

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Photography	117	PHO 117 02/19/2015- Introduction to the Studio
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts	Donald Werthmann
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Display a prescribed range of lighting proficiencies in final images using the proper studio workflow.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Final portfolio of photographic images.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the students with a minimum of 20.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmental technical and aesthetic rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 90% of the students will score 80% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time photography faculty along with external, working-professional studio photographers.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
27	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

As stated above, "the number of students to be assessed is a random sample of 50% of the students with a minimum of 20." This assessment report includes randomly selected final portfolios from both sections. Section 01 is represented with 10 students, and Section 02 is represented with 10 students.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Two sections of the course were offered. The instructors from each section submitted electronic versions of their students' Final Portfolios in a common computer folder. To preserve anonymity, the folders were renamed as "Stu1," "Stu2," etc. and then sorted alphanumerically for the review process.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Reviewers score a student final portfolio that consists of 10 images by means of the rubrics [see attached pho117_Assessment_StuScoreDoc.pdf] that measure various formal properties present in the images, such as: control of camera, lighting technique and exposure value, set construction, composition, and other technical and aesthetic qualities. With each rubric descriptor, the images are scored on a scale ranging from 50 [*Excellent* 100-80%], 40 [*Average* 70-60%], or 30 [*Incomplete* Less than 60%]. Each portfolio produced a total ranging from 260 to 160 points.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

The standard of success is "90% of the students will score 80% or higher." **90% of 20 portfolios is 18.** To meet the standard of success, 18 [90%] out of 20 portfolios must score 208 points [80%, B-] or higher.

Each portfolio produced a score, ranging from 260 to 160 points. Each score was then correlated to a score range, such as 260 to 248 = A. The frequency of scores was then tallied [see attached pho117_Outcome1.pdf].

Thirteen (13) portfolios [65%] out of 20 scored 208 points [80%] or higher. The standard of success was not met. However, 18 portfolios [90%] out of 20 scored 182 points [70%] or higher, and the mean score was 83% [B].

Based on these results, a new standard of success is to be implemented for the next assessment, "85% of the students will score 70%, C- or higher."

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Among the 20 student portfolios assessed, they collectively displayed the greatest strengths in the following criteria:

Rubric 1, "Overall camera exposure value of lighting present on the set is accurate in regard to intent and interpretation." **65% scored in the Excellent Range [100-80%]**; 25% scored in the Average Range [70-60%]; and 5% scored in the Incomplete Range [<60%].

Rubric 3, "Demonstrated control of image composition strategy, image framing/cropping and resultant visual impact." **70% scored in the Excellent Range [100-80%]**; 30% scored in the Average Range [70-60%]; and 0% scored in the Incomplete Range [<60%].

Rubric 4, "Demonstrated intention to use color in figure/ground relationship to convey idea." **60% scored in the Excellent Range [100-80%]**; 35% scored in the Average Range [70-60%]; and 5% scored in the Incomplete Range [<60%].

Rubric 5, "Intent to position and render subject figure gestalt to express idea, character, or attitude." **60% scored in the Excellent Range [100-80%]**; 35% scored in the Average Range [70-60%]; and 5% scored in the Incomplete Range [<60%].

Improvements in each of these scoring criteria can be improved with deeper instruction and assignments that hold students more accountable to garnering those skills and proficiencies.

[See pho117_Outcome1_ScorePerctgs.pdf]

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Among the 20 student portfolios assessed, they collectively displayed the greatest need for improvement in the following criteria:

Rubric 2, "Strong evidence that the set construction strategy to illuminate separate planes of space is being implemented [2-point or 3-point lighting]." **50% scored in the Excellent Range [100-80%]**; 50% scored in the Average Range [70-60%]; and 0% scored in the Incomplete Range [<60%].

Rubric 6, "Portfolio presentation method meets industry standards." **55% scored in the Excellent Range [100-80%]**; 40% scored in the Average Range [70-60%]; and 5% scored in the Incomplete Range [<60%].

Improvements in each of these scoring criteria must be improved with deeper instruction, successful examples, and demonstrations for students to garner those skills and proficiencies.

[See pho117_Outcome1_ScorePerctgs.pdf]

Upon writing the assessment plan for the Master Syllabus, there was no previous assessment plan, let alone data to draw from. Consequently, the Standard of Success stated was based on the author's calculation of student Final Portfolio scores, producing a Mean. This Mean was consistent across several previous semesters of teaching the course, and it typically fell in the 80% range. This is evident in the Mean calculated for these 20 students; see the attachment [pho117_Outcome1.pdf]. So, basing the Standard of Success on Mean Final Portfolio score calculations appears to set too high of an expected outcome.

Based on these results, a new Standard of Success will be implemented for the next assessment plan and cycle: "85% of the students will score 70% [Grade of C-] or higher." This language offers a more realistic, achievable, and acceptable expectation of student success. Although a bit of a reduction from the original language, it does not change efforts to continually improve the level of instruction and course content for student success.

Outcome 2: Identify processes that change the character and properties of light to achieve specific results in photographs in the studio.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Exam
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the students with a minimum of 20.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Answer Sheet.

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score 80% or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: By current faculty of the course.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
27	24

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Section 01 had 10 students, and Section 02 had 14 students. Three (3) students were unaccounted for due to course withdrawal.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The scores from all students, across both sections, who completed a Midterm exam were collected.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Each exam score was tallied in a spreadsheet [pho117_Outcome2.pdf], producing a list that enabled the data to be calculated as "grade frequency." When a score is found within a specific grade range, then it is counted accordingly.

Students take the Midterm exam during one designated class because of the hands-on questions constructed in the studio environment. Students cannot use open notes, books, or the like to complete the exam. Questions and answers occur in a traditional paper format, and require students to display written retention of terminology, accurately identify specific studio equipment components by sight then naming, and accurately interpreting a basic lighting "set" construction by means of "hands-on" interaction, with written responses. Exams are scored with an answer key by the instructor.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>No</u>
Standard of Success: "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." 75% of 24 exams is 18. To meet the standard of success, 18 [75%] out of 24 exams must score 96 points [80%] or higher.
1 student scored in the "100-96%" range; 6 students scored in the "95-90%" range; 3 students scored in the "89-87%" range; 3 students scored in the "86-83%" range; 1 student scored in the "82-80%" range. The 10 remaining exams scored below 80%. 14 [60%] out of 24 exams scored 80% or higher. Therefore the Standard of Success was not met. However, 18 exams [75%] out of 24 scored 75% [Grade of C] or higher, and the Mean score was 82%, B-.
Based on these results, a new standard of success will be implemented for the next assessment plan and cycle, "75% of the students will score 75%, [Grade of C] or higher."

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The Standard of Success stated, "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." 75% of 24 Midterm exams is 18. Therefore, to meet the Standard of Success, 18 [75%] out of 24 exams must score 80% or higher.
Only 14 Midterm exams [60%] out of 24 scored 80% [Grade of B-] or higher, so the Standard of Success is not met. However, 18 exams [75%] out of 24 scored 75% [Grade of C] or higher.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Upon writing the assessment plan for the Master Syllabus, there was no previous assessment plan, let alone data to draw from. Consequently, the Standard of Success stated was based on the author's calculation of student Midterm exam scores, producing a Mean. This Mean was consistent across several previous semesters of teaching the course, and it typically fell in the 80% range. This is evident in the Mean calculated for these 24 students; see the attachment [pho117_Outcome2.pdf]. So, basing the Standard of Success on Mean test score calculations appears to set too high of an expected outcome.
--

Based on these results, a new Standard of Success will be implemented for the next assessment plan and cycle: "75% of the students will score 75% [Grade of C] or higher." This language offers a more realistic, achievable, and acceptable expectation of student success. Although a bit of a reduction from the original language, it does not change efforts to continually improve the level of instruction and course content for student success.

Outcome 3: Recall and use the vocabulary that defines studio work flow.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Exam
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the students with a minimum of 20.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Answer Sheet.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score 80% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: By current faculty of the course.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
27	24

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Section 01 had 10 students, and Section 02 had 14 students. Three (3) students were unaccounted for due to course withdrawal, or failure.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The scores from all students, across both sections, who completed a Final exam were collected.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Each exam score was tallied in a spreadsheet [pho117_Outcome3.pdf], producing a list that enabled the data to be calculated as "grade frequency." When a score is found within a specific grade range, then it is counted accordingly.

Students take the Final exam during one designated class because of the hands-on questions constructed in the studio environment. Students cannot use open notes, books, or the like to complete the exam. Questions and answers occur in a traditional paper format, and require students to display written retention of terminology, accurately identify specific studio equipment components by sight then naming, and accurately interpreting specific lighting equipment by means of "hands-on" interaction, with written responses. Exams are scored with an answer key by the instructor.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

Standard of Success: "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." **75% of 24 exams is 18.** To meet the Standard of Success, 18 [75%] out of 24 exams must score 96 points [80%] or higher.

No students scored in the "100-96%" range; 10 students scored in the "95-90%" range; 1 student scored in the "89-87%" range; 4 students scored in the "86-83%" range; 2 students scored in the "82-80%" range. The 7 remaining exams scored below 80%. 17 [71%] out of 24 exams scored 80% or higher. Therefore, the Standard of Success was not met. However, 23 exams [95%] out of 24 scored 70% or higher, and the Mean score was 84%, B.

Based on these results, a new standard of success will be implemented for the next assessment, "85% of the students will score 70%, C- or higher."

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The Standard of Success stated, "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." 75% of 24 Final exams is 18. Therefore, to meet the Standard of Success, 18 [75%] out of 24 exams must score 80% or higher.

Only 17 Midterm exams [71%] out of 24 scored 80% [Grade of B-] or higher, so the Standard of Success is not met. However, 18 exams [75%] out of 24 scored 75% [Grade of C] or higher.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Upon writing the assessment plan for the Master Syllabus, there was no previous assessment plan, let alone data to draw from. As a consequence, the Standard of Success stated was based on the author's calculation of student Final exam scores, producing a Mean. This Mean was consistent across several previous semesters of teaching the course, and it typically fell in the 80% range. This is evident in the Mean calculated for these 24 students; see the attachment [pho117_Outcome3.pdf]. So, basing the Standard of Success on Mean test score calculations appears to set too high of an expected outcome.

Based on these results, a new standard of success is to be implemented for the next assessment plan and cycle: "75% of the students will score 75% [Grade of C] or higher." This language offers a more realistic, achievable, and acceptable expectation of student success. Although a bit of a reduction from the original language, it does not change efforts to continually improve the level of instruction and course content for student success.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

This course absolutely meets the needs of students. It provides students with very different approaches and methodologies to construct photographs, because they are encountering and working in a new environment [studio] with a very wide range of variables, tools, and techniques for the first time.

For instance, safety is emphasized because of hazards presented with electricity and proper set construction of equipment to prevent its damage and/or injury to students. Student psychological workflow to construct images shifts significantly since they must work additively [starting with an absence of subject matter, light, etc., then producing a composition] in the studio, instead of subtractively [starting with an abundance of subject matter, light, etc., then producing a composition] like when on location when photographing a landscape in the natural world. These learning experiences provide unparalleled comparisons in regard to image construction strategies, problem solving, and overall value to artistic vision.

The statistical outcomes for each Standard of Success stated surprised me the most. Although I was disappointed that none of the three was met, the results and proposed changes in those numbers now offer a much stronger set of statistical expectations for student achievement.

Upon writing the assessment plan for the Master Syllabus, there was no previous assessment plan, let alone data to draw from. As a consequence, the Standards of Success stated were based on the author's calculation of student scores, producing a Mean. The Means were consistent across several previous semesters of teaching the course, and it typically fell in the 80% range. Basing a Standard of Success on Mean calculations does not offer the same measure of expected outcomes.

Although each outcome experienced a bit of a reduction from the original language, it does not change efforts to continually improve the level of instruction and course content for student success.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

Upon approval of this assessment report, the results will be distributed immediately via eMail to my Full-time colleagues, and the Part-time faculty that teach this course to inform their instructional processes.

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	<p>Outcome 1: "85% of the students will score 70% or higher."</p> <p>Outcome 2: "75% of the students will score 75% or higher."</p> <p>Outcome 3: "75% of the students will score 75% or higher."</p>	Because the enhanced measuring instruments and depth of statistical analysis for each outcome offered a more realistic, accurate, and acceptable Standard of Success.	2019
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Live demonstrations addressing the areas in need of improvement	Because each of the Final Portfolio rubrics noted above scored below 60%	2019

	[rubrics 2 & 6] for Outcome 1 must be implemented. This information is to be supported via handouts and/or assignments.	in the Excellent Range [100-80%].	
--	---	-----------------------------------	--

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

Not at this time.

III. Attached Files

[pho117Outcome1_StuScoreDoc](#)
[pho117Outcome1_ScorePerctgsDoc](#)
[pho117Outcome1_StatAnalysis](#)
[pho117Outcome2_StatAnalysis](#)
[pho117Outcome3_StatAnalysis](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Donald Werthmann **Date:** 07/16/2016
Department Chair: Ingrid Ankerson **Date:** 07/20/2016
Dean: Kimberly Hurns **Date:** 07/26/2016
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 10/03/2016