

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: Photography

B2. Report author(s): Doug Dertinger, Nigel Poor

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 181

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:
(<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
X	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The Photography Program is accredited by NASAD (National Association of Schools of Art and Design). The program uses both formative and summative means of performance assessment to measure learning outcomes in the Creative Thinking and Oral Communication PLOs. Photography Program assessment takes place in Phot 180, the senior capstone class, through group and individual critiques and classroom discussions of self-directed student projects. These projects include thesis writing, oral and written communication about work in progress, and the creation and assessment of exhibition-ready bodies of photographic work. Course rubrics evaluate the quality of the students work, both in progress and as a final portfolio.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. **[WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]**

Note: It is important to note that Phot180 is co-taught by both full time photography professors and so course critiques take place and are assessed in partnership.

PLO #4: During Phot180, we had four formal critiques of student work in progress. Each critique lasted one week and during this week each student's work was discussed and reviewed per specific criteria by professors and class peers. Professors kept track of student participation during these oral critiques and met afterwards to evaluate student performance. Evaluations were then discussed with students, and new goals were set for the next work in progress critique. Students received individual written rubrics assessing their participation. Results: The participation in critiques and the resultant assessments required students to become more accountable for, and articulate of, their intellectual and visual investigation. Students in the group became more accountable for their reactions to the varying levels of sophistication within their peers' work. The overall level of sophistication of the student work was markedly higher than in prior 180 courses.

This was due to the rigor and clarity of the demands reviewed at each of the four critiques. Faculty also noted that students had greater clarity in evaluating and discussing the progress of their projects with professors on an individual basis. However, we also found that, despite clear evaluations and feedback, students who began the semester being silent in the critiques tended toward silence throughout the semester. Students that were more orally discursive in the critiques remained so during the semester. In lieu of this, faculty are changing curriculum in prerequisite courses in order to strengthen individual oral participation of each student.

PLO #7: Oral discussion, by which we in the Photography program mean the communication of the visual experience of imagery, is deeply linked to creative thinking. It is the mechanism by which the students define and then qualify the experience of their own and peers' work. By gearing Phot180 to more intensive oral critique and discourse we intrinsically addressed creative thinking. Students had to be more aware of how they explained their work, and had to become more aware of how they responded to others' work (and through this their own). Through our assessment and feedback, students became more familiar and confident of their own process, and more aware of the possibilities inherent in the parameters of their own work. In becoming so, they were able to assess their weaknesses and strengths, all of which led to greater sophistication across the majority of the class work. In assessing this, we have found that students still have problems understanding how their work (and process of working) operates in relationship to contemporary and historical photographic practice. Students remain tentative about research and discussion of contemporary artists and photographic history in relationship to their own creative work. We are trying to address this through the two upper division Photographic history/lecture courses (Phot 101 and 102), and through the introduction of readings and visual lectures in all the prerequisite Photography courses in the program. Greater emphasis is planned for writing about contemporary photography in the fall 14 Phot165 course in order to help the spring 15 Phot180 course.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Oral Communication]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [Creative Thinking]

X	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs **in total** did your program **assess in the 2013-2014 academic year?** 2

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in **2013-14**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
X	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]:

Assessment was measured for the Photo180 final portfolio. This portfolio consists of a body of 10 cohesive images and an accompanying written statement of purpose and supporting documentation, making the work ready for professional portfolio use and application for exhibition. The project was assessed on a three-point measure addressing the project's quality of presentation/finish, quality of object/print, and quality of aesthetics/conceptualization.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes
---	--------

	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We evaluated total enrollment of the Spring 180 courses, 42 students.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Data was collected from our established grading rubric from each Phot180 course in the spring 14 semester. For reliability the rubric is shared between all faculty, and the course is team taught so that all evaluating faculty members' input is reciprocated.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [1]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses	X				
2. Modifying curriculum	X				
3. Improving advising and mentoring			X		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals		X			
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	X				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			X		
7. Annual assessment reports			X		
8. Program review		X			
9. Prospective student and family information			X		
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation		X			
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning		X			
16. Institutional benchmarking			X		
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement			X		
19. Resource allocation and budgeting			X		
20. New faculty hiring		X			
21. Professional development for faculty and staff		X			
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

The recent restructuring of our curriculum into a tighter and elegant series of courses that build upon each other as the students progress through the program has been the best example of how assessment data has directly affected our actions in the program. We are able to evaluate the work students are doing in any course and look at the courses around that course for corrective measures. Student needs are constantly discussed and addressed through this in a holistic manner.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

NA

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
X	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010

	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [Phot180]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: Photography

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: Design

A9. Department Chair's Name: Andrew Anker

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: 1

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

X	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 1

A12.1. List all the name(s): Photography B.A.

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 1

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A13.1. List all the name(s): NA

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? NA

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A14.1. List all the names: NA

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A15.1. List the name(s): NA

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____