



Program Assessment Report

Program: Global Socio-Cultural Responsibility

Option: Appreciation of the Arts

Report Year: 2019-20

Drafted by Basil Moutsatsos on Nov 22, 2020

Overall Introduction

In support of the mission of St. Petersburg College, faculty committees established several General Education Goals. These goals are to provide an open admission general education curriculum that results in students' achievement of several educational outcomes. This Assessment Report addresses Appreciation of the Arts, one of the options identified within the following educational outcome: "Students should be able to participate actively as informed and ethically responsible citizens in social, cultural, global, and environmental matters.."

It is the intent of St. Petersburg College to incorporate continuous improvement practices in all areas. Assessment reports provide comparisons of present and past results which are used to identify topics where improvement is possible. The following section illustrates how SPC has traditionally used past results as a vital tool in achieving its commitment to continuous improvement.

Program Learning Outcomes

#1: Participate actively as informed and ethically responsible citizens in social, cultural, global, and environmental matters.

I. Use of Past Results

Appreciation of the Arts:

Method 1: Assessment Administered by Instructors

2005-06 Assessment Report Results

On-Campus Classes: Overall, there was a marked improvement from the spring 2004-05 results to the spring 2005-06 results. In face-to-face classes, the Domains for Ancient Greece (Questions 1 & 2), Early Renaissance (Questions 9, 10 & 11) and Rome (Questions 3 & 4) showed improvements: the mean for Ancient Greece increased from 64.16% in 2004-05 to 67.04% in 2005-06; the mean for Early Renaissance increased from 62.90% in 04-05 to 66.9% in 05-06; and the mean for Rome increased from 54.06% in 04-05 to 58.49% in 05-06.

The Domains for Middle Ages (Questions 5, 6, 7 & 8) and High Renaissance (Questions 12, 13, 14 & 15) showed minimal improvement from spring 2004-05 to spring 2005-06: the mean for Middle Ages was 68.32% in 2004-05 and 69.98% in 2005-06; the mean for High Renaissance was 69.06% in 2004-05 and 70.36% in 2005-06.

On-line Classes: Although a smaller sample was assessed for spring 2005-06 online classes, the mean for all the Domains except Middle Ages showed improvement in comparison to the combined mean scores for 2004-05. The Domain mean scores for online classes follow: the mean for Ancient Greece was 71%; the mean for Rome was 63%; the mean for Early Renaissance was 74%; and the mean for High Renaissance was 79%. The mean score for the Domain Middle Ages remained the same with 68.32% in 2004-05 and 68% in 2005-06.

2008-09 Assessment Report Results

On-Campus Classes: Overall, there was little change between the spring 2007-08 results and the spring 2008-09 results. In face-to-face classes, the domain for Ancient Greece (Questions 1 & 2) showed an improvement of 0.04. The declines ranged from 0.4 in Rome (Questions 3 & 4) to -4.3 in Middle Ages (Questions 5, 6, 7 & 8). Early Renaissance (Questions 9, 10 & 11) and High Renaissance (Questions 12, 13, 14 & 15) also had declines of 1.9 and 0.9, respectively. Only two items in the spring 2008-09 on-campus administration met the 70% criteria for success: Early Renaissance (71.5%) and High Renaissance (73.3%).

On-line Classes: While a smaller sample was assessed in the online classes, there was also little change between the spring 2006-07 results and the spring 2007-08 results. In online classes, the domain for Early Renaissance (Questions 9, 10 & 11) and Ancient Greece (Questions 1 & 2) displayed improvements of 5.9 and 0.1, respectively. While the remaining domains declined ranging from 5.0 in High Renaissance (Questions 12, 13, 14 & 15), to 1.5 in Middle Ages (Questions 5, 6, 7 & 8), The last domain, Rome (Questions 3 & 4), declined by 1.6. No items in the spring 2008-09 on-line administration met the 70% criteria for success. High Renaissance was the closest with a mean of 69.0%.

For the participation survey item, 66.9% of the respondents from the spring 2008-09 on-campus classes attended two or more cultural activities outside of class, while 63.6% of the respondents from the spring 2008-09 on-line classes attended two or more cultural activities.

Method 2: Comparison of Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

The six items related to the Humanities and Fine Arts were compared between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys in 2005-06. Five of the six items resulted in a statistical significant difference between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys. The last item, 'Performing in or creating a work of drama, music, or dance', resulted in a mean increase of 0.12 points which was not statistically significant.

The six items related to the Humanities and Fine Arts were compared between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys in 2006-07 and 2007-08. Four of the six items resulted in a statistical significant difference between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys in both administrations. The second to last item, 'Creating a painting, sculpture or other work of visual art' was statistically significant in 2006-07. However, it only had an increase of 0.03 in 2007-08, which was not statistically significant. The last item, 'Performing in or creating a work of drama, music, or dance', resulted in a mean increase of 0.09 points in 2006-07, and a mean decrease of 0.01 in 2007-08, neither of which was statistically significant.

This analysis while cross-sectional in nature, suggested an increase in the self-reported perceptions of students regarding their experience with Humanities and Fine Arts during their College stay.

2010-11 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

In the area of Fine Arts and Humanities, the entering student survey and graduating student surveys were compared for the years 2008-2009, and 2009-2010. Although they were not the same cohort of students, the data suggested an upward trend in two of the three categories.

This trend suggested that SPC has provided some influence toward appreciation and participation in the arts, primarily in attending concerts, dramas, performances, and art museums. It also suggested that there was a general upward trend of awareness and appreciation for performing and visual art participation and appreciation, related to a student's experience at SPC. However, the effect on visual arts creativity was not seen in this measure. Perhaps this question is too specific to conservatory arts skills and other measures would be more indicative of the positive affects of Humanities and Fine Arts on SPC students.

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey

Although the satisfaction survey indicated only a slight increase in the preparedness in the humanities (from 6.02 to 6.05) this was still relatively high on a 7 point scale. It remains our goal to see growth in this category by providing vital arts experiences and relevant teaching and learning in the classroom.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

The online general education assessment indicated slight increases in the successful responses from Spring to Summer 2010 (73.95 to 74.38). Also, comparing Fall 2010 to Spring 2011 for forms 1, 2, and 3, there was an increase in form 1 (73.78 to 75.99), a decrease in form 2 (62.35 to 59.97) and an increase in form three (61.82 to 66.69), reflecting an overall upward trend in these responses. This reflected a composite of 4 subgroups in this category: Social, Ethics, Cultural, and Global. Our faculty core group reviewed the Cultural portion of the assessment items to evaluate if they were equal in validity across the three forms. The department continues to inform and motivate faculty across the disciplines to infuse learning activities in courses that include practical applications from the arts.

2013-14 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison of Entering and Graduating student surveys

The most significant change was in the category of "Attending an art museum;" which increased in all three years (.36, .29, and .29) for that item. This reflected the significant work of faculty in the humanities and other liberal arts in conjunction with the educational staff of Leepa-Rattner Museum of Art to infuse meaningful learning experiences for students of all disciplines using the resources of the museum. The item "Attending a concert, dance performance, or live drama" increased during the first year (.07) but decreased in the second (.07) and third year (.04). The overall numbers (3.05, 2.95, and 2.93) were still above average on a 5-point scale. This indicated a need for more internal communication within departments regarding arts events and activities of common interest to students. The third item focused on "Creating a painting, sculpture, or other work visual art." This showed a slight increase in the first year (.03) and slight decline in years two and three (.03 and .02), which are not significant. This item may need some re-wording to get at the general impact of the humanities program across disciplines, since the focus is general education and not limited to students entering arts majors with intention of improving their creative skills.

Method 2: Satisfaction Data from Graduating Student Survey

For all three years, the record was 4.2 out of 5, reflecting a positive response to student satisfaction with the preparation they received in the Humanities program.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

For all of the competencies, as recorded using different forms, the wide variance in the results suggested a review of assessment items, by our department, was needed to check for parity. With only 3 of the items receiving an acceptable rating of 70% or above, a review of the items was needed to ensure they were measuring the competencies appropriately, and that the most appropriate competencies for assessment had been identified.

Competency 1 - The student will be able to distinguish the broad differences within artistic style periods. This one was successful (75%) with the group who used Form 2 but not successful with groups who used forms 3 (34%), 4 (40%), or 5 (55%).

Competency 2 - The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of arts to the liberal arts and sciences. For this one, none of the forms reflected a successful result. There was more consistency among forms: 44%, 35%, 46%, 53%. This bears examination as to the methods of introducing cross-discipline applications of learning outcomes to students.

Competency 3 - The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of the arts to the liberal arts and sciences. Although forms 2 and 3 did not illustrate success for this competency, forms 4 and 5 did, with 75% and 74%, respectively. This indicated a review of the appreciation of the arts assessment items was needed to check for parity and revision, if necessary.

2015-16 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

A slight increase is seen in 2014-2015 compared to 2013-2014 in all three areas, though not statistically significant (less than 0.05 change from year to year). The most significant change from entering to graduation is "visiting an art museum;" a change of +0.30. This is attributable to SPC's Leepa-Rattner Museum of Art, and other local art museums that are used for a cultural experience assignment for students.

Method 2: Satisfaction Data from Graduating Student Survey.

Moving from 4.17 to 4.21 (7-point scale) from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 is a positive direction; though slight. Both years show overall satisfaction with Humanities preparedness at SPC.

Method 3: Online Gen Ed Assessment.

Results here are less positive; in that only one category is seen as acceptable: "The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of arts to the liberal arts and sciences" which was rated at 87%. Questions for these domains are being revised and will be implemented in an upcoming administration of this method.

Method 4: Course Assessment

This was a pilot of a new assessment methodology that will expand to larger group this year. These results were skewed by a rubric that had included global focus in the scoring, though many of the particular cultural experience assignment essays that contributed to the pool of data did not have a global focus as assigned by faculty. This resulted in lower scores for those assignments on two rubric items. We are adjusting for next iteration by 1) clarifying the nature of the assignments used in Humanities sections that will be used for this purpose; 2) including World Religion REL 2300 to incorporate the global focus; and 3) adjusting the rubrics used to appropriately represent the assignments to which they apply.

Also, we will more accurately aggregate the resulting data. An aggregate of the six groups assessed in this report is as follows:

n=128

Capstone - 2.6% achievement (4 point)
Milestones - 18.1% (3-point); 33.1% (2 point); combined 41.2% achievement
Benchmark - 26.1% achievement (1 point)
Not Met - 20.2% (0 point)

It is hoped that these numbers will increase with ongoing improvements in HUM 1020 standard course; addition of REL 2300 standard course to data collection; revision of rubrics; and more understanding and participation by faculty in the next administration of this assessment.

2018-19 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

Comparisons between the Entering and Graduating Student Surveys indicated increases in each of the three categories, both years.

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey

When asked about their satisfaction with the preparedness they received at St. Petersburg College in “Humanities”, students mean score (4.21) remained the same both years.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

The fall 2018 administration of the online general education assessment utilized three forms. For students completing forms 1 and 2, (68%-90%) responded correctly to the questions. The percent of students (44%-84%) responding correctly to questions in form 5, was lower.

Method 4: Course Assessment

This evaluation was a continuation of an assessment methodology that began in 2015-2016. These results were inconsistent from the Fall 2016-Spring 2017 results versus the Spring 2019 results. This may be because of a change in the rubric used (lead committee member error in Spring 2019) or because there were more evaluators for Spring 2019 with all of the full time Humanities faculty participating. Regardless, since the entire department was involved in this process, with even some help from an adjunct faculty member, the members of the department have decided to adjust the rubric again for future evaluations.

As the department viewed the results, Fall 2016-Spring 2017 results were skewed by a rubric that had included an updated wording of “Global focus” in the scoring, though many of the particular cultural experience assignment essays that contributed to the pool of data did not have a “Global focus” as assigned by faculty. Scores for Learning Outcome 3 were consistently below the Benchmark. While it was determined in results from the Fall 2015-Spring 2016 evaluation that the “Global focus” element of this assessment would be shifted to REL 2300 (World Religions) because of similar results from past evaluations, the implementation of using an assignment from REL 2300 had not been put into practice yet. A new rubric for a REL 2300 assignment evaluation for the “Global focus” has been created and will be used as early as Fall semester 2019 evaluation.

The results for Spring 2019 seemed more balanced with the majority of the submissions evaluated at Capstone or Milestone level. However, this may be due to the old rubric applied or almost twice the evaluators as before. It may seem like an anomaly, but the numbers show a fair increase in submission meeting a high level of Capstone or Milestone. These results are promising and hopefully this trend continues in subsequent evaluations.

Furthermore, as a result of REL 2300 being used for evaluating the “Global focus”, the existing rubric for HUM 1020 needed to be adapted as well. Moving forward, the HUM 1020 rubric will not focus on any “Global focus” and the wording of that rubric will be edited so that it is adequately focused on the proper learning outcomes.

Also, we will more accurately aggregate the resulting data. Aggregates of each semester groups assessed in this report are as follows:

Fall 2016: n=707
Capstone – 8.6% achievement (4 point)

Milestones – 25% (3-point); 25.5% (2 point); combined 50.5% achievement
Benchmark - 23.1% achievement (1 point)
Not Met – 17.8% (0 point)

Spring 2017: n=839
Capstone – 8.3% achievement (4 point)
Milestones – 20.6% (3-point); 28.1% (2 point); combined 48.7% achievement
Benchmark – 18.7% achievement (1 point)
Not Met - 24.2% (0 point)

Spring 2019: n=1522
Capstone – 23.8% achievement (4 point)
Milestones – 29.6% (3-point); 21.7% (2 point); combined 51.3% achievement
Benchmark – 16.3% achievement (1 point)
Not Met – 8.5% (0 point)

It is hoped that these numbers will continue to increase with ongoing improvements in HUM 1020 standard course; addition of REL 2300 standard course to data collection; revision of rubrics; and more understanding and participation by faculty in the next administration of this assessment, as shown with involvement with this particular assessment.

II. Methodology

Means of Assessment: The Appreciation of the Arts option within the Global Socio Cultural Responsibility goal was assessed using one method. The purpose of this report is to highlight the newly revised course assessment. The next assessment report will include additional methods as in the past.

Date(s) of Administration: 2019-2020

Method 1: Course Assessment

Students in HUM1020 Introduction to Humanities courses were assigned an Aesthetic Experience Assignment that required students to attend a performance (e.g. dance concert, play, musical theater production, poetry reading, opera, musical performance, etc.) or an arts museum or gallery, either face to face or virtually. Students are required to reflect and describe their experiences using the appropriate vocabulary for the area of the humanities appropriate to their experience and correctly identify the broad cultural context (eastern or western) to which the experience conformed. Instructors are given latitude on the length and format of the assignment as long as the core components are included.

Assessment Instrument: Aesthetic Experience Assignment

The assessment used is aligned to course outcomes and general education outcomes. Students must attend an event, performance, or museum outside of class and compose a written response and reflection on that experience by applying

key concepts relevant to the humanistic discipline appropriate to their choice. When students attended a museum, they are required to choose a specific work of art to discuss. Students must demonstrate their ability to:

1. correctly apply the appropriate vocabulary and concepts;
2. correctly identify the work's basic elements of style and broad cultural context; and
3. demonstrate their critical thinking skills through written communication.

The faculty chose to use a similar version of the AAC&U Global Learning Value Rubric, excluding any "Global" elements, which still utilizes the other Learning Outcomes from previous rubrics. The collected pieces were divided among the committee of 10 members and then evaluated based on the corresponding rubric for each of the semesters listed.

Population: The sample population for this assessment was 20% of the total sections of HUM1020 that ran in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 across all modalities (face-to-face, blended, and online).

Rubric: The following is the newly adapted rubric for the 2019-2020 assessment:

Level	Capstone	Milestone		Benchmark	Not Met
	4	3	2	1	0
Learning outcome 1: The student will be able to distinguish the broad differences within artistic style periods.	For the artistic work under consideration, all of the following are identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, at least 3 of the following are identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, at least 2 of the following are identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, only 1 of the following is identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, none of the following are identified correctly: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style
Learning outcome 2: The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of the arts across disciplines.	The artistic work under consideration is strategically linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines in organized and clear way.	The artistic work under consideration is strategically linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines but the analysis lack organization or clarity.	The artistic work under consideration is partially linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines and the analysis may lack organization or clarity.	The artistic work under consideration is minimally linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines and the analysis may lack organization or clarity.	The artistic work under consideration is not linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts.
Learning outcome 3: The student will be able to develop critical analysis skills in reference to works of human creative expression by applying basic vocabulary essential for	Student demonstrates their critical analysis skills by employing specialized vocabulary correctly through multiple and diverse examples.	Student demonstrates their critical analysis skills by employing specialized vocabulary correctly within their analysis but the examples maybe limited in scope and/or application.	Student makes use of some specialized vocabulary, but the critical analysis is not fully developed or the application of the terms needs some improvement.	Some specialized vocabulary is used but the application of the terms lacks accuracy and the student's analysis is underdeveloped	A critical analysis is not developed and/or no specialized vocabulary relating to the subject area is present in the analysis.

communicating concepts in the humanities disciplines.					
-------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

III. Criteria for Success

Method 1: Course Assessment

Goal: Students must score at least 70% to be successful.

IV. Summary of Assessment Findings

Method 1: Course Assessment

HUM 1020-Fall 2019

Totals-f2f						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	72	40	34	21	12	179
LO - 2	46	61	33	21	17	178
LO - 3	50	54	34	23	17	178
Totals	168	155	101	65	46	

Totals-online						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	51	25	28	24	3	131
LO - 2	33	36	35	18	9	131
LO - 3	39	35	30	16	11	131

Totals	123	96	93	58	23	
--------	-----	----	----	----	----	--

Totals-blended						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	4	1	2	0	0	7
LO - 2	3	2	2	0	0	7
LO - 3	3	2	1	1	0	7
Totals	10	5	5	1	0	

Totals-all submissions						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	127	66	64	45	15	317
LO - 2	82	99	70	39	26	316
LO - 3	92	91	65	40	28	316
Totals	301	256	199	124	69	

HUM 1020-Spring 2020

Totals-f2f						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	

LO - 1	46	30	29	24	9	138
LO - 2	45	36	28	19	10	138
LO - 3	45	33	24	23	14	139
Totals	136	99	81	66	33	

Totals-online						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	35	25	21	20	2	103
LO - 2	33	28	19	17	6	103
LO - 3	38	26	21	12	7	104
Totals	106	79	61	49	15	

Totals-blended						
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	10	2	0	0	0	12
LO - 2	10	2	0	0	0	12
LO - 3	10	2	0	0	0	12

Totals	30	6	0	0	0	
--------	----	---	---	---	---	--

Totals-all submissions							
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met		
	4	3	2	1	0		
LO - 1	81	55	50	44	11	241	
LO - 2	78	64	47	36	16	241	
LO - 3	83	59	45	35	21	243	
Totals	242	178	142	115	48		

V. Discussion and Analysis of Assessment Findings

Method 1: Course Assessment

A continued assessment of a cultural experience assignment in the HUM 1020 (Introduction to Humanities) course has a much more balanced set of results from previous years. The results from the Fall 2019-Spring 2020 changed with the updating of the rubric for this assessment. The Humanities Full time faculty agreed on a new rubric for this assessment removing the aspect of the Global Focus and shifted that element to a different assessment for the course REL 2300. The result for this assessment focused more on the cultural element.

By removing the "Global" Learning outcome from the Rubric, the results are much more aligned with the goals of this assessment and our department is supporting the college well. The separate discussion for the Global component in regards to the "Global Community Assessment" will be discussed in the other Assessment. This is good news and this continued assessment now has a good baseline for our department to judge how we are doing.

Aggregates of each semester groups assessed in this report are as follows:

Fall 2019: n=949

Capstone – 31.7% achievement (4 point)

Milestones – 26.96% (3-point); 20.97% (2 point); combined 47.94% achievement

Benchmark - 13.07% achievement (1 point)

Not Met – 7.27% (0 point)

Spring 2020: n=725

Capstone – 33.38% achievement (4 point)

Milestones – 24.55% (3-point); 19.59% (2 point); combined 44.14% achievement

Benchmark – 15.86% achievement (1 point)

Not Met - 6.62% (0 point)

These results definitely support a good positive direction for our department and assessment. The majority of results are in the Capstone or Milestone levels which is a distinct change from the previous semesters' assessments.

Action Plan

Category	Action Plan Detail / Implications	For PLO	Responsible Party / Due Date
D. Improve Assessment Methodology			
D6. Improve communications and instructions for faculty			
	Action Detail		Nov 2021
	Budget / Planning Implications: Now is the time to help make this process more efficient for faculty involvement and ease of getting the results. This should be worked on by the next Assessment report.		

Evaluation of the Impact of Action Plan Items on Program Quality

This assessment is a major agenda item at each of our College-wide Humanities and Fine Arts Faculty meetings. We look at the data and the process, and are struggling together as a group to find the best way to improve how we assess what we do. Included in this discussion is a review of how we present the major learning outcomes for our students and how to make them relevant for students in a process of continuous improvement.

Approvals

Program Administrator:

Basil Moutsatsos - Faculty

Approved by Basil Moutsatsos - Faculty on Nov 22, 2020

Educational Outcomes Coordinators:

Amy Eggers - Coord, Accredtn&BaccAssessment

Magaly Tymms - Assessment Director

Approved by Magaly Tymms - Assessment Director on Dec 17, 2020

Dean:

Barbara Hubbard - Acting Dean, Hum & Fine Arts

Approved by Barbara Hubbard - Acting Dean, Hum & Fine Arts on Dec 17, 2020

Senior Vice President:

Sabrina Crawford - AVP, Institutional Eff Acad Srv

Approved by Sabrina Crawford - AVP, Institutional Eff Acad Srv on Dec 18, 2020

St. Petersburg College
 P.O. Box 13489
 St. Petersburg FL 33733-3489

Having technical difficulties? [Contact us](#)

St. Petersburg College is committed to equal access/equal opportunity in its programs, activities, and employment.
For additional information visit www.spcollege.edu/eao/. St. Petersburg College is an Equal Opportunity Employer.
[Privacy Policy](#) | [Social Security Number usage](#) | [Site Disclaimer](#) | [Crime Reports](#) | [Campus Safety](#) | [Emergency Preparedness](#)

[Use this link to report accessibility issues on this page.](#)