Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO:

Students will demonstrate aesthetic responsiveness by taking a position on and communicating the merits of specific works of art, music, and literature and how those works reflect human values. Evidence will be written or oral communications that articulate a personal response to works of art and explain how personal and formal factors shape that response and connect works of art to broader contexts.

Planning: On August 23, 2012, during the campus Flex Day, faculty divided into groups to discuss campus wide/cross discipline assessment of LAMC’s seven Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). A group that included representatives from art, multimedia, music, Computer Applications and Office Technologies, Disabled Students Programs & Services, and Family Consumer Studies met to discuss development of the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO assessment. The group examined and discussed the ILO, a sample rubric, and ideas on how to assess it.

Additional meeting dates regarding the assessment and rubric occurred on: 9/11/2012 and 10/09/2012 at the Arts, Media and Humanities Department meeting 10/02/2012 with representatives from the English Department 12/04/12 Cross-discipline meeting to discuss the results and plan for improvement

Assessment Method: A common rubric was developed which included the criteria for assessment and the weighting scale (point value) for each criterion.

The rubric had four criteria:

- **Personal Response**
  Articulates a personal response to art, music or literature

- **Formal Factors**
  Explains how formal factors shape the response

- **Human Experience/Cultural Values**
  Relates the response to the human experience and/or cultural values experience

- **Merits and Broader Context**
  Communicates merits of the specific works of art, music or literature in connection to broader contexts
An invitation for voluntary participation was sent out to each department and instructor that taught a class that had identified the ILO Aesthetic Responsiveness in the curriculum process. Each instructor participating in the ILO assessment was to select or modify an existing assignment from his or her class to use for the assessment. Once the assignment was evaluated by the instructor, they logged into the online SLO system to describe the assessment method, enter data, and any initial analysis or resource requests.

Thirteen instructors and fifteen classes in total participated. The classes included:

- Art 201 Drawing I (Kindah Brennan)
- Art 204 Life Drawing I (John Zarcone)
- Art 300 Introduction to Painting (Barbara Kerwin)
- Art 502 Beginning 3D Design (Deborah Paulsen)
- English 102 College Reading and Composition (Jose Maldonado, 2 sections)
- English 205 English Literature I (Louise Barbato)
- English 127 Creative Writing (Timothy Welch)
- Multimedia 110 Visual Communication (Jacalyn Lopez-Garcia)
- Music 111 Music Appreciation (Dr. Tobin Sparfeld, 2 sections)
- Music 141 Jazz Appreciation (Sherri Canon)
- Photo 10 Beginning Photography (Anita Bunn)

Once the instructors had entered the data, the individual reports were collected and the criteria were tallied across the board. A four-point scale was utilized:

4 = Exemplary, 3 = Above Average, 2 = Acceptable, 1 Unacceptable and 0 Not Applicable.

Result averages:

- Personal Response 3.46
- Formal Factors 3.2
- Human Experience/Cultural Values 3.25
- Merits and Broader Context 2.95

In the individual reports, each instructor discussed the strengths and challenges of the assessment and their students’ work. Six instructors noted possible curriculum modifications to consider for their own class regarding delivery of the topic. One instructor suggested a resource request for technology to better teach course objectives. Another instructor suggested modifying the rubric to exclude the personal response and stated that it is a challenge to teach writing in a drawing class. Some instructors attached the work samples of the students to their reports.
On December 4, 2012 participants met to discuss the assessment and results. In attendance were: Louise Barbato, Jacalyn Lopez-Garcia, Jose Maldonado (English) Deborah Paulsen, Dr. Tobin Sparfeld, and Timothy Welch.

Instructors introduced themselves and described their assignment or assessment method, including observations and challenges. Instructors noted the strengths of their students’ abilities in completing the assessment; a few noted where they felt their students could improve or how the assignment may have not fully addressed the ILO. There was a consensus among the group present that the rubric worked well for assessing the ILO. The group discussed why they thought students might have scored lower on the last criterion “Merits and Broader Context.” One idea was that the assignments or presentation of the assignments might not have addressed the criterion in-depth.

A small revision of the ILO was discussed to add the words “such as” and “theater” to the first sentence.

Students will demonstrate aesthetic responsiveness by taking a position on and communicating the merits of specific works of art, such as music, literature and theater and how those works reflect human values. Evidence will be written or oral communications that articulate a personal response to works of art and explain how personal and formal factors shape that response, and connect works of art to broader contexts.

These possible changes will need to be further discussed and vetted through the Academic Senate.

Although we did have participation of five different disciplines for this ILO assessment, during the next ILO assessment cycle it would be good to get wider campus participation with other disciplines such as Child Development, Chicano Studies, and Interior Design. Support from the Department Chairs is imperative for a successful campus wide/cross-discipline assessment.