**GE C1 Arts SLO Evaluation Report July 2021:**

**Background/Description of GE Program ePortfolio:**

Prior to the 2017-2018 AY, departments/programs were responsible for assessing GE student learning outcomes and submitting a report every year for the GE Committee to review. This system had several weaknesses. Departments and programs were responsible for deciding which of the two to four outcomes designated for a specific GE Area to assess; thus some outcomes were evaluated multiple times within a year and others were not evaluated at all in certain years. It was also not possible for departments to access and evaluate a representative sample of student work, nor was it possible to compare the results from GE courses in the same GE Area taught by different departments/programs, because each department/program used its own criteria/rubrics. Finally, the GE Committee was not able to review and analyze the GE assessment reports in a comprehensive fashion, since the committee was also tasked with reviewing all GE curriculum proposals, as well as with discussing and updating GE policies and procedures.

Therefore, Fresno State developed a proposal for a new system of evaluating GE student learning outcomes during the 2014-2015 AY. The proposal was approved by Fresno State’s Academic Senate in May 2017 and by Dr. Joseph Castro in August of 2017. Essentially, all freshmen and transfer students admitted to Fresno State beginning in Fall 2018 will submit one designated assignment aligned to one GE student outcome from lower-division (for freshmen) and upper-division (for freshmen and transfer students) GE courses to a GE Program ePortfolio. Students will also write 300-word reflections (freshmen write three and transfer students write one) about their learning and submit these to the GE Program ePortfolio. The GE Program ePortfolio was set up by the Director of Assessment and students were automatically enrolled. Handouts, videos, and other resources that were posted previously to Blackboard were uploaded to Canvas when the campus transitioned from Blackboard to Canvas.

During the first year of implementation (2017-2018 AY), efforts focused on electing members to the new GE Assessment Subcommittee and on approving common rubrics to be used to evaluate GE student learning outcomes. Fresno State’s GE student learning outcomes were approved by the Academic Senate in 2010. These forty outcomes are evaluated on a five-year schedule. In the 2020-2021 AY, the Director of Assessment selected a random sample of student submissions for the three learning outcomes in Area C1, Arts. The Chair of the GE Assessment Subcommittee selected two faculty members from the subcommittee to assess each learning outcome. The Director of Assessment collaborated with each team of subcommittee members to determine which assignments aligned well with the relevant learning outcome. The Director of Assessment then provided a random sample of assignments to the team and they applied the appropriate rubric to assess the assignments and determine student proficiency in each learning outcome.

**GE Assessment Subcommittee: Evaluation and Norming Process:**

The GE Assessment Subcommittee had previously reviewed and approved common rubrics for evaluating each of the three GE learning outcomes designated for GE Area C1. Prior to conducting the assessment, the Director of Assessment met with each faculty team for the purpose of norming. Each team member had independently reviewed a sample of student work and used the rubric to evaluate the work. Where there were discrepancies in the team members’ ratings of proficiency, the Director of Assessment and team members discussed the reasons for the differences and reached a consensus on how to apply the rubric going forward. The faculty teams then independently scored all of the selected assignments. After scoring the work, faculty teams met to identify common strengths and weaknesses. A third reviewer scored all assignments on which the two reviewers did not agree about proficiency.

**Outcomes and measures (assignments) used to evaluate C1 outcomes:**

Upon completion of an Area C1 (Arts) course, students will be able to**:**

1. Respond orally and in writing to aesthetic experiences, both subjectively and objectively, validating the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses.

 2. Recognize and explain the relationship between the self and the arts in a given cultural context.

 3. Recognize, describe, and interpret works of art and performance; students may engage in skill development and/or participate in artistic creations.

Assignments:

 Nine departments offer nineteen total courses that satisfy GE Area C1. The Assessment Team members and Director of Assessment selected assignments that best aligned with each of the C1 learning outcomes.

 For learning outcome 1, assignments selected came from courses in Armenian Studies, Art and Design, Drama, Chicano and Latin American Studies, Media Communications and Journalism, and Music. The assignments required students to respond to aesthetic experiences, including art exhibitions, musical performances, films, and plays.

 For learning outcome 2, assignments considered came from courses in Art and Design, Chicano and Latin American Studies, Drama, English, and Music. The student work selected was diverse; the primary connection was that the assignment included references to the self.

 For learning outcome 3, assignments selected came from courses in Art and Design, Art History, and Chicano and Latin American Studies. Many of the assignments called for students to recognize, describe, and interpret architecture, paintings, photography, sculpture, and woodblock prints. There were also assignments where students created their own drawings.

**RESULTS**

**Results for Area C1, Learning Outcome 1**

 The evaluation of C1 learning outcomes demonstrated that Fresno State students had a high degree of proficiency in responding to aesthetic experiences. The thirty-four students evaluated earned the following scores:

* Proficient 31 (91.2%)
* Developing 3 (8.8%)

 Inter-rater reliability was 91.2%, meeting Fresno State’s benchmark of 90%.

 Students were rated proficient if they scored 3 (advanced) or 2 (proficient) on the rubric. Students were not proficient if they scored a 1 (developing) on the rubric.

 On assignments rated advanced, the faculty team made comments such as these:

* Tied into course material well
* Extensive detail in responses
* Developed both objective and subjective responses
* Explained objective and subjective responses well

 On assignments rated proficient, the faculty team made comments such as these:

* Objective response explained, too limited subjective response
* Insufficient explanation of objective response
* Overall well done, but lacked tie-in to course material

 On assignments rated developing, the faculty team made comments such as these:

* Very limited analysis
* Objective response not explained
* Weak subjective response
* Little original work, description appeared to come from event pamphlet

 In summary, the faculty team’s qualitative comments indicated that advanced papers included explanations of both the objective and subjective responses and provided details in each. Student responses tied into course material well. Proficient papers were strong in either the objective or subjective response (typically the objective response), but not for both types. They may have needed greater tie-in to course material. Developing papers provided very limited explanation or analysis of the objective and subjective responses. In one case, there was little or no original analysis, the description appeared to come from the event pamphlet.

**Results for Area C1, Learning Outcome 2**

The student work submitted for Area C1 did not align with Learning Outcome 2 (Recognize and explain the relationship between the self and the arts in a given cultural context). The Director of Assessment reviewed several hundred submissions for Area C1 and did not find any signature assignments that seemed designed to fit outcome 2. Nearly every submission was a better fit with Learning Outcome 1 or Outcome 3. Some individual assignments happened to discuss the self, although other student submissions for the same assignment did not focus on the self. For example, one student’s concert review discussed how the music related to the self, whereas the other concert reviews assessed different factors such as the musicianship or the musical selections. The Director of Assessment provided the Faculty Team with the papers that included some discussion of the self. The Faculty Team did not believe that the assignments aligned well with Learning Outcome 2 and after discussing this work during norming, the Director of Assessment concurred. The assignments referred to the self but did not discuss the *relationship* between arts and the self or specify a cultural context. The Director of Assessment and Faculty Team contacted Department Chairs for Area C1 courses and asked them to check with their faculty to see if any had assignments that aligned with Learning Outcome 2. One assignment provided aligned well, but that class was not taught until spring 2021. Assessing the papers submitted for Area C1 would not be an accurate measure of student achievement of Learning Outcome 2, given that the assignments did not seem to require students to explain the relationship between the self and the arts in a given cultural context.

**Results for Area C1, Learning Outcome 3**

The evaluation of C1 learning outcomes demonstrated that Fresno State students had a high degree of proficiency in recognizing, describing, and interpreting works of art. Papers that received a score of 3 (advanced) or 2 (proficient) were classified as proficient. Papers that received a score of 1 (emerging) were classified as not proficient. The thirty-five students evaluated earned the following scores:

* Proficient in all three categories 33 (94.3%)
* Proficient in recognizing works of art 34 (97.1%)
* Proficient in describing works of art 35 (100.0%)
* Proficient in interpreting works of art 34 (97.1%)

 Inter-rater reliability was 97.1%, meeting Fresno State’s benchmark of 90%.

 Ninety-four percent (94%) of the papers were rated proficient. It is noteworthy that of the thirty-four papers (97.1%) that were proficient in recognizing works of art, thirty-one earned a rating of advanced. Of the thirty-five papers that were proficient in describing works of art (100%), thirty-one earned a rating of advanced. Of the thirty-four papers (97.1%) that were proficient in interpreting works of art, twenty-six earned a rating of advanced.

 Only two papers received an emerging rating in any of the criteria. Both of those papers were emerging on one of the rubric criteria and proficient on the other two. One paper was emerging in identifying works of art. The paper did not tell the reader what the work of art is, identify the artist, or note the context surrounding the work’s creation. One paper was emerging in interpreting works of art. The paper was mostly a report on works of art; the paper did not provide the student’s interpretation of the works.

**Conclusions**

The results of the assessment of Area C1 (Arts) were very positive. For Learning Outcome 1 (responding to aesthetic experiences), 91.2% of the submissions were rated proficient. For Learning Outcome 3 (recognize, describe, and interpret works of art), 94.3% of submissions were rated proficient in all three of these categories. In the “recognize” category, 97.1% were proficient, in the “describe” category, 100% were proficient, and in the “interpret” category, 97.1% were proficient. Inter-rater reliability was high—91.2% for Learning Outcome 1 and 97.1% for Learning Outcome 3. These results indicate a high level of student achievement of these learning outcomes.

 The GE Assessment Subcommittee will need to discuss Learning Outcome 2 in the 2021-22 academic year. We identified one assignment that aligned well with Learning Outcome from a course taught for the first time in spring 2021. If additional instructors are beginning to designate assignments that align with Learning Outcome 2, then the subcommittee could assess this student work. However, if instructors are not designating assignments that align with Learning Outcome 2 and do not plan to do so in the future, that outcome should be revised or replaced.
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