



Assessment Reporting

GEarea**Delivery Mode:****Submitted by:****Participating Faculty and Staff:****Outcome Assessed:****Courses Used:****Course or degree outcomes to be added/changed/removed:****Course Level Assessments:****Area C - Humanities**

(Choose one)

R-EUREKA\Mark-Renner on 5/23/2021

Peter Blakemore, Ashley Knowlton, Ken Letko, Ed Macan, Philip Mancus, Ruth Rhodes and Sean Thomas. Facilitator: Mark Renner

1 - Communicate aesthetic and/or cultural ideas.

ART-2 (F2019 and F2020), ART-4 (S2021 in eLumen), ART-17 (F2020 in eLumen), ENGL-10 (F2019), ENGL-17 (F2020 in eLumen), ENVSC-11 (F2020 in eLumen), GEOL-10 (F2020 in eLumen), MUS-12 (F2020), SPAN-1A (F2020), and SPAN-2A (F2020)

We recommend that stakeholders should review and possibly revise CR's GE outcomes in order to highlight the relationship between CLOs and GEOs with cultural competency as the new focus of GE. Details found in the "Findings/Results" portion of this report.

0 courses were not successful at conveying this outcome.

5 courses were generally successful at conveying this outcome.

7 courses were definitely successful at conveying this outcome to most of the students.

17 courses were not included in this report.

Findings/Results:**A) PROGRAM-LEVEL DIALOGUE SUMMARY:**

1) Overall, the courses included in this outcome assessment indicate that students are achieving this degree program's learning outcome #2 at respectable-to-high levels. The aggregate of all CSLO scores indicate the composite achievement of this PLO to be that 90% of all students met and/or exceeded the expectation.

2) From evaluated CSLO reports, we also saw that many sections had atypically high levels of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students which, we believe, reflect challenges related to the rapid change to a fully online modality with concomitant technical challenges and other unique stressors upon students during this unprecedented global pandemic. Mitigating strategies, including proactive mid-semester outreach, repeated email contact and one-on-one Zoom conferences, could be useful to reduce high levels of 'N/A' students during assessment activities beyond COVID. While this is not a discipline-specific issue, additional careful analysis and contemplation is needed to incorporate these data into ongoing assessment and retention dialogues. It's also important to note that 'not assessed' numbers naturally fluctuate depending on course, assessment type, and other subjective factors in any given cycle and should be viewed only as soft data, with no specific ties to resource requests or changes in course design. As a result of the observations above, we excluded 'N/A' student head counts when we computed PLO success from CSLO reports. We further expand on the issue of 'N/A' students in section E) below.

3) Online and/or hybrid modalities offer certain unique benefits (see, for example, narratives below for ART-31A), but also many challenges. We are finding that certain courses appear to be a poor "fit" for the online and/or hybrid modalities, especially where specific technology needs are unmet. Recommendations (found in section D below) are principally focused on issues relevant to a change from face-to-face to online modality, especially for courses best suited to face-to-face delivery venue or needing vast digital storage space.

B) WHAT WERE THE GENERAL FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS?

Total number of students assessed = 378 if counting those 'N/A' during assessment process;
Total number of students assessed = 321 if excluding those 'N/A' during assessment process.
We summarized above why we chose to exclude 'N/A' students when computing the PLO outcome achievement "Success", and doing so we found the following:

- Percent Not Successful = 10%
- Percent met expectations = 27%
- Percent exceeded expectations = 63%

We made the PLO outcome achievement "success" computations using this rubric for the evaluated course-level assessments:

- Not successful: If <70% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome;
- Generally successful: If 70-85% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome;
- Successful: If >85% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome.

C) ARE THE FINDINGS UNIQUE TO A COURSE, DISCIPLINE, OR SUBSET OF COURSES?

No; these findings appear to be reasonably consistent throughout the subset of CSLO reports evaluated for this PLO assessment, with a few outliers described below.

D) DESCRIBE POSSIBLE CHANGES OR IMPROVEMENTS TO PROGRAM COURSES, REQUIREMENTS, RESOURCES, AND/OR OUTCOMES BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISCUSSED:

We propose 1) specific resource and/or technology requests (to be entered into the Program Review workflow), and 2) continuing dialogue about the issue of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students:

1) Though Program Review is the appropriate venue for resource issues/requests, narratives indicate the following: for ART-31A, there is an urgent need to replace a mission-critical kiln; for ART-35 there is an urgent need to find a suitable means for online storage of vast libraries of student digital images; and for ART-23 there is a clear need for ONLINE studio art instructors to have access to specific technology (such as iPads, Apple Pencils, and Procreate) to remotely correct student work, which is an essential activity when teaching drawing and painting techniques in any venue.

2) Regarding the issue of 'N/A' students and its impact on assessment methodology, we propose a potentially District-wide dialogue session (maybe a convocation/flex activity) where the issue of 'N/A' students is considered, with the goal of reducing the number of students in the 'N/A' assessed category.

E) ADD OTHER COMMENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE PROGRAM-LEVEL DIALOGUE:

Themes Derived from Reflection Narratives in CSLO Reports:

1) The pandemic has added extraordinary pressures beyond those that are typical, resulting in higher-than-normal rates of "absenteeism" on assignments that instructors use as instruments of CSLO assessment. Moreover, student retention problems ("drop-outs") as well as lower-than-typical performances were exacerbated as well. Potential mitigating strategies were suggested above in section A) under item 2).

2) Relocating venues to online/virtual courses further exacerbated these issues, in part due to technology and/or internet issues for students. THIS IS ESPECIALLY SALIENT FOR COURSES

to the end of the semester (when student stressors might be at very high levels) in hopes of eliciting fuller participation (thus lower levels of "absenteeism" on assessments).

The following selected anecdotes from CSLO reports encapsulate these themes:

ART-1B-S2021:

"Timing delivery of assessment instruments at the end of the semester may limit participation and maximize the number of absentee students who are not assessed. The pressures associated with the pandemic have resulted in higher-than-normal numbers of students dropping out as well as increased absenteeism on assignments that instructors use as instruments of CSLO assessment. Changing to online/virtual courses exacerbated these issues, in part due to students' technology and/or internet challenges. Some students struggled with absenteeism. Overall students' performance tended toward extremes, with many either exceeding outcome expectations or not meeting them at all. To what degree this was the result of the online format is hard to say. Larger than normal numbers of students have dropped this semester, many because of pandemic-related stressors. As a result, larger than normal numbers of students were not available this semester for SLO assessment."

ART-3A-S2021:

"Teaching a "making" course via Zoom presented significant challenges. Specifically, ART 3A requires access to very specialized tools which most students don't possess. For this version of the course, I had to completely restructure the coursework to be accessible to all students. I relied heavily on CAD design and worked with CANVAS modules to keep discussions a large component of the students' activities. It worked out and opened up other options for instruction, however it was not a desirable approach to teach this coursework."

ART-4-S2021:

"The virtual format of this course surely impacted student learning. There was a learning curve for some students to become comfortable utilizing canvas, accessing videos and ConferZoom, and communicating through email. The biggest impact to student learning in this course was conducting discussions online rather than in person. While the discussion board format and

ART-17-F2020:

"The transition to remote learning for fall 2020 impacted student learning in many ways, particularly in how the students evaluated and critically assessed the work of fellow students and art historical examples. Rather than in class critiques and discussions, this work was largely completed through discussion boards. Additionally, conducting demonstrations over video changed how students learned to draw and complete assignments. Student enthusiasm for communicating with one another through discussion boards was much greater than I expected and offers an opportunities to meet outcomes in new ways utilizing this resource.

It is noteworthy to point out that online classes have a larger drop out rate than face to face classes, and especially in the time of covid, larger than normal numbers of students dropped this semester, sometimes very Inexplicably. This means larger than normal amounts of students could not be assessed this semester, for some of the SLOs."

ART-19-S2021:

"The only issue is that four students were not able to submit this assignment on time at the time of this report. Students' falling behind on assignment completion (especially toward the end of this semester) has been a bit higher in the online iteration of this course than it typically is when this course is offered face-to-face. A good thing about the online iteration of this course, however, is that working from videotaped models (as opposed to live models) makes this resource available until the very end of the semester, and thus easier for a student to make up missed work."

ART-23-S2021:

"Since ART23 has last been assessed, we had to move the class online due to the covid-19 pandemic. Though most of the content remained the same, the delivery of the content had to be

Actions/Changes To Be Implemented:**Course Mapping:**

39 individual CSLOs from 27 separate courses are mapped to this GE area. This analysis is based on a subset of eighteen (18) recently-assessed* course outcomes from ten (10) courses in six (6) disciplines mapped to this General Education outcome.

This subset of mapped courses and relevant outcomes reflects the diversity of courses in the GE area. Regarding reports used for this analysis, preference was given to the most recent reports and therefore includes those generated in eLumen in F2020 and S2021 wherever possible.

(*"Recently-assessed" means within the past 2 years.)

Yes, these course assessments are a sufficient sample to evaluate achievement of Area C (Humanities) outcome #1:
"Communicate aesthetic and/or cultural ideas."

