art and art history students. We involved a large number of art faculty to tally and review the data, and we have drawn conclusions and begun making plans for next year. See the answer to question 2 for an in-depth explanation and quests 3 and 4 for next year's plans.

In addition, we were quite busy with curriculum changes this year including updating (clarifying and stream-lining) CCOGs for all Art classes (approximately 90), specifically course descriptions and outcomes; and applying for General Education List status.

<b>PEER REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT REPORT, 2011</b>		<b>2012 Some response based on Art SAC Assessment (2011-12)</b>
General Comments	Annual Report was not in standardized format, making it harder to evaluate.  Since the Art SAC covers such different kinds of classes, it may be best to split into 1 report for Visual Art and 1 report for Studio Art.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Standard format presented in this report</li><li>• Due to the nature of the breadth of our indirect/direct assessment this year, the report for Studio Art and Art History is combined. However, each sub-discipline within the Art Department was able to make separate and focused conclusions based on the assessment.</li></ul>

<p>1. Changes resulting from last year's assessment?</p>	<p>Unknown.</p> <p>This year's outcomes: Communication/Self Reflection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Art Historians revised and updated the 100-level series as a result of last year's discussions and assessments. For example, titles, course descriptions, and learning outcomes were updated to tie more directly to PCC Core Outcomes and to reflect the current direction of scholarship in art and art history. The learning outcomes of the 200-level courses were revised also.</li> <li>• Art History Faculty have not addressed the writing components of the Art History classes district-wide, though assessing writing has emerged in discussions this year.</li> <li>• Studio Faculty revised the learning outcomes and course descriptions of studio courses to tie them more clearly to College outcomes.</li> <li>• We did not address specific ways to improve self-reflection and communication, especially in regards to critique.</li> </ul>
<p>2a This year: DESIGN (what did you do?)</p>	<p>Plan was very interesting:</p> <p>Rubric evaluating student work to study evidence of outcomes.</p> <p>Self critique before/after Group critique.</p> <p>(Sample size should be</p>	<p>Even though there was interest in our approach, due to the small amount of data, we decided to revamp our assessment process with an indirect/direct assessment survey question that involved more faculty and students in the assessment process.</p>

	<p>n=8 per section.)</p> <p>Indirect assessment questionnaire.</p> <p>Art History student project.</p>	
<p>2b This year: RESULTS (what did you learn?)</p>	<p>Sample size is low.</p> <p>Before/after shows no change, which means it was either ineffective at addressing core outcomes, or perhaps needs a different implementation.</p> <p>We agree with simple 1-5 ranking (statistically less problematic). Perhaps students spent lots of time on 1-5 ranking, and not much on Questions 1 &amp; 3 which would show strong evidence of self-reflective skills.</p>	<p>In order to increase the sample size as suggested for 2010-11, this year, we simplified the plan to include two questions to be asked district-wide in art classes (one question related to Cultural Awareness and one related to Professional Competence). Student answers were completely narrative, but the first part of our data tally was succinct (in determining whether or not the student had an understanding of the question).</p>
<p>3a. Instructional changes planned based on what was learned?</p>	<p>You might want to show the students the rubric before the assignment. As it is, this assessment did not deliver reliable enough information to suggest program improvements.</p>	<p>This year, we played with the amount of instruction and direction that we gave the students before the question was distributed. In Fall term, the question was given “cold” with little explanation. By the end of Winter term, the students completed the question after discussion about assessment and the outcomes. However, the trend analysis worksheet was not shared with students.</p>

<p>3b</p> <p><u>Assessment strategy changes planned based on what was learned ?</u></p>		<p>We have clearer ideas about plans for next year, though we will address this again at the beginning of Fall 2012 term to make sure that we are all on the same page.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>Rubrics and benchmark indicators are thorough.</p> <p>We agree that “weighting” of 1-5 scores is questionable. It is difficult to see what is actually important.</p> <p>(What do commas mean on studio art tables?)</p>	
<p><b>GENERAL TRENDS AT PCC</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Our numbers shown this year can be looked at in terms of the number and variety of classes assessed.</li> <li>3. The norming process occurred (peer-to-peer) before faculty tallied data.</li> <li>4. This year’s assessment involved student awareness and students’ sense as to whether or not they attained the outcomes.</li> <li>5. Room for improvement is discussed throughout this report. We have not explored the benchmarks by which to measure this report. Don’t hesitate to guide us more in this area.</li> </ol>	

**For each outcome assessed this year:**

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:

- The nature of the assessment (e.g., written work, project, portfolio, exam, survey, performance etc.) and if it is direct (assesses evidence mastery of outcomes) or indirect (student's perception of mastery). Please give rationale for indirect assessments (direct assessments are preferable).

Following review of the Art Assessment Report 2010-11 (assessing Communication and Self-Reflection), the Art SAC decided in the Fall 2011 to use indirect/direct assessment in the form of student questionnaires this year in order

- To increase the sample size for assessment, and
- To increase student and faculty awareness of and active participating in the process of assessment.

The following describes the assessment process this year for BOTH outcomes (Cultural Awareness and Professional Competence).

1. September 2011 -- The Art SAC continued to reflect on last year's process, and at our first SAC meeting, we brainstormed as a group around the outcomes of Cultural Awareness and Professional Competence to determine specific courses to target this year. The goal became to address a breadth of classes in terms of subject/medium but also to target classes that seemed to address best these outcomes. An assessment subcommittee was formed to write the plan and present to the SAC in October (members mostly part time instructors - Vanessa Calvert, JulieAnne Poncet, Sandy Sampson, Susanne Tringali, and Elizabeth Bilyeu, SAC Chair). We met consistently with Assessment Coach Gabe Hunter-Bernstein so that he could help facilitate and guide us.
2. October 2011 -- The assessment subcommittee presented the plan to the Art SAC: to ask students in the designated classes a narrative-response question about Cultural Awareness or Professional Competence. The questionnaire would be administered three times (week 8 Fall term, week 2 Winter term, week 8 Winter term). Since the process began late in Fall term, the Fall term question could serve possibly as an indicator of the need for more class discussion and self-awareness around assessment. The Winter term assessment would be conducted with more awareness and discussion about assessment and outcomes throughout the term. The questions asked beginning in week 8 were

- a. "Please address the following as it relates to this course with as much detail as possible: Explain how the same work of art/architecture could be viewed differently by people from different cultural backgrounds, or social contexts (Time periods, place, ethnicity). Include specific examples from this course." (for Cultural Awareness)
- b. "Please address the following as it relates to this course with as much detail as possible: Please describe the skills, knowledge, ways of thinking, or habits you gained in this class that you can apply in a profession or advanced academic program." (for Professional Competence)

We asked students about their perception of meeting these outcomes (indirect), and we were able to measure to what degree they understood and met the outcomes (direct) by evaluating their responses and examples. The short, written responses seemed to be the preference of the group in order to be open to unexpected trends and moods. We also focused on this sort of approach in order to capture more students in the process. Data collection began!

3. January 2012 - The subcommittee met with Gabe to devise a trend analysis template to use to score the students' written responses. Faculty reading the responses would judge to what degree the student made a connection to the question, how many, and what types of examples they used to support the connection. We had collected approximately 500 responses from Fall term. At this point, we realized that evaluating that many responses in addition to Winter term responses would be a monumental task, so we addressed a sample of approximately 200 based on a random sample approach. The entire Art SAC met and began to apply the trend analysis to the answers collected from Fall term and from week 2 of Winter term. Sally Earll and Paul Wild (from the PALS group) facilitated. Each time we worked on trend analysis as a group, we began with a discussion of the process and a partnering of faculty to help with the norming of the scoring. Feedback from faculty included
  - a. Concern about the mix-up between this question and class evaluations.
  - b. Awareness that the Professional Competence question is easier to answer than the Cultural Awareness question.
  - c. Questions about the subjectivity of the trend analysis scoring and whether or not faculty should score their own classes.
  - d. Due to lack of funding, the Art SAC decided to send back the questionnaires so that faculty could score their own classes on their own. However, the group acknowledged that faculty awareness and buy-in was raised in regards to assessment within group exercises like this.

4. February, March, April 2012 - Fortunately, the Art SAC was awarded a Learning Assessment Grant to fund two workshops (March 12 and April 6) in which Art Faculty could be paid to apply the trend analysis to data collected in Winter term. The grant also paid the part time instructors on the subcommittee for administrative work to facilitate the workshops and to pull together the data from the trend analysis in order to present it to the Art SAC Spring term meeting. Feedback from the workshops included
- a. Faculty felt we were able to engage intelligently.
  - b. Faculty felt that the workshop was a good use of time.
  - c. The trend analysis is strong, and seems to reveal a good reflection of the data.
  - d. Faculty noticed frustration by students in week 8. If they were in more than one art class, they felt like they were doing the same thing over and over. Should we ask different questions? Should we do different activities in order to assess?
5. April 2012 - The Art SAC received the data at the Spring term meeting. Sally Earll and Gabe Hunter-Bernstein (PALS) led the following activity that was devised by the assessment subcommittee
- 9:15 – 9:30, explanation of process to interpret fall and winter data for assessment report
  - 9:30 – 9:55, in small groups, describe the data (positive and negative), one record keeper per group, larger group discussion
  - 9:55 – 10:20, in same group, what does this suggest? what do we infer? what does it mean? move from general to specific; one record keeper per group, larger group discussion
  - 10:20 – 10:45, in same group, now, what details/specifics should we focus on in the art department? one record keeper per group, larger group discussion
  - 10:45 – 11:00 break (volunteer to call in lunch order)
  - 11:00 – 11:25, join a group within your teaching area (“job alike”, for example art historians or 3-D instructors); what sort of instructional, programmatic, and/or curriculum change do we need to make next year and in the future? one record keeper per group, larger group discussion
  - 11:25 – 11:50, again in “job alike” groups, what are your suggestions for changes to the assessment process next year; one record keeper per group, larger group discussion; our next outcomes to assess are
    - Community & Environmental Responsibility
    - Critical Thinking and Problem Solving (assessed in 2010)
  - 11:50 – noon, conclusions

- Calculations included numbers of classes assessed in studio and in art history, the percentage of students who created a connection to the question, and the percentage of times certain examples were cited.

In summary, this assessment reached

	Cultural Awareness	Professional Competence	
Number of types of classes (by course number)	12 each term	13 each term	39 Fall term 42 Winter term
Total number of classes assessed	25 Fall (wk 8) 20 Win. (wk 2) 16 Win. (wk 8)	27 Fall (wk 8) 14 Winter (wk 2) 21 Winter (wk 8)	Approximately 200 classes offered Fall term. Approximately 205 classes offered Winter term.
Number of student questionnaire samples scored	277 Fall (wk 8) 306 Win. (wk 2) 187 Win. (wk 8)	246 Fall (wk 8) 210 Win. (wk 2) 260 Win. (wk 8)	
Number of faculty who participated in scoring the trend analyses	17 full time 23 adjunct	17 full time 23 adjunct	

Included here on the next six pages are spreadsheets with more data (CA and PC Summaries).





[illegible]

Professional Competency Summary	pc fall	pc fall	pc fall	pc wint. 1	pc wint. 1	pc wint. 1	pc wint. 2	pc wint. 2	pc wint. 2
	Studio	Art Hist	Combined	Studio	Art Hist	Combined	Studio	Art Hist	Combined
Number of classes	22	5	27	12	2	14	19	2	21
Connection?	%			%			%		
Student made connection	47.40%	67.12%	53.25%	71.04%	81.48%	72.38%	68.77%	100.00%	69.62%
Student made no connection	52.60%	32.88%	46.75%	28.96%	18.52%	27.62%	31.23%	0.00%	30.38%
Total samples	173	73	246	183	27	210	253	7	260
Total examples	328	117	445	465	44	509	525	18	543
Average examples per class	14.91	23.40	16.48	38.75	22.00	36.36	27.63	9.00	25.86
Average examples per student	1.90	1.60	1.81	2.54	1.63	2.42	2.08	2.57	2.09
<b>Examples:</b>									
Organization	2.44%	4.27%	2.92%	1.72%	2.27%	1.77%	3.43%	0.00%	3.31%
Planning	5.79%	1.71%	4.72%	4.52%	0.00%	4.13%	3.81%	0.00%	3.68%
Patience	5.49%	0.00%	4.04%	3.01%	0.00%	2.75%	8.38%	0.00%	8.10%
Verbal communication	3.35%	2.56%	3.15%	2.80%	6.82%	3.14%	4.19%	22.22%	4.79%
Written communication	0.91%	1.71%	1.12%	1.08%	4.55%	1.38%	0.19%	11.11%	0.55%
Confidence	3.96%	0.85%	3.15%	2.80%	0.00%	2.55%	3.43%	0.00%	3.31%
Critical thinking	4.27%	16.24%	7.42%	6.45%	11.36%	6.88%	5.90%	33.33%	6.81%
Hand-eye coordination	1.22%	0.00%	0.90%	1.72%	0.00%	1.57%	1.33%	0.00%	1.29%
Specific art skills	19.21%	0.85%	14.38%	15.70%	0.00%	14.34%	18.29%	0.00%	17.68%
Identified profession	8.84%	13.68%	10.11%	9.03%	11.36%	9.23%	5.33%	0.00%	5.16%
Follow through	3.35%	0.00%	2.47%	4.73%	0.00%	4.32%	2.48%	0.00%	2.39%
Analyzing	4.57%	21.37%	8.99%	4.09%	22.73%	5.70%	0.76%	5.56%	0.92%
Scheduling	0.30%	0.85%	0.45%	1.51%	0.00%	1.38%	0.57%	0.00%	0.55%
Study skills	0.30%	12.82%	3.60%	2.80%	0.00%	2.55%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Conceptualization	3.35%	5.13%	3.82%	8.39%	2.27%	7.86%	1.33%	0.00%	1.29%
Tech vocabulary	7.01%	2.56%	5.84%	1.72%	0.00%	1.57%	5.90%	0.00%	5.71%
Problem Solving	3.05%	0.00%	2.25%	5.16%	2.27%	4.91%	4.38%	5.56%	4.42%
Risk taking	1.22%	0.00%	0.90%	1.08%	0.00%	0.98%	1.52%	0.00%	1.47%
Flexibility	3.05%	0.00%	2.25%	1.72%	0.00%	1.57%	1.90%	0.00%	1.84%
Deadlines	2.74%	0.00%	2.02%	0.22%	0.00%	0.20%	1.71%	0.00%	1.66%
Consequences	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Attention to Detail	0.61%	0.00%	0.45%	0.43%	0.00%	0.39%	0.76%	0.00%	0.74%
Teamwork	2.13%	0.00%	1.57%	1.29%	2.27%	1.38%	0.95%	5.56%	1.10%
Cleanliness	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Punctuality	0.61%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33%	0.00%	1.29%
Learn from criticism	1.83%	0.00%	1.35%	0.65%	0.00%	0.59%	2.86%	0.00%	2.76%
Initiative	1.22%	2.56%	1.57%	0.22%	0.00%	0.20%	0.38%	0.00%	0.37%
Craftsmanship	1.22%	0.00%	0.90%	0.65%	0.00%	0.59%	0.95%	0.00%	0.92%
Time management	3.05%	0.85%	2.47%	3.44%	0.00%	3.14%	5.90%	0.00%	5.71%
Focus	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.20%	0.76%	0.00%	0.74%
Passion	0.91%	0.00%	0.67%	1.08%	0.00%	0.98%	0.38%	0.00%	0.37%
Reading skills	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	0.18%
Memory	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Research	0.00%	2.56%	0.67%	0.00%	11.36%	0.98%	0.19%	11.11%	0.55%
Manners	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Goal Setting	0.91%	0.00%	0.67%	0.43%	0.00%	0.39%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Portfolio Creation	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.20%	0.57%	0.00%	0.55%
Efficiency	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Note Taking	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Seeking Advice/Help	0.61%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Persistence	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%	0.37%
Work Ethic	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	0.43%	0.00%	0.39%	0.19%	0.00%	0.18%
Leadership	0.30%	0.85%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Diversity awareness	0.00%	4.27%	1.12%	1.94%	13.64%	2.95%	0.38%	0.00%	0.37%
Life skills	0.00%	3.42%	0.90%	2.15%	0.00%	1.96%	2.67%	0.00%	2.58%
Self awareness	0.00%	0.85%	0.22%	2.80%	2.27%	2.75%	0.76%	0.00%	0.74%
Creativity	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	3.01%	0.00%	2.75%	2.67%	0.00%	2.58%
Other	0.30%	0.00%	0.22%	0.65%	6.82%	1.18%	1.90%	0.00%	1.84%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Professional Competency Summary	pc fall	pc wint. 1	pc wint. 2	pc fall	pc wint. 1	pc wint. 2	pc fall	pc wint. 1	pc wint. 2
	Studio	Studio	Studio	Art Hist	Art Hist	Art Hist	Combined	Combined	Combined
Number of classes	22	12	19	5	2	2	27	14	21
Connection?	%	%	%						
Student made connection	47.40%	71.04%	68.77%	67.12%	81.48%	100.00%	53.25%	72.38%	69.62%
Student made no connection	52.60%	28.96%	31.23%	32.88%	18.52%	0.00%	46.75%	27.62%	30.38%
Total samples	173	183	253	73	27	7	246	210	260
Total examples	328	465	525	117	44	18	445	509	543
Average examples per class	14.91	38.75	27.63	23.40	22.00	9.00	16.48	36.36	25.86
Average examples per student	1.90	2.54	2.08	1.60	1.63	2.57	1.81	2.42	2.09
Examples:									
Organization	2.44%	1.72%	3.43%	4.27%	2.27%	0.00%	2.92%	1.77%	3.31%
Planning	5.79%	4.52%	3.81%	1.71%	0.00%	0.00%	4.72%	4.13%	3.68%
Patience	5.49%	3.01%	8.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.04%	2.75%	8.10%
Verbal communication	3.35%	2.80%	4.19%	2.56%	6.82%	22.22%	3.15%	3.14%	4.79%
Written communication	0.91%	1.08%	0.19%	1.71%	4.55%	11.11%	1.12%	1.38%	0.55%
Confidence	3.96%	2.80%	3.43%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.15%	2.55%	3.31%
Critical thinking	4.27%	6.45%	5.90%	16.24%	11.36%	33.33%	7.42%	6.88%	6.81%
Hand-eye coordination	1.22%	1.72%	1.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	1.57%	1.29%
Specific art skills	19.21%	15.70%	18.29%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	14.38%	14.34%	17.68%
Identified profession	8.84%	9.03%	5.33%	13.68%	11.36%	0.00%	10.11%	9.23%	5.16%
Follow through	3.35%	4.73%	2.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.47%	4.32%	2.39%
Analyzing	4.57%	4.09%	0.76%	21.37%	22.73%	5.56%	8.99%	5.70%	0.92%
Scheduling	0.30%	1.51%	0.57%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	1.38%	0.55%
Study skills	0.30%	2.80%	0.19%	12.82%	0.00%	0.00%	3.60%	2.55%	0.18%
Conceptualization	3.35%	8.39%	1.33%	5.13%	2.27%	0.00%	3.82%	7.86%	1.29%
Tech vocabulary	7.01%	1.72%	5.90%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	5.84%	1.57%	1.29%
Problem Solving	3.05%	5.16%	4.38%	0.00%	2.27%	5.56%	2.25%	4.91%	4.42%
Risk taking	1.22%	1.08%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	0.98%	1.47%
Flexibility	3.05%	1.72%	1.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.25%	1.57%	1.84%
Deadlines	2.74%	0.22%	1.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.02%	0.20%	1.66%
Consequences	0.30%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.18%
Attention to Detail	0.61%	0.43%	0.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.39%	0.74%
Teamwork	2.13%	1.29%	0.95%	0.00%	2.27%	5.56%	1.57%	1.38%	1.10%
Cleanliness	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%
Punctuality	0.61%	0.00%	1.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	1.29%
Learn from criticism	1.83%	0.65%	2.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%	0.59%	2.76%
Initiative	1.22%	0.22%	0.38%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	1.57%	0.20%	0.37%
Craftsmanship	1.22%	0.65%	0.95%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	0.59%	0.92%
Time management	3.05%	3.44%	5.90%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	2.47%	3.14%	5.71%
Focus	0.00%	0.22%	0.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.74%
Passion	0.91%	1.08%	0.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.67%	0.98%	0.37%
Reading skills	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%
Memory	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Research	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	2.56%	11.36%	11.11%	0.67%	0.98%	0.55%
Manners	0.30%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.18%
Goal Setting	0.91%	0.43%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.67%	0.39%	0.18%
Portfolio Creation	0.00%	0.22%	0.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.55%
Efficiency	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%
Note Taking	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%
Seeking Advice/Help	0.61%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.18%
Persistence	0.30%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.37%
Work Ethic	0.30%	0.43%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	0.39%	0.18%
Leadership	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%
Diversity awareness	0.00%	1.94%	0.38%	4.27%	13.64%	0.00%	1.12%	2.95%	0.37%
Life skills	0.00%	2.15%	2.67%	3.42%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	1.96%	2.58%
Self awareness	0.00%	2.80%	0.76%	0.85%	2.27%	0.00%	0.22%	2.75%	0.74%
Creativity	0.30%	3.01%	2.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	2.75%	2.58%
Other	0.30%	0.65%	1.90%	0.00%	6.82%	0.00%	0.22%	1.18%	1.84%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

## Cultural Awareness Summary of examples given

CA Fall Combined	
Time, place, ethnicity	35.80%
Specific medium	18.02%
Content of work	14.57%
Specific work	11.36%
Specific artist	8.89%
Religion	4.94%
Specific Style/genre	2.72%
Political	0.99%
Specific period	0.99%
Generational	0.74%
Materials	0.25%
Criticism	0.25%
Other	0.25%
Gender	0.25%
Color	0.00%
Travel	0.00%
Symbol	0.00%
Tools	0.00%

CA Winter week 2 Combined	
Time, place, ethnicity	36.17%
Content of work	15.74%
Specific medium	11.49%
Religion	8.51%
Specific work	7.66%
Specific artist	5.53%
Political	4.89%
Specific Style/genre	3.62%
Other	2.13%
Specific period	1.91%
Color	0.85%
Criticism	0.43%
Materials	0.21%
Generational	0.21%
Travel	0.21%
Symbol	0.21%
Tools	0.21%
Gender	0.00%

CA Winter week 8 Combined	
Time, place, ethnicity	28.84%
Specific Style/genre	13.48%
Specific work	12.94%
Specific medium	11.86%
Religion	9.43%
Specific artist	7.01%
Content of work	4.85%
Political	4.31%
Specific period	1.89%
Generational	1.89%
Gender	1.35%
Symbol	1.08%
Other	0.81%
Materials	0.27%
Color	0.00%
Travel	0.00%
Criticism	0.00%
Tools	0.00%

## Professional Competency Summary of examples given

### PC Fall Combined

Specific art skills	14.38%
Identified profession	10.11%
Analyzing	8.99%
Critical thinking	7.42%
Tech vocabulary	5.84%
Planning	4.72%
Patience	4.04%
Conceptualization	3.82%
Study skills	3.60%
Verbal communication	3.15%
Confidence	3.15%
Organization	2.92%
Follow through	2.47%
Time management	2.47%
Problem Solving	2.25%
Flexibility	2.25%
Deadlines	2.02%
Teamwork	1.57%
Initiative	1.57%
Learn from criticism	1.35%
Written communication	1.12%
Diversity awareness	1.12%
Hand-eye coordination	0.90%
Risk taking	0.90%
Craftsmanship	0.90%
Life skills	0.90%
Passion	0.67%
Research	0.67%
Goal Setting	0.67%
Scheduling	0.45%
Attention to Detail	0.45%
Punctuality	0.45%
Seeking Advice/Help	0.45%
Leadership	0.45%
Consequences	0.22%
Cleanliness	0.22%
Manners	0.22%
Persistence	0.22%
Work Ethic	0.22%
Self awareness	0.22%
Creativity	0.22%
Other	0.22%
Focus	0.00%
Reading skills	0.00%
Memory	0.00%
Portfolio Creation	0.00%
Efficiency	0.00%
Note Taking	0.00%

### PC Winter week 2 Combined

Specific art skills	14.34%
Identified profession	9.23%
Conceptualization	7.86%
Critical thinking	6.88%
Analyzing	5.70%
Problem Solving	4.91%
Follow through	4.32%
Planning	4.13%
Verbal communication	3.14%
Time management	3.14%
Diversity awareness	2.95%
Patience	2.75%
Self awareness	2.75%
Creativity	2.75%
Confidence	2.55%
Study skills	2.55%
Life skills	1.96%
Organization	1.77%
Hand-eye coordination	1.57%
Tech vocabulary	1.57%
Flexibility	1.57%
Written communication	1.38%
Scheduling	1.38%
Teamwork	1.38%
Other	1.18%
Risk taking	0.98%
Passion	0.98%
Research	0.98%
Learn from criticism	0.59%
Craftsmanship	0.59%
Attention to Detail	0.39%
Goal Setting	0.39%
Work Ethic	0.39%
Deadlines	0.20%
Initiative	0.20%
Focus	0.20%
Portfolio Creation	0.20%
Efficiency	0.20%
Consequences	0.00%
Cleanliness	0.00%
Punctuality	0.00%
Reading skills	0.00%
Memory	0.00%
Manners	0.00%
Note Taking	0.00%
Seeking Advice/Help	0.00%
Persistence	0.00%
Leadership	0.00%

### PC Winter week 8 Combined

Specific art skills	17.68%
Patience	8.10%
Critical thinking	6.81%
Tech vocabulary	5.71%
Time management	5.71%
Identified profession	5.16%
Verbal communication	4.79%
Problem Solving	4.42%
Planning	3.68%
Organization	3.31%
Confidence	3.31%
Learn from criticism	2.76%
Life skills	2.58%
Creativity	2.58%
Follow through	2.39%
Flexibility	1.84%
Other	1.84%
Deadlines	1.66%
Risk taking	1.47%
Hand-eye coordination	1.29%
Conceptualization	1.29%
Punctuality	1.29%
Teamwork	1.10%
Analyzing	0.92%
Craftsmanship	0.92%
Attention to Detail	0.74%
Focus	0.74%
Self awareness	0.74%
Written communication	0.55%
Scheduling	0.55%
Research	0.55%
Portfolio Creation	0.55%
Initiative	0.37%
Passion	0.37%
Persistence	0.37%
Diversity awareness	0.37%
Study skills	0.18%
Consequences	0.18%
Reading skills	0.18%
Manners	0.18%
Goal Setting	0.18%
Note Taking	0.18%
Seeking Advice/Help	0.18%
Work Ethic	0.18%
Cleanliness	0.00%
Memory	0.00%
Efficiency	0.00%
Leadership	0.00%

- The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?
- The courses to assess were chosen by faculty during a small group activity during Inservice in Fall term. The initial questions asked of the faculty were the following and a wide variety of courses were chosen from the results.
  - Partner with a colleague, and divide a piece of paper into four columns.
  - Columns 1 and 2: Each of you name one of your classes and the ultimate thing that you want your students to learn to carry with them for years. Someone take the role of scribe and write list in first columns as you discuss with partners.
  - Column 3: What can we do to measure that this happened – that they have or will have that knowledge or skill in 10 years?
  - As it relates to our Art and Art History curriculum, define
    - Cultural Awareness
    - Professional Competence
  - Column 4: Which of these classes in Column 1 connect best to Cultural Awareness or Professional Competence?
- The large student sample was based on feedback from last year that we did not have a large enough sample size.
- Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.
- Questions for students (see page 6 above)
- Trend analysis worksheet for Cultural Awareness used by faculty in SAC meetings and workshops to tally answers for each class (below, page 16)
- Trend analysis worksheet for Professional Competence used by faculty in SAC meetings and workshops to tally answers for each class (below, page 17)
- Cultural Awareness Summary drawn from trend analysis worksheets (above, pages 9 - 10)
- Professional Competence Summary drawn from trend analysis worksheets (above, pages 11 - 12)
- Cultural Awareness Examples given by students (above, page 13)
- Professional Competence Examples given by students (above, pages 14)

## Cultural Awareness

Class	#of students	
-------	--------------	--

### Connection?

Student made connection		%
Student made no connection		
Incomplete connection		
Subjectivity vs. Cultural Awareness		
<b>Total samples</b>		

### Number of examples per student

Student 1		Student 16	
Student 2		Student 17	
Student 3		Student 18	
Student 4		Student 19	
Student 5		Student 20	
Student 6		Student 21	
Student 7		Student 22	
Student 8		Student 23	
Student 9		Student 24	
Student 10		Student 25	
Student 11		Student 26	
Student 12		Student 27	Total
Student 13		Student 28	
Student 14		Student 29	
Student 15		Student 30	

### Examples:

Time, place, ethnicity		%
Specific artist		
Specific medium		
Content of work		
Specific work		
Religion		
Specific Style/genre		
Political		
Specific period		
Materials		
Generational		
Color		
Travel		
Symbol		
Criticism		
Tools		
Other		
Gender		
<b>Total examples:</b>		



Class	#of Students	
-------	--------------	--

Student made connection  
Student made no connection

Number of examples per per student

Student 1	
Student 2	
Student 3	
Student 4	
Student 5	
Student 6	
Student 7	
Student 8	
Student 9	
Student 10	
Student 11	
Student 12	
Student 13	
Student 14	
Student 15	
Student 16	
Student 17	
Student 18	
Student 19	
Student 20	

Student 21	
Student 22	
Student 23	
Student 24	
Student 25	
Student 26	
Student 27	
Student 28	
Student 29	
Student 30	
Student 31	
Student 32	
Student 33	
Student 34	
Student 35	
Student 36	
Student 37	
Student 38	
Student 39	
Student 40	

Organization	
Planning	
Patience	
Verbal communication	
Written communication	
Confidence	
Critical thinking	
Hand-eye coordination	
Specific art skills	
Identified profession	
Follow through	
Analyzing	
Scheduling	
Study skills	
Conceptualization	
Tech vocabulary	
Problem Solving	
Risk taking	
Flexibility	
Deadlines	
Consequences	
Attention to Detail	
Teamwork	
Cleanliness	
Punctuality	
Learn from criticism	
Initiative	
Craftmanship	
Time management	
Focus	
Passion	
Reading skills	

[illegible]

- How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another).

During each group scoring exercise/workshop, facilitators explained the process. We then paired faculty and worked to score a few answers together to gain consistency across the group. From there, we moved individually to score/tally questionnaires, checking in with faculty colleagues during the process if we hesitated on a score.

3. Provide information about the results (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?
  - If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any appropriate benchmarks.
  - Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning. Please show those specific results.

Please see included data from Fall and Winter terms (especially pages 10 – 14) and observations and conclusions captured from the Art SAC Spring meeting (process explained above and listed below).

- Art Cultural Awareness Assessment Observations and Conclusions
- Art Professional Competence Assessment Observations and Conclusions

## **Cultural Awareness**

### **Observations and Conclusions based on**

#### **2011-12 assessment processes and Cultural Awareness Summary,**

#### **Spring Art SAC meeting, April 2012**

---

##### **General**

- In summary, dramatic rise and fall of specific works cited
- For students making no connection, studio classes increased and art history decreased.
- More diversity in answers as year progressed, combined
- Subjectivity as an answer went down
- More difficult to connect to this question than Professional Competence question; we are surprised.
- We question organization of assessment
- Most non-connections in winter 2
- Rise of total examples, then drop in winter 2
- Average examples per student and per class went up in winter 2
- From summary, in winter, criticism decreased, content of work decreased; specific style and specific work increased.

##### **Studio**

- Percentage increased in content or work until winter 2, art history was opposite

##### **Art History**

- Impressed by art history students making specific connections

##### **What do we infer?**

- Hierarchy of data might be a function of what the prerequisites are and preparation of students coming to studio and art history (also in professional competence answers)
- Subjectivity vs. cultural awareness, decreased, less confusion in later questionnaires
- Are we giving enough context in our classes to give students sense of cultural awareness?
- Ability to cite artists and cultures – in studio art, students don't know at tip of tongue, important artists
- More specific – as time goes on, examples given arrange themselves to education; students adapting to what we are teaching
- Why did half the students not make connection to cultural awareness?
- Difference between examples, was question too vague? Do we reword, rewrite questions? In regards to the fact that we are surprised that the question was difficult for students.

## **Professional Competence**

### **Observations and Conclusions based on**

### **2011-12 assessment processes and Professional Competence Summary,**

### **Spring Art SAC meeting, April 2012**

---

#### General observations from small groups in SAC meeting

- Number of 0s in categories of examples
- Examples increased, and number of examples increased
- Number of skills listed increased
- More classes reported in second part of winter term than first part; data somewhat faulty because of this
- Portfolio creation as a skill low versus mentioning of specific art skills
- Differences between studio and art history in numbers assessed
- Acknowledgement of verbal and written almost equal in studio and history
- Drop in identified profession at end of winter
- Increase in mention of criticism from winter 1 to winter 2
- Should plot data points as graph
- List of skills is mostly generated by students
- Creativity is low

#### Studio specific

- Tech vocab high

#### Art History specific

- Tech vocab low

#### What do we infer about Professional Competence?

- Passion, risk taking, creativity were low; this was surprising
- How could verbal and written communication be the same in studio and art history (closer look at data)?
- Expectations of students change; reality of the class changes students' expectations
- Can studio and art history courses attempt to be stronger in different areas?
- How can we create better understanding of portfolio? What are students' goals?
- Our top three skills as instructors ranked lowest for the students (problem solving, critical thinking, patience) [Upon second glance, patience actually rates high for studio art students and was more likely to be listed at the end of Winter term than at the beginning.]

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).

Please see below

- Art Cultural Awareness Recommendations
- Art Professional Competence Recommendations

## **Cultural Awareness**

### **Recommendations for Programmatic/Curriculum Changes based on 2011-12 assessment processes and Cultural Awareness Summary, Spring Art SAC meeting, April 2012**

---

#### **3-D Classes**

- Focus on assignments in order to introduce specific aspects of cultural literacy.
- Specific assignments will integrate a self-reflection component in order to present an objective awareness. This also could address assessment conclusions from 2010-11.
- Use images in class, and ask student to consider cross-cultural comparison; ask students to share with peers to create context around choices

#### **2-D Classes, especially Photo and Printmaking**

- Identity question to ask students: Why is it important to see ourselves reflected in society? How does it reflect in other societies?

#### **2-D Classes, especially Drawing and Painting**

- Increase awareness of specific artists and works within the discipline (history, ways of seeing, material)
- Possibly implement through course tools of essays, presentations, quizzes.

#### **Art History**

- Develop module or lesson around “cultural awareness”; module could be consistent for all art history classes, but content could vary by class
- Change instructional vocabulary in class to relate college core outcomes – “cultural context” vs. “cultural awareness”

## **Professional Competency**

### **Recommendations for Programmatic/Curriculum Changes based on 2011-12 assessment processes and Professional Competency Summary, Spring Art SAC meeting, April 2012**

---

#### **3-D Classes**

- Increase student learning of patience and problem-solving by addressing these skills of professional competency in assignments
- Use a rubric and a self-assessment tool

#### **2-D Classes, especially Photo and Printmaking**

- Connect/communicate more deliberately/clearly with students regarding their professional goals and circle back to address how the course might help them reach their goals.

#### **2-D Classes, especially Drawing and Painting**

- Increase portfolio awareness and presentation ethic

#### **Art History**

- Art history should focus more on cultural awareness than professional competence in the future. However, art history will continue to develop assignments focused on writing to address professional competence -- perhaps adopting writing goals across the department for art history classes.

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

Please see Reflections on Assessment below.



## **Cultural Awareness and Professional Competence**

### **Reflections on Effectiveness of Assessment Tool based on 2011-12 assessment processes (student questionnaires and faculty scoring/tallying),**

**Spring Art SAC meeting, April 2012**

---

#### **Question Design**

- Important to make questions more standardized (ex: multiple choice).
- Design of question should be looked at, considering specifically abstract nature of questions and answers. Include preface and/or opening statement to questions. Include PCC definitions of Cultural Awareness and/or Professional Competency. Give one example to students.
- Possibly introduce professional consultant to design questions so that results are statistically relevant. Objective question might engage the Likert Scale of scoring. We could talk to Math SAC about their questionnaire.
- Possibly add an option to opt out of survey; would this supply adequate and accurate data for our use?

#### **Time Management**

- Try to make process less time consuming, both in the classroom and as a SAC looking at the data.
- Is there a way to design a process which is less time consuming yet still valuable to the SAC and instructional practice?

#### **Engagement**

- For/from Faculty: this process engaged a great number of Art Faculty in the assessment process. Consider how participation and enthusiasm lessened with assessment fatigue.
- For/from Students: this is not a high stakes assessment. Students had limited reasons to invest in their responses for the task. Maybe add value or incentive to engage students more fully. Simplify process. Consider how participation and enthusiasm lessened with assessment fatigue.
- For/from the College: we need more and continued help from the College regarding comprehensive assessment. We need help clarifying the process and showing the value to students and faculty.

## Ideas and initial thoughts for next year's assessment – Critical Thinking and Community and Environmental Responsibility

- We may want a combination of assessment approaches, indirect and direct. The general mood at this point is to return to direct assessment as we did two years ago, with attention to the breadth (in numbers) of the assessment.
- Critical Thinking can be assessed in all classes, as it is integral to all.
- Community and Environmental Responsibility Environmental responsibility may lend itself to project-oriented classes.