Discipline	Course Number	Title
Photography	216	PHO 216 01/10/2019-Environmental Portraiture
College	Division	Department
Business and Computer Technologies	Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts (new)
Faculty Preparer		Donald Werthmann
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

   No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

   3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

   5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Display lighting proficiencies in the final images such that the implementation of environmental portraiture work-flow is evident.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Portfolio of photographic images.

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2012

    o Course section(s)/other population: ALL

    o Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the photographs with a minimum of 10.

- o How the assessment will be scored: Scored by utilizing a departmental technical and aesthetic rubric.

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 90% of the students will score 80% or higher.

- o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time photography faculty along with external, working professionals that produce environmental portraiture.

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)
2020		2018, 2017, 2021

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
50	42

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.

The number of students differs because only those that completed a final portfolio of images were included in the sampling. Among the four sections, across as many years, there were audit- and withdraw-status students that were not included. These sections offer a robust number of students that far exceed the language, "random sample of 50% of the photographs with a minimum of 10".

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 data sample intentionally includes a mixture of semester formats that were driven by a variety of circumstances. Roughly an equal number of students are represented from the face-to-face, on-campus format, and the virtual classroom format that were conducted with Zoom video conferencing in special, pandemic-era circumstances.
• Spring 2021 — [9 students] pandemic-era, virtual classroom 10-weeks
• Fall 2020 — [11 students] pandemic-era, virtual classroom 10-weeks
• Spring 2018 — [15 students] face-to-face on-campus 7.5 weeks
• Spring 2017 — [7 students] face-to-face on-campus 10-weeks [regularly offered format]

Regardless of the semester format, all classes are only offered in the evening time frame. This is because students are required to photograph models [friends,

companions, relatives, and/or semi-professional talent] and availability of these individuals increases significantly in the evening hours.

The other rationale to offer this class as evening-only is because this light quality for portraiture [known as sweetlight or golden-hour] is far better than morning or afternoon hours.

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

An electronic final portfolio of photography, which is required to be formatted as a web-based photo gallery, is submitted by each student at the end of the semester.

The portfolios are collected via cloud-based [Google Drive] secure folders. Each portfolio is scored using rubrics that measure various formal properties present in the images, such as: control of camera, lighting technique, exposure value, set construction, composition, and other technical and aesthetic qualities.

There are five [5], core location-lighting assignments assessed. Each portfolio produced a score of up to 225 possible points. Each score was then correlated to a score range, such as 225 to 216. The frequency of scores was then tallied.

With each rubric descriptor, each image is scored on a scale ranging as [*Excellent* 45-40], [*Average* 35-30], [Below *Average* 25-20] or [*Incomplete* 15 to zero]. ***All outcome rubrics are in the attachment entitled pho216_Outcome1_Rubrics.pdf***

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>Yes</u>

The standard of success is "90% of the students will score 80% or higher. **90% of 42 portfolios is 38**. To meet the standard of success, 38 [90%] out of 42 portfolios must score 180 points [80%] or higher.

41 Portfolios [98%] out of 42 scored 180 points [80%] or higher. ***All outcome statistics are in the attachment entitled pho216_Outcome1_Data.pdf***

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

This 3-credit elective, intermediate-level course attracts students that are enthusiastic and ready to put functional technical methods and aesthetic theories into deeper practice. Students must complete the 90 contact hour prerequisite,

PHO117 Introduction to the Studio, and discover that the assignments in this course are a workflow continuation, but in the more specific context of the portrait genre.

Students that also complete the 4-credit elective course, PHO116 Studio Portraits, bring an even greater depth of 90 contact hours and practicum of the portrait genre into this course.

The core assignments used to assess the Portfolio of photographic images serve as an important measure of retention in problem-solving deep technical issues around camera and location-based lighting systems. The statistics evident in the scoring ranges point to very strong retention: **41 out of 42 portfolios scored 80% or higher, which means the standard of success was met.**

27 scored in the 100 to 96% range; **11** scored in the 95 to 90% range; **1** scored in the 89 to 87% range; **2** scored in the 86 to 83% range. **1** score was tallied below 80%.

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.

The achievement of technical and aesthetic retention in this portfolio of images offers evidence that the instructional designs in the pre-requisite and elective course work are very supportive to student learning outcomes.

The application and continued practice of craft and personal vision is enabled in Environmental Portraiture, and can lead to successful self-employment opportunities. With that said, more portrait business practices can be integrated into this course to create a greater range of applicable skills in the job market.

Outcome 2: Identify camera and lighting equipment settings to control images and achieve specified results.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Exam
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2012
    - Course section(s)/other population: All
    - Number students to be assessed: All
    - How the assessment will be scored: Answer key.

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score a 80% or higher.

- o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time photography faculty along with external, working professionals that produce environmental portraiture.

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)
2020		2021, 2018, 2017

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
50	42

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.

The number of students differs because only those that completed an exam were included in the sampling. Among the four sections, across as many years, there were audit- and withdraw-status students that were not included.

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 data sample intentionally includes a mixture of semester formats that were driven by a variety of circumstances. Roughly an equal number of students are represented from the face-to-face, on-campus format, and the virtual classroom format that were conducted with Zoom video conferencing in special, pandemic-era circumstances.
• Spring 2021 — [9 students] pandemic-era, virtual classroom 10-weeks
• Fall 2020 — [11 students] pandemic-era, virtual classroom 10-weeks
• Spring 2018 — [15 students] face-to-face on-campus 7.5 weeks
• Spring 2017 — [7 students] face-to-face on-campus 10-weeks [regularly offered format]

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

Students take the exam during one designated class session. 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 lighting equipment and the handling of equipment on location.

Exams are scored with an answer key by the instructor. **See the document entitled pho216_Outcome2_Exam-Sample.pdf**

Each exam produced a score of up to 120 possible points. Each score was then correlated to a score range, such as 120 to 115. The frequency of scores was then tallied.

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: Yes

The standard of success is "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." **75% of 42 exams is 32**. To meet the standard of success, 32 [75%] out of 42 exams must score 96 points [80%] or higher.

32 exams [76%] out of 42, scored 96 points [80%] or higher. ***All outcome statistics are in the attachment entitled pho216_Outcome3_Exam-Data.pdf***

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

Students that complete the 90 contact hour prerequisite, PHO117 Introduction to the Studio, and potentially the 90 contact hour elective, PHO116 Studio Portraits, bring significant depth of study to the tools and techniques practiced in this course. Students begin to not only identify but clarify the mathematical patterns and logic of camera operations and lighting equipment, which in turn generates greater confidence and rates of success.

The exam measures retention in problem-solving deep technical issues around camera operation, location-based lighting systems, and image production coordination. The statistics evident in the scoring ranges point to strong retention: **32 out of 42 exams scored 80% or higher, which means the standard of success is met.**

13 scored in the 100 to 96% range; **8** scored in the 95 to 90% range; **5** scored in the 89 to 87% range; **4** scored in the 86 to 83% range; **2** scored in the 82 to 80% range. **10** scores are tallied below 80%.

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.

The achievement of technical retention in the exam offers evidence that the instructional designs in the pre-requisite and elective course work are very supportive to student learning outcomes.

The application and continued practice of craft and personal vision is enabled in Environmental Portraiture, and can lead to successful self-employment opportunities. With that said, more portrait business practices can be integrated into this course to create a greater range of applicable skills in the job market.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate collaboration and problem-solving skills in the execution of a team on-location photo-shoot.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Photographic image.

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2012

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

    o Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the photographs with a minimum of 10.

    o How the assessment will be scored: Scored using a departmental technical and aesthetic rubric.

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 90% of the students will score 80% or higher.

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time photography faculty along with external, working professionals that produce environmental portraiture.

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)
2020		2021, 2018, 2017

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
50	22

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.

> The number of students differs because only those that completed a team-produced image were included in the sampling. Among the four sections, across as many years, there were audit- and withdraw-status students that were not included.
>
> 22 of the 42 students were used in the assessment of this outcome.
>
> The number of students that were assessed for this outcome enabled a "random sample of 50% of the photographs with a minimum of 10".

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 Spring/Summer 2018 & 2017 semesters offer the only available data for this outcome:
> • Spring 2018 — [15 students] face-to-face on-campus 7.5 weeks
> • Spring 2017 — [7 students] face-to-face on-campus 10-weeks [regularly offered format]
>
> During the Fall 2020 and Summer 2021 semesters, students were prohibited from sharing equipment components and were required to practice mandatory social distancing policies. A majority of buildings and services on campus were shut down because of public health restrictions imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

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

> **Campus Life at WCC Group Project:** students are required to work as a pair, or in a group of three. They must identify an area on campus to produce a photograph about students, staff, and/or faculty engaged in some aspect of their everyday experience in the WCC culture. These images are routinely utilized by the college recruitment office, which are presented to prospective students to inspire them to enroll at the college.
>
> **Research Component:** Each student must contribute three images, borrowed from any source, to contribute to group ideation and discussion time. This enables the group to envision what formal properties their image might include. For example, camera technique, lighting technique, use of location, wardrobe, and props.

Plan of Work: Each student must identify their role and participate in the production of the photograph for the duration of the assignment. The three roles are as follows: Photographer, Lighting Technician, and Location Manager. Each student is required to complete a 'Plan of Work' that outlines their specific tasks, and problem solving they anticipate encountering.

Post-Production Rationale: Each student must compose a written rationale after the image is produced by their group. The responses to three leading questions are specific to their role in the image production as either, Photographer, Lighting Technician, or Location Manager. ***See the attachment entitled pho216_Outcome3_Rubrics.pdf***

There are three [3], core group project components assessed. Each student can generate a score of up to 90 possible points. Each score was then correlated to a score range, such as 90 to 86. The frequency of scores was then tallied.

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>

The standard of success is "90% of the students will score 80% or higher. **90% of 22 group projects is 20**. To meet the standard of success, 20 [90%] out of 22 group projects must score 72 points [80%] or higher.

16 projects [72%] out of 22 scored 72 points [80%] or higher. ***All outcome statistics are in the attachment entitled pho216_Outcome3_Data.pdf***

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

Students are told that the group project functions as a 'hands-on final exam'.

The project measures retention in problem-solving deep technical issues around the three core individual practices involved in the production of location-based portraiture: Technical and aesthetic camera operation, technical and aesthetic choices of location-based lighting systems, and location management & production coordination. The statistics evident in the scoring ranges point to strong retention: **16 out of 22 projects scored 80% or higher, which means the standard of success was not met.**

12 scored in the 100 to 96% range; **1** scored in the 89 to 87% range; **3** scored in the 86 to 83% range. **6** scores are tallied below 80%.

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.

> The data sample for this outcome was much different than the previous two outcomes. Instead of being able to use data from all 42 students, only 22 had scores available. This is because the pandemic-era semesters [2020 & 2021] caused a shutdown of most campus facilities — the group project is entitled 'Campus Life at WCC'.
>
> Social distancing policies on campus complicated the situation further, and prohibited students from sharing in the handling of equipment. In these semesters, students enrolled in a 'virtual classroom' format, which forced them to work independently on location.
>
> The standard of success was not met, but then looking at the idea that 90% of students must achieve 80% or higher is too optimistic, and statistically unlikely. In other assessments that I've completed, the standard of success states, "75% of students must score 80% or higher", which is a more realistic range of expectations. Update of the master syllabus for this course is due, and this language is to be updated accordingly.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

> This is the first time the course is being assessed, so no data or intended changes are available for reference to compose a discussion about improved student learning.

2. 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?

> Environmental Portraiture offers students the opportunity to participate in a very strong confluence of skills and proficiencies found in industry. These skill sets range from camera operation to various location lighting systems, to software tools and techniques, and even rudimentary portrait business practices and ethical uses of images in the portrait sector of the photography industry.
>
> Overall, the assessment results offer a pleasant affirmation of success.

3. 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 to Full Time Faculty, and the Advisory Committee membership. The Part-time Faculty that teach this course are also to be informed for their instructional processes.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	The standard of success for Outcome 3 will be changed in the master syllabus update.	The current standard of success states, "90% of students must score 80% or higher." This sets the bar too high, and it needs to be set back to a more realistic range of expectations. The new standard of success will state, "75% of students must score 80% or higher." This language will meet the same standard of success in the pre-requisite [PHO117] and elective course [PHO116] master syllabi. This can offer stronger continuity of language across all the courses that align with the studio-sector of the photography department.	2023

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

None.

III. Attached Files

pho216_Outcome1_Data
pho216_Outcome2_Exam-Data
pho216_Outcome3_Project-Data
pho216_Outcome1_Rubrics
pho216_Outcome2_Exam-Sample
pho216_Outcome3_Project-Rubrics

Faculty/Preparer:	Donald Werthmann	**Date:** 07/18/2022
Department Chair:	Jason Withrow	**Date:** 07/21/2022
Dean:	Eva Samulski	**Date:** 08/10/2022
Assessment Committee Chair:	Shawn Deron	**Date:** 02/08/2023