

Students


Benchmark


Percent of all students that scored a 2 or above (competency is passing or above) on PLOs 1-4.

More than half of participating students scored a 4-strong evidence of compentency


All participating African American and Asian students scored a 2 or above


Courses Involved ART-18, 23, 25A, 26, 27, 28A COM-1, 3
PHO-20 and THE-3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED IN PROGRAM

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

## PROGRAM: AOE FINE AND APPLIED ARTS PLO 1

SEMESTER ASSESSED: Spring 2019
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Demonstrate basic knowledge and skills (technique) in one discipline of the fine and applied arts. These include fundamentals of the field in terms of practice, history, analysis and their applications and technical ability in one discipline to create, sustain and evolve a personal vision and/or purpose.
COURSES INVOLVED: ART-18, ART-23, ART-26, ART-27, ART-28A, PHO-20, THE-3
ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4- STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY

## BENCHMARK :

- At least $70 \%$ of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 90 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 40.14 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 9.22 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $91.1 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 1 | 7 | $7.8 \%$ |
| 2 | 6 | $6.7 \%$ |
| 3 | 31 | $34.4 \%$ |
| 4 | 45 | $50.0 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: 4 or less units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 4 units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL \# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $81.4 \%$ | 2.93 | 43 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $100 \%$ | 3.53 | 47 |

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=3.008, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR <br> ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 100\% | 7 | N/A |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 15 | N/A |
|  | Hispanic | 90.7\% | 43 | 1.00 |
|  | White | 81.8\% | 22 | . 91 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 3 | N/A |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 92.1\% | 63 | 1.00 |
|  | 25 and above | 88.9\% | 27 | . 97 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 95.1\% | 61 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 82.1\% | 28 | . 86 |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 1 | N/A |
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## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

## PROGRAM: AOE FINE AND APPLIED ARTS PLO 2

SEMESTER ASSESSED: Spring 2019
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Develop a personal vision and/or purpose-sometimes called "artistic voice"-that is evident in terms of work produced and manifested in a portfolio, performance, exhibition, or other presentation.
COURSES INVOLVED: ART-18, ART-23, ART-25A, ART-26, ART-27, ART-28A, COM-1, COM-3, PHO-20
ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4-STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY

## BENCHMARK:

- At least $70 \%$ of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above


## SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 238 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 35.91 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 4.78 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $97.5 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| 1 | 6 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2 | 15 | $6.3 \%$ |
| 3 | 81 | $34.0 \%$ |
| 4 | 136 | $57.1 \%$ |

YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: less than 3 units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: 3 or more units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL \# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $94.6 \%$ | 3.28 | 74 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $98.8 \%$ | 3.54 | 164 |

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=2.244, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 100\% | 21 | 1.00 |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 15 | N/A |
|  | Hispanic | 97.8\% | 135 | . 98 |
|  | White | 95.1\% | 61 | . 95 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander | 100\% | 1 | N/A |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 4 | N/A |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 1 | N/A |
| AGE | 24 and below | 97.4\% | 190 | . 99 |
|  | 25 and above | 97.9\% | 48 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 97.9\% | 140 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 96.8\% | 95 | . 99 |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 3 | N/A |
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## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

## PROGRAM: AOE FINE AND APPLIED ARTS PLO 3

PLO(S) ASSESSED: Generate and apply original ideas and methods to discover, create and communicate specific artistic content.
COURSES INVOLVED: ART-18, ART-23, ART-25A, ART-27, ART-28A, PHO-20, THE-3
ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4- STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY

## BENCHMARK:

- At least $70 \%$ of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 97 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 43.67 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 10.76 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $92.8 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 4 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 1 | 3 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2 | 5 | $5.2 \%$ |
| 3 | 26 | $26.8 \%$ |
| 4 | 59 | $60.8 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: Less than 6 units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: 6 or more units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL\# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $83.3 \%$ | 2.93 | 45 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $100 \%$ | 3.71 | 55 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=3.636, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR <br> ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 100\% | 7 | N/A |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 15 | N/A |
|  | Hispanic | 91.7\% | 48 | 1.00 |
|  | White | 87.5\% | 24 | . 95 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 3 | N/A |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 93.9\% | 66 | 1.00 |
|  | 25 and above | 90.3\% | 31 | . 96 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 95.5\% | 67 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 86.2\% | 29 | . 90 |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 1 | N/A |
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## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

## PROGRAM: AOE FINE AND APPLIED ARTS PLO 4

SEMESTER ASSESSED: Spring 2019
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Demonstrate conceptual acuity, clarity, imagination, and technical ability to combine, integrate, and synthesize elements into works in ways that enhance their communicative powers.
COURSES INVOLVED: ART-18, ART-23, ART-25A, ART-26 ART-27, ART-28A, COM-1, COM-3, PHO-20
ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4 - STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY

## BENCHMARK:

- At least $70 \%$ of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above


## SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 207 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 46.26 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 9.09 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $96.6 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 1 | 7 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2 | 6 | $4.3 \%$ |
| 3 | 31 | $28.5 \%$ |
| 4 | 45 | $63.8 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: Less than 4 units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: 4 or more units completed in the program at the beginning of the spring semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL \# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $86.5 \%$ | 3.15 | 52 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $100 \%$ | 3.64 | 155 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=2.905, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 ON PLO | TOTAL\# in GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 100\% | 15 | N/A |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 18 | N/A |
|  | Hispanic | 96.5\% | 115 | 1.00 |
|  | White | 94.3\% | 53 | . 98 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander | 100\% | 1 | N/A |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 4 | N/A |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 1 | N/A |
| AGE | 24 and below | 96.3\% | 162 | . 98 |
|  | 25 and above | 97.8\% | 45 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 97.5\% | 119 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 95.3\% | 85 | . 98 |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 3 | N/A |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## Participants

Ashlee Johnson, Assessment Coordinator, Associate Professor, Engineering Tech
Greg Aycock, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
Caitlin Welch, Acting Research and Assessment Manager
Quinton BeMiller, Associate Professor, Art
Megan Lindeman, Assistant Professor, Art
Barbara May, Adjunct Professor, Art

## Overview

AOE assessment is facilitated by the IE department. 10 faculty participated in the assessment assignments for their courses, with a total of 16 sections assessed.

PowerPoint of summary of results for PLO1 and an overall summary of all 4 PLOs was presented (attached). The data summary and Infographic were emailed to participating faculty in advance of the discussion.

## Discussion

- Question: Do the assessment assignments only include students currently working on the AOE for Fine and Applied Arts. No, all students in courses that are identified to map to the PLOs are included in the assessment.
- Low program units completed can indicate that the students involved in the assessment are not pursuing the Assessed AOE. They could be working on their general education.
- Pointed out that almost all of the art classes included in the PLO 1 data summary have a prerequisite, with exception of Photo 20 and Theater 3.
- The classes needed for the Fine and Applied Arts AOE are much broader than needed for the Studio Art ADT, almost any art class can count towards this AOE. Question if Photo 20 is required for the AOE?
- All the PLOs have consistent results. Including the observation that the more program units completed the higher PLO Score. For PLO 1, 100\% of 'almost completers' scored a 2 or above $\geq$ evidence of competency.
- Program progression has resulted in deeper learning.
- Do these PLOs represent what faculty try to instill in their students? Yes, students are learning.
- Suggestion to compare the PLOs for the Fine and Applied Art AOE to the Studio Art ADT.
- Observation that beginning students may be benefiting from the curriculum and conversations of more advanced students because Art 27, ART 28A, and ART 26 courses all share a classroom. Beginning students are included in the conversations especially pertaining to personal voice.
- Interesting that disproportionate impact is not seen- students are learning the outcomes but they may not be completing or obtaining a high course grade. For example- a student could have learned well all semester, but they missed the final and ended up receiving a poor grade.
- Success rate for art is generally high.
- Greg looked at success rate for the participating students for achievement and there was no disproportionate impact.
- Students close with faculty are able to have more conversations. Projects can be personal. This environment is much different than a large lecture class. The students experience and the learning environment are more intimate. Studio classes meet 6 hours a week with usually not
more than 26 students. Suggested that students are not in these courses unless they really want to be there.
- The courses are not easy but students in these courses are passionate about the course work.
- The Photo 20 class is more media focused, faculty will introduce art history and fine arts because it is important but not necessarily included in the SLOs. The AOE-PLOs are fine art aligned and the course SLOs are media aligned there is a disconnect.
- This makes assessing the Photo 20 for the PLOs of AOE Fine and Applied Arts more difficult.
- The SLOs for Photography 20 don't include esthetics. Suggestion to develop a Photography for Fine Art course.
- Suggestion to look at the Photo course SLOs and the FAA AOE PLOs.
- Mapping of SLOs to PLOs are at faculty's discretion and can be done as a discipline at Norco.
- Total units completed is higher than compared to other PLOs. Average of 40 units completed, shows that these students are more advanced, possibly $2 / 3$ of the way to completion.
- Suggestion that students tend to continue to take studio art courses after they have completed the required courses in art for their degree.
- The Fine and Applied Art AOE does not require all the courses students need to continue in Art at a university.
- Art students taking Photo 20 is practical because students need to take pictures of their work especially right now with the current COVID conditions.
- Do students come as beginners to these courses already possessing some of the required skills? Yes, and No.
- Opportunity to think about creating a beginning drawing course for non-art majors. Students walking in the door of any studio art class already know that they want to be there. There is selection bias when students choose the course.
- In terms of smaller groups of students- example transgender-is disproportionate impact trackable with numbers under 20? Can we track very small groups of students?
- We would need to do more in depth qualitative studies for groups smaller than 20.
- AOEs were developed to help students earn a degree and complete at the CC level.
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