

COURSE SLO ASSESSMENT REPORT, SCC

Department: Art Course: Art 230

Year: 2012 Semester: Spring

1) Outcome to be assessed	2) Means of assessment and criteria of success	3) Summary of data collected	4) Analysis of data	5) Plan of action/what to do next
<p>Ability to create drawings using complex application of personal expression, materials and techniques.</p>	<p>A project assigned in the last 25% of the semester is assessed using a 4-point rubric.</p> <p>It is expected that 70% of students will score a 3 or better.</p>	<p>10 Students were assessed and scored the following: 4pts – 5 students (50%) 3pts – 3 students (30%) 2pts – 2 students (20%) 1pts – 0 students (00%) 0pts – 0 students (00%)</p> <p>8 (80 %) students scored 3 or above which meets our expectation.</p>	<p>Overall students exceeded our expectation of 70% by scoring an average of 80%. The highest scores were given to composition, proportion, and details while the lower scores were given to contour line and energy of line. Students seem to get a feel for how to put a drawing together, but not how to make it their own.</p>	<p>More data is needed to decide what actions to take from the results.</p>

<p>Ability to critically analyze form and content of their drawings and those of others.</p>	<p>A written critique of a peer student project assigned in the last 25% of the semester is assessed using a 4-point rubric.</p> <p>It is expected that 70% of students will score a 3 or better.</p>	<p>10 Students were assessed and scored the following: 4pts – 4 students (40%) 3pts – 3 students (30%) 2pts – 3 students (30%) 1pts – 0 students (00%) 0pts – 0 students (00%)</p> <p>7 (70 %) students scored 3 or above which meets our expectation.</p>	<p>Overall students met the expectation of 70%.</p> <p>Students were able to critique each others work, but less than half were able to use a variety of art terminology when discussing peer's form and content of the project.</p>	<p>More data is needed to decide what actions to take from the results.</p>
--	---	---	--	---

Art 230 – Intermediate Drawing Rubric for Evaluating Student Work (SLO 1)
20 Points Available – Divided by 5 Categories for a 0-4 scale

Project: Personal concept influenced by a master’s technique

Criteria for Evaluation	A Advanced - 4	B Competent - 3	C Emerging - 2	D Needs Improvement - 1	F No Substantive Effort - 0
Composition Focal Point Directional Line Visual Balance Picture Plane					
Proportions Construction Size Scale					
Contour Line Variety of Weight Define Form Display Value					
Energy of Line Gesture Movement					
Finishing Details Color Value Texture					
				Total Points:	
				Divided by 5:	

Art 230 Assessment Results
Spring 2012

Project: Personal concept influenced by a master's technique

Student	Composition	Proportions	Contour Line	Energy of Line	Details	Average Final Score
1	4	3	4	3	4	4
2	3	4	4	4	4	4
3	4	3	4	4	4	4
4	3	3	3	3	4	3
5	2	2	3	2	3	2
6	4	3	3	2	2	3
7	2	4	4	4	3	3
8	3	2	2	2	2	2
9	4	4	4	4	4	4
10	3	4	4	4	3	4

Total of Students with a score of 4 = 5 (50)%

Total of Students with a score of 3 = 3 (30)%

Total of Students with a score of 2 = 2 (20)%

Total of Students with a score of 1 = 0 (00)%

Total of Students with a score of 0 = 0 (00)%

Written Critique

Student	Score out of 4
1	4
2	4
3	4
4	2
5	2
6	3
7	4
8	3
9	3
10	2

Total of Students with a score of 4 = 4 (40)%

Total of Students with a score of 3 = 3 (30)%

Total of Students with a score of 2 = 3 (30)%

Total of Students with a score of 1 = 0 (00)%

Total of Students with a score of 0 = 0 (00)%

Art 230 – Intermediate Drawing Rubric for Evaluating Student Written Response (SLO 2)

Project: Peer critique of “Master Copy” project

	Met	Unmet
Advanced (4)	Used art terminology properly to critique peers work speaking of both formal elements and content. Were respectful yet critical and discussed improvement opportunities.	
Competent (3)	Discussed form and content of peer’s work and was respectful yet critical and discussed improvement opportunities as well as areas of success.	Used art terminology properly to critique peers work speaking of both formal elements and content. Was respectful yet critical and discussed improvement opportunities as well as areas of success.
Emerging (2)	Discussed improvement opportunities as well as areas of success.	Was respectful yet critical and discussed improvement opportunities as well as areas of success.
Needs Improvement (1)	Turned in personal project but did not give feedback to a peer’s project.	Discussed improvement opportunities as well as areas of success.
No Substantive Effort (0)		Turned in personal project but did not give feedback to a peer’s project.