

**Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Photography	116	PHO 116 01/10/2019- Studio Portraits
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts (new)	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 a prescribed range of lighting proficiencies in the final images. The proper implementation of studio portrait workflow must be evident in the work.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Final Portfolio of photographic images
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2017
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: All
  - How the assessment will be scored: Evaluated by utilizing a departmentally-developed technical and aesthetic rubric.

- 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: Photography faculty

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)
2018, 2014		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	25

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 Fall 2018 class roster states 12 students, but only **9** completed the course for credit. 1 student dropped in week-one; 1 student moved and did not complete the course [W]; 1 student chose audit status and didn't complete work for evaluation.

The sample quantity was increased for greater reliability in data collection by adding the Fall 2014 students. 18 students were listed on the class roster, and **16** completed the course for credit. One student withdrew because of life difficulties, and one student chose audit status and didn't complete work for evaluation. These students had the same instructor, assignments, and evaluation products and processes.

Therefore, **25** students are included in this assessment component.

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.

All students from both sections who took the course for credit and earned a letter grade were included.

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

The portfolios are collected via the DMA Local-Area Network in a secure folder. Each portfolio is scored by 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.

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* 10% to zero]. With 9 required images, plus on-time submission and identification credit, each portfolio can produce a total possible value of 360 points. ***All outcome rubrics are in the attachment entitled pho116\_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: Yes

The standard of success is "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." **75% of 25 portfolios is 19.** To meet the standard of success, 19 [75%] out of 25 portfolios must score 288 points [80%] or higher.

Each portfolio produced a score of up to 360 possible points. Each score was then correlated to a score range, such as 360 to 346. The frequency of scores was then tallied. ***All outcome statistics are in the attachment entitled pho116\_Outcome1\_Statistics.pdf***

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

The greatest area of strength in achievement is evident in student final portfolio scores being heavily weighted in the 100 to 96% range, with 18 out of 25. The remaining seven students earned scores no lower than 87%.

As an intermediate-level, 4-credit elective course, students typically bring a great deal of enthusiasm and a very good range of technical proficiencies from the very start. A studio-based course such as this requires students to work in small collaborative groups, no greater than three per group, that enables multi-dimensional problem solving to photograph people.

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 standard of success was met and far exceeded expectations with 25 out of 25 final portfolios scoring above the 80% success threshold. Improvements to the rubrics can contain more detailed language and incremental scoring steps. The

final portfolio scoring instrument uses primary assignment objectives that are mostly technical in nature and leaves ample room for aesthetic, subjective commentary by the instructor. More concise, pre-formatted rubrics can be written for subsequent semesters.

Outcome 2: Identify and interpret the camera and lighting equipment settings needed to control desired image outcome and achieve specified results in the studio.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Exam
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2017
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: All
  - How the assessment will be scored: Answer Key
  - 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: Photography faculty

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)
2018, 2014		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	25

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 Fall 2018 class roster states 12 students, but only **9** completed the course for credit. One student dropped in week-one, one student moved and did not complete the course [W], and one student chose audit status and didn't complete work for evaluation.

The sample quantity was increased for greater reliability in data collection by adding the fall 2014 students, with 18 students listed on the class roster, only **16** completed the course for credit. One student withdrew, and one student chose

audit status and didn't complete work for evaluation. These students had the same instructor, assignments, and evaluation products and processes.

Therefore, **25** students are included in this assessment component.

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.

All students from both sections who took the course for credit and earned a letter grade were included.

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

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. **See the document entitled [pho116\\_Outcome2\\_Exam.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: Yes

The standard of success is "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." **75% of 25 exams is 19.** To meet the standard of success, 19 [75%] out of 25 exams must score 96 points [80%] or higher.

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. ***All outcome statistics are in the attachment entitled [pho116\\_Outcome2\\_Statistics.pdf](#)***

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

As noted previously, students bring a great deal of enthusiasm into this intermediate-level, elective course because they are putting very functional technical methods and aesthetic theories into practice. Students that complete the Level-1 prerequisite course, PHO117 Introduction to the Studio, are seeing a good percentage of the material on this exam for a second time but in the more specific context of the portrait genre.

The Midterm exam serves as an important measure of retention in problem-solving deep technical issues around camera and studio lighting systems. The statistics evident in the scoring ranges point to very strong retention: 22 out of 25 exams scored 80% or higher, which means the standard of success is met.

**9** scored in the 100 to 96% range; **5** scored in the 95 to 90% range; **3** scored in the 89 to 87% range; **3** scored in the 86 to 83% range; **2** scored in the 82 to 80% range; **3** scores are noted 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 on this exam offers evidence that the instructional designs in pre-requisite courses are very supportive to student learning outcomes. The application and continued practice of craft and personal vision is enabled in Studio Portraits, and can lead to successful self-employment opportunities. With that, more studio portrait business practices can be integrated into this course to create a greater range of applicable skills in the job market.

Outcome 3: Apply the theory and practice of various basic and intermediate level digital retouching techniques.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Quizzes
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2017
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: All
  - How the assessment will be scored: departmental rubrics
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will achieve 80% or better.
  - Who will score and analyze the data: Photography faculty

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)
2018, 2014		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	25

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 Fall 2018 class roster states 12 students, but only **9** completed the course for credit. One student dropped in week-one, one student moved and did not complete the course [W], and one student chose audit status and didn't complete work for evaluation.

The sample quantity was increased for greater reliability in data collection by adding the fall 2014 students, with 18 students listed on the class roster, only **16** completed the course for credit. One student withdrew because of life difficulties, and one student chose audit status and didn't complete work for evaluation. These students had the same instructor, assignments, and evaluation products and processes.

Therefore, **25** students are included in this assessment component.

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.

All students from both sections that took the course for credit and earned a letter grade were included.

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

Students completed hands-on digital retouching quizzes during designated class sessions. Each quiz experience is guided by the instructor via step-by-step walk-through of the software interface, processes, and procedures.

In addition to the written tutorial guide published and utilized during the software walk-through, students could also use open notes, books, or the like to complete their work. Questions and answers occurred during the lab session walk through,

and students were provided with additional time outside of class to complete their work, but had to meet a deadline to turn-in for full credit.

Hands-on quizzes are scored with an answer key by the instructor. *See the documents entitled [pho116\\_Outcome3\\_A6.2Rubric.pdf](#) & [pho116\\_Outcome3\\_A6.2Rubric.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: Yes

The standard of success is "75% of the students will score 80% or higher." **75% of 25 is 19.** To meet the standard of success, 19 [75%] out of 25 Quiz "SumScores" must be 112 points [80%] or higher.

Two, hands-on quizzes were scored per student; 90 & 50 points respectively. A student's total [max 140 points] is called a SumScore. Each score was then correlated to a range, such as 140 to 134. The frequency of scores was then tallied. *All outcome statistics are in the attachment entitled [pho116\\_Outcome3\\_Statistics.pdf](#)*

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

As noted previously, students bring a great deal of enthusiasm into this intermediate-level elective course because they are putting very functional technical methods and aesthetic theories into practice from prerequisite course work.

Similar to the evidence in Outcome 2, the evidence in Outcome 3 suggests the likelihood that if students complete the Level-2 prerequisite course, PHO127 Digital Photo Imaging 1, then greater retention of digital image compositing [i.e. Adobe Photoshop] techniques is possible.

The two, hands-on format quizzes serve as an important measure of retention of visual problem solving with intermediate to advanced software tools and techniques. The statistics evident in the scoring ranges point to very strong retention and application of these specific skills and proficiencies: 24 out of 25 SumScores [sum of both quiz scores] were 80% or higher, which means the standard of success is met.

**See [pho116\\_Outcome3\\_A6.2Rubrics.pdf](#) & [pho116\\_Outcome3\\_A7.2Rubrics.pdf](#)**



17 scored in the 100 to 96% range; 4 scored in the 95 to 90% range; 1 scored in the 89 to 87% range; 1 scored in the 86 to 83% range; 1 scored in the 82 to 80% range; 1 score is far below 80% because this student did not turn in one quiz for evaluation, producing a fail.

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 these software technical abilities offers evidence that the instructional designs in pre-requisite courses are very supportive to student learning outcomes. The application and continued practice of craft and personal vision is enabled in Studio Portraits and can lead to highly marketable skills and proficiencies.

With that, more studio portrait digital retouching professional practices such as these can be integrated into the course to create an even greater range of applicable skills in the job market.

### 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?

Studio Portraits 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 studio 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.

The assessment results offer a pleasant affirmation of success. The change from a 3-credit course, [without the digital retouching components] to a 4-credit course, and depth of digital retouching and business practice components is very beneficial to student learning outcomes and 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 immediately via email to my Full-time colleagues, and the Part-time faculty that teach this course to inform their instructional processes.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	For the final portfolios used to assess Outcome 1, more concise, pre-formatted rubrics can be written for subsequent semesters.	To increase precision when evaluating final portfolio components.	2020
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Integrate more studio portrait business practices, such as estimate and invoice forms (Outcome 2).	To create a greater range of applicable skills in the job market.	2020
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Integrate more studio portrate digital retouching professional practices (Outcome 3).	To create a greater range of applicable skills in the job market.	2020

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

6.

### III. Attached Files

[pho116 Outcome2 Exam](#)  
[pho116 Outcome2 Statistics](#)  
[pho116 Outcome3 A6Rubrics](#)  
[pho116 Outcome1 Rubrics](#)  
[pho116 Outcome1 Statistics](#)  
[pho116 Outcome3 A7Rubrics](#)  
[pho116 Outcome3 Statistics](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:**

Donald Werthmann **Date:** 07/24/2019

**Department Chair:** Donald Werthmann **Date:** 07/24/2019  
**Dean:** Eva Samulski **Date:** 07/25/2019  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 08/29/2019