

Aesthetic Responsiveness

Institutional Learning Outcome Assessment

Los Angeles Mission College
October 2018

Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) conducted an assessment of the Aesthetic Responsiveness Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) during the 2017-18 academic year.

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

The benchmark for this ILO is: *70% of the students will achieve an acceptable score or better.*

203 assessments were completed, with 88 percent rated acceptable or above. Thus, the 70 percent benchmark for this ILO was achieved.

Number of Assessments	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Benchmark Achieved
203	178	87.8%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The methodology used to assess the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO this year consisted of authentic class assessments that were aggregated across different disciplines and course sections. Course sections with at least one SLO supporting the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO were invited to participate. Each course section assessed their students using individual, course-specific assessments (see Appendix A) that were rated according to a common rubric developed by the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO Subcommittee (see Appendix B). Rubric results were then aggregated and are summarized in this report.

The following eight class sections from six different courses participated in the assessment during spring 2018, except for one section of MUSIC 111, which participated during summer 2018.

Course	Number of Sections	Enrolled Students	SLOs Assessed	Number of Assessments
ART 111 – History of Contemporary Art	1	20	2	17
ART 201 – Drawing I	1	30	2	10
ART 204 – Life Drawing I	1	18	1	14
CH DEV 007: Introduction to Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	1	29	1	29
MUSIC 111 – Music Appreciation I	2	92	1	79
SPANISH 001 – Elementary Spanish I	2	58	1	54
TOTAL	8	247	8	203

Disaggregated Assessment Results

The percentage of "acceptable or above" assessments is disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age group, unit load in the term they were assessed, and total cumulative units in the table below. Some students were assessed more than once, either for different supporting SLOs in the same course, or in different courses, and are counted more than once in the "number assessed" below.

Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100.0%.

Despite the provision of an updated common assessment rubric, some course sections used a previous version of the rubric with a slightly different rating scale. In order to compare scores across rubrics, normalized scores are used. The normalized score scale runs from 1.00 to -1.00, with zero indicating the minimum acceptable score. A positive number indicates performance above "acceptable" and a negative number indicates "unacceptable." Larger positive numbers indicate better performance, and larger negative numbers indicate worse performance.

	Number Assessed	% of Total	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Normalized Score
Total	203	100.0%	178	87.8%	0.44
Gender					
Female	135	66.5%	123	91.1%	0.48
Male	68	33.5%	55	80.9%	0.36
Ethnicity					
Hispanic	149	73.4%	128	85.9%	0.41
White	19	9.4%	18	94.7%	0.68
Asian	10	4.9%	10	100.0%	0.65
Black	6	3.0%	6	100.0%	0.50
Multiethnic	3	1.5%	3	100.0%	0.75
Unknown	16	7.8%	13	81.3%	0.24
Age					
Under 18	8	3.9%	5	62.5%	0.29
18-21	93	45.8%	83	89.2%	0.45
22-25	43	21.2%	34	79.1%	0.35
26-30	22	10.8%	20	90.9%	0.52
31-40	22	10.8%	21	95.4%	0.49
41-50	8	3.9%	8	100.0%	0.66
Over 50	7	3.5%	8	100.0%	0.45
Unit Load					
Full-time	70	97.1%	68	97.1%	0.61
Part-time	80	88.8%	71	88.8%	0.52
Summer term	53	73.6%	39	73.6%	0.10
Cumulative Units					
Less than 60	98	48.3%	83	84.7%	0.39
60 or more	105	51.7%	95	90.5%	0.49

Although both genders performed well, female students performed better than male students overall, with 91 percent of women scoring acceptable or above as compared with 81 percent of men. With regard to ethnicity, only Hispanic students had a large enough sample size to obtain valid results. Overall, Hispanic students performed less well than non-Hispanic students – 86 percent of Hispanic students achieved acceptable or above scores as compared with 93 percent of non-Hispanic students – although both groups performed well above the benchmark, as was the case with gender.

Two-thirds of the students assessed were between the ages of 18 and 25. As a consequence only two age groups (18-21 and 22-25) had a large enough sample size to obtain valid results. The younger group of traditional college-age students (18-21 year olds) performed better than the 22-25 year olds, with 89 percent achieving acceptable or above as compared with 79 percent for the older group.

Full-time students generally have more time to devote to their studies than part-time students. In this assessment, full-time students predictably scored better than part-time students, with 97 percent of full-time student attaining acceptable or above scores while 89 percent of part-time students did. Furthermore, full-time students had a higher average normalized score (0.61 as compared with 0.52), indicating that they received more exemplary ratings than part-time students. The 53 students assessed during the summer term fared least well, with only 74 percent attaining acceptable or above, with a normalized score of 0.10, indicating that quality of the students' work hovered close to the minimum acceptable level.

If the purpose of ILO assessment is to gauge whether a student has attained a reasonable level of competence in the skill area defined during the course of their program of study, students who are nearing the completion of their program should score higher than those with fewer units. This was indeed the case for this assessment. Students with 60 or more units, a proxy for program completion, did score better than students with fewer than 60 units (91 percent of students with 60 or more units attained acceptable or above scores as compared with 85 percent of those with less than 60 units).

Assessment Results by Discipline

The tables below show the assessment results disaggregated by discipline and course. As with the tables above, data for categories with a small number of students have low reliability and should not be used as a basis for decision-making. Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100.0%.

	Number of Assessments	% of Total	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Normalized Score
TOTAL	203	100.0%	178	87.7%	0.44
ART	41	20.2%	38	92.7%	0.38
ART 111–History of Contemporary Art	17	8.4%	16	94.1%	0.18
ART 201–Drawing I	10	4.9%	10	100.0%	0.70
ART 204–Life Drawing I	14	6.9%	12	85.7%	0.41
CHILD DEVELOPMENT					
CH DEV 007–Introduction to Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	29	14.3%	28	96.6%	0.57
MUSIC					
MUSIC 111–Music Appreciation I	79	38.9%	64	81.0%	0.27
SPANISH					
SPANISH 001–Elementary Spanish I	54	26.6%	48	88.9%	0.67

Analysis by the Instructors

ART 111

Benchmark was achieved. (72%)

Aesthetic Merits of Creative Work: students can articulate judgement about works of art beyond merely liking it or having it "catch their eye" mostly due to the examples they have been given of formal analysis, readings and lectures that stress the formal significance of a work of art.

Relevant Terminology and Concepts: students struggle with these in description of artwork mostly due to a lack of familiarity with the terminology and concepts. This is something that comes with study and practice.

Personal and Formal Factors: formal factors are key in a formal analysis on a work of art, and this was mostly successful due to the students having been well prepared for this assignment. Prior to writing they were given a short essay on a painting and asked to highlight the parts of the essay that were formal (rather than biographical, contextual, theoretical or historical).

Human Values to Broader Contexts: this was a small but important part of the assignment and students were asked to include some contextual background in order to demonstrate their understanding of what that means in relation to formal analysis in art history. They were mostly successful in this.

ART 201

Out of the students who submitted all the components of the project, the benchmarks were met on each part of the rubric. The total average score was a 90%. The highest section scored was on "Relevant Terminology and Concepts" at 5.6 or 93%, followed by "Personal and Formal Factors" at 5.5 or 92%. For the most part, the students had little difficulty expressing their views regarding the aesthetics of their chose works (scoring 5.4 or 90% on the category of "Aesthetic Merits of Creative Works"). The lowest score was 5.1 or 85% on connecting the work to its broader contexts. The students did well on this, but several could have elaborated a bit more.

ART 204

Students exceeded the benchmark score by 1%. In general most have a grasp of the concepts, but don't go into enough depth in their analysis. For the most part the writing, which has been weak in the past was competent, though brief. The broader context category may be the weakest due to the amount of art historical course work for some. Most of our class time is spent drawing, as this is a studio class, in preparation I do have to spend a lot of time going over the design elements and principles, which would be covered if Art 501: Beginning Design was a prerequisite to all advanced studio classes. Through an informal survey, few had taken either 501 or Art History. A program with a foundation of 201 (Drawing I), 501, and Art History would impact the results favorably.

CH DEV 007

Students were required to develop a creative arts learning plan for ages 2 to 5 and present it in the classroom using a PowerPoint presentation and hands-on activities. Most of the students demonstrated an understanding in open-ended art and were able to plan age and developmentally appropriate activities for children. All of the students were able to present their work using a PowerPoint presentation with detailed information. During their PowerPoint presentations, most of the students were able to articulate the importance of open-ended art and how it is beneficial for children's development. A few of the students did poorly on explaining the benefits of the open-ended art; however, they benefited greatly from their peers' presentations.

MUSIC 111

Students wrote concert reports about their experience seeing a live concert of Classical music or jazz. They were strongest in the area of using relevant terminology and concepts (94%). Most students were able to discuss the genres, instruments, and stylistic features, although a few students need to improve on some of the terminology of orchestral music. Their second strongest area was judging the merits of creative works (91%). The third strongest area was interpreting the relationship between personal and formal factors (87%). Many were able to analyze specific musical works and communicate their personal reactions to them. The area that was most challenging to students was expressing an understanding of the relationship between the creative works and human values (76%). The concert report assignment did not stress a depth of analysis in terms of contextualizing the concert historically. It was more about listening and observing and relaying their knowledge of music genres, forms, and

stylistic features and expressing personal reactions to the creative works, which were informed by everything they had learned about music throughout history. For this criteria (human values to broader contexts), I looked more at their ability to communicate clearly and effectively in essay form, which tends to be a challenge for students at the community college level. The benchmark of 70% was met, with an average score of 87%.

SPANISH 001

The test consists of two parts: In the first part, the students answered the questionnaire of 20 questions using the three present tenses and periphrastic future (the students learned this during class). The test was 15 minutes long. The second part consisted of an oral examination. Students must immediately answer the question by conjugating the verb at the appropriate time. The second part of the exam began with a warm-up of basic questions, for the students to feel more secure speaking Spanish. Students next were asked more personal questions, regarding their family, things they liked about their culture, and what they embrace in their culture (if any). Since the students are taking a Spanish class, it is important to reference the fact that they are learning a new language and culture. Furthermore, culture is a strong part of people's lives. It influences their views, their values, their humor, their hopes, their loyalties, and their worries and fears. With that being emphasized in class, students expressed whether Spanish (or a different language besides English) was spoken at home, some students also expressed how their culture has changed at home (due to taking a Spanish class and being able to communicate with their family). Students also expressed the importance of culture and how it brings their family together and allows different expression in mood, personality, and social interactions.

Assessment Results by Criterion

This section excludes Art 204 and one section of Music 111, which used a different rubric.

Criterion	Number of Assessments	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Rubric Score (out of 6.0)
1) Aesthetic Merits of Creative Work	136	128	94.1%	5.3
2) Relevant Terminology and Concepts	136	130	95.6%	5.2
3) Personal and Formal Factors	136	129	94.9%	5.1
4) Human Values to Broader Contexts	136	129	94.9%	5.0

Criterion #1: Aesthetic Merits of Creative Work	Number of Assessments	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Rubric Score (out of 6.0)
TOTAL	136	128	94.1%	5.3
ART	27	26	96.3%	4.7
ART 111–History of Contemporary Art	17	16	94.1%	4.4
ART 201–Drawing I	10	10	100.0%	5.4
CHILD DEVELOPMENT				
CH DEV 007–Introduction to Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	29	28	96.6%	5.1
MUSIC				
MUSIC 111–Music Appreciation I	26	25	96.2%	5.5

SPANISH SPANISH 001–Elementary Spanish I	54	49	90.7%	5.5
--	-----------	-----------	--------------	------------

Criterion #2: Relevant Terminology and Concepts	Number of Assessments	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Rubric Score (out of 6.0)
TOTAL	136	130	95.6%	5.2
ART	27	26	96.3%	4.8
ART 111–History of Contemporary Art	17	16	94.1%	4.4
ART 201–Drawing I	10	10	100.0%	5.6
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CH DEV 007–Introduction to Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	29	29	100.0%	5.1
MUSIC MUSIC 111–Music Appreciation I	26	25	96.2%	5.7
SPANISH SPANISH 001–Elementary Spanish I	54	50	92.6%	5.2

Criterion #3: Personal and Formal Factors	Number of Assessments	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Rubric Score (out of 6.0)
TOTAL	136	129	94.9%	5.1
ART	27	26	96.3%	4.7
ART 111–History of Contemporary Art	17	16	94.1%	4.3
ART 201–Drawing I	10	10	100.0%	5.5
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CH DEV 007–Introduction to Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	29	29	100.0%	5.1
MUSIC MUSIC 111–Music Appreciation I	26	25	96.2%	5.2
SPANISH SPANISH 001–Elementary Spanish I	54	49	90.7%	5.2

Criterion #4: Human Values to Broader Contexts	Number of Assessments	Acceptable or Above	% Acceptable or Above	Average Rubric Score (out of 6.0)
TOTAL	136	129	94.9%	5.0
ART	27	26	96.3%	4.6
ART 111–History of Contemporary Art	17	16	94.1%	4.3
ART 201–Drawing I	10	10	100.0%	5.1
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CH DEV 007–Introduction to Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	29	29	100.0%	5.2
MUSIC MUSIC 111–Music Appreciation I	26	25	96.2%	4.5

SPANISH SPANISH 001–Elementary Spanish I	54	49	90.7%	5.3
--	-----------	-----------	--------------	------------

Comparison of Assessed Students to Overall Student Body

The table below compares the demographic breakdown of assessed students with that of the overall student body. As noted earlier, some students were assessed more than once, either in the same course section for different supporting SLOs, or across multiple courses, and are counted more than once in the "number assessed" below.

	Number Assessed	% of Total	Spring 2018 Student Body
Total	203	100.0%	9,954
Gender			
Female	135	66.5%	61.0%
Male	68	33.5%	39.0%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	149	73.4%	73.9%
White	19	9.4%	9.7%
Asian	10	4.9%	4.6%
Black	6	3.0%	3.0%
Multiethnic	3	1.5%	1.0%
Other/Unknown	16	7.8%	7.8%
Age			
Under 18	8	3.9%	13.9%
18-21	93	45.8%	36.4%
22-25	43	21.2%	19.7%
26-30	22	10.8%	11.7%
31-40	22	10.8%	9.4%
41-50	8	3.9%	5.0%
Over 50	7	3.5%	3.9%

Summary and Future Steps

Overall, the 70 percent benchmark for this Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) was achieved by all course sections assessed and for all demographic groups with a large enough sample size to provide reasonably valid data. In fact, the College performed quite well in the assessment, with 88 percent of assessments rated as acceptable or above.

It does appear that students who have completed 60 or more cumulative units have better aesthetic responsiveness as 91 percent of those with 60 or more units scored acceptable or above compared to 85 percent of students with less than 60 units. The normalized scores of those with 60 or more units was also higher (0.49 vs. 0.39), indicating that a higher proportion of students with 60 or more units scored exemplary as compared with students with less than 60 units.

Thus, we can conclude that Los Angeles Mission College is fulfilling its commitment to teach students to demonstrate aesthetic responsiveness by taking a position on and communicating the merits of great works of the human imagination and how those works reflect human values.

When disaggregating the data by gender, we saw that women performed quite a bit better than men in this assessment. 91 percent of women scored acceptable or above, compared to 81 percent of men. Women also had a higher normalized score, with 0.48 as compared with 0.36 for men, indicating that a higher proportion of women received exemplary scores than among men.

As the overall sample size was smaller than in previous ILO assessments, Hispanic was the only ethnic group for which we had a large enough sample size to provide valid data for analysis. Hispanic students comprised about three-quarters of our student body in Spring 2018 and 86 percent of Hispanic students assessed scored acceptable or above. While this is a high score and well above the 70 percent benchmark, Hispanic students nevertheless scored lower overall compared to all other ethnic groups combined, 93 percent of whom scored acceptable or above.

The advent of the LA Promise program in Fall 2017 may have accounted for the better performance of traditional college-age students (18-21 year olds) in this assessment as compared with slightly older students (22-25 year olds). Due to LA Promise, the College saw an influx of full-time entering freshmen in Fall 2017. Full-time students are likely to score higher due to having more time to study and fewer personal, family and work commitments. As expected, full-time students scored better than part-time students in this assessment, with 97 percent of full-time students attaining acceptable or above scores, compared to 89 percent of part-time students. Full-time students also had a higher average normalized score, indicating more exemplary ratings than part-time students. Similarly, while 89 percent of college-age students scored acceptable or above in the assessment, only 79 percent of 22-25 years old did. Other age groups did not have a large enough sample size to provide valid data.

The results of this assessment were discussed during Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC) meetings, as well as during Academic Senate meetings, and shared with the campus at large during the annual SLO Summit.

One of the new methodological issues that came up during the analysis phase of this assessment is the question of how to weight multiple SLOs from a single course section. Since all course sections with at least one SLO that supported the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO were invited to participate in this assessment, there were some participating courses which had more than one supporting SLO, specifically Art 111 and Art 201. In this report, all assessments are weighted equally. However, because Art 111 and Art 201 completed two assessments per student, these courses (and students) can in some sense be considered double counted. In the future, this issue will be addressed ahead of time during the assessment design phase to decide whether it is necessary to limit each assessed course to one supporting SLO and how to weight multiple assessments of the same student.

This assessment also encountered some of the same roadblocks experienced in previous authentic ILO assessments, namely the difficulty in reaching a broad base of students across a variety of disciplines and course sections to truly represent instruction on aesthetic responsiveness across the institution. For example, six courses participated in the assessment this year, representing four disciplines: Art, Music, Child Development and Spanish. Due to course enrollment levels and other factors, almost 40 percent of assessments were conducted in Music courses, thus over-representing the Music discipline and under-representing other disciplines. In addition, the following disciplines whose courses are linked to the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO were not represented in the assessment: Chicano Studies, Cinema, English, Humanities, Interior Design, Multimedia, Photography and Theater. While extensive efforts were made to contact Department Chairs and individual faculty for participation, ultimately faculty participation is completely voluntary and uncompensated. Methodology for future assessments will include a greater frequency of reminders and contact via email and announcements in various committee meetings as well as attempts to incentivize greater faculty participation.

Another issue encountered during this assessment that has not previously surfaced is the inadvertent use of a different rubric than the one created by the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO Subcommittee for this assessment. Two course sections used the rubric created for the previous Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO assessment, thus complicating analysis by individual rubric criteria. Future steps will include more focus on ensuring that the instructions are clear for faculty and earlier follow-ups to make mid-course correction

possible. The rubric system has also been modified to disable the copying of ILO assessment rubrics to prevent the proliferation of nearly identically named rubrics.

In addition, one course section assessed during Summer 2018 rather than in Spring 2018, thus crossing academic years and adding a layer of complexity due to differing student body characteristics during the summer when non-Mission College students and entering first-year students are more likely to enroll, confounding our attempts to assess as many graduating students as possible. As mentioned above, in future assessments, we will focus on ensuring that participating faculty understand the constraints of the assessment and are clear on the instructions.

Furthermore, it was brought to the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee's (LOAC's) attention that the SLO assessment for one of the courses did not seem well-aligned with the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO. Namely, the SLO assessment for the Spanish 001 course that involved the discussion of the importance of learning a new language and culture may not support the component of the ILO which stipulates that students will demonstrate aesthetic responsiveness by taking a position on and communicating the merits of great works of the human imagination and how those works reflect human values. It is not clear from the analysis of this course's assessment that a response to works of art and explanation of how personal and formal factors shape that response are taking place. Even though the assessment conducted in this class does not seem to directly measure the outcomes stated in the ILO, the LOAC has decided to include the results of this assessment in the report. In the future, LOAC will include more focus on ensuring that the instructors and Department Chairs are fully informed about the true meaning of the ILOs, and assistance will be provided to determine if course SLOs and assessments are being accurately mapped to specific ILOs.

Conducting regular ILO assessments provides the opportunity for discipline faculty to engage with the College at large regarding issues of concern to them. One of the discussion items that emerged during meetings of the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO Subcommittee and SLO Summit in Fall 2017 was the desire of the Health, Kinesiology & Athletics Department to be included in the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO assessment. Faculty provided their perspective that physical education courses engage students' development of aesthetic responsiveness because the physical motions that are taught in these courses are also judged aesthetically. As a result of these interactions, the committee engaged in deep discussions about the possibility of rewording the ILO to include athletic and artistic performances. However, the subcommittee concluded that the current phrasing of the Aesthetic Responsiveness ILO, which focuses on the ability to communicate the merits of works of art by written or oral means, should be retained. Hence, artistic or athletic performance do not directly support this ILO. To the extent that courses in these departments do promote the ability to communicate the aesthetic elements of athletic performance by written or oral means, then the current ILO is supported and courses in Health, Kinesiology & Athletics could be included in future assessments.

Appendix A: Assessment Method Description

ART 111
Formal analysis - 500 words
ART 201
In addition to writing a response paper, students were required to create a drawing as one of the two assessment methods for the “Master Artist Project”. Students were asked to research an artist and carefully copy from observation one of his/her paintings, drawings, collages, or photographs (in full value). Works chosen by students were to exhibit actual three-dimension or the illusion of three-dimension so that students could work on the first course SLO beyond the lab work. Students were encouraged to select an artist and artworks that were of interest to them as it was explained that they would be writing a response paper on the chosen work. Students completed one research study using a drawing medium of choice in order to perceive and emulate techniques used by the artist. The written paper was the final part of the assignment and it was explained in terms of the four parts of the rubric whereby students were to discuss the formal elements, formulate a personal response, convey the human experience and/or cultural values, and place the work within a larger context.
ART 204
After mid-term students are to construct a formal analysis in written form. After an introduction/review of the design elements and principles, the students select an artwork by an artist from the list provided by the instructor. Students are instructed to address all of the formal elements and principles and discuss how their use informs the meaning of the piece. The student must also cite any historical and cultural connections. The paper is assessed through a rubric.
CH DEV 007
Students planned and implemented developmentally appropriate learning plans in the curriculum areas such as language and literacy, math, social studies and science using power point presentation.
MUSIC 111 – Spring 2018
Students must attend a live concert of Classical music or jazz and write a 2-page (500 word) concert report detailing their experience, including rich detail of the event, venue, performers, audience, genre, instruments, stylistic features, and specific details including song titles and analysis of song performance. They are also graded on their ability to communicate clearly in their writing. The concert report is due the last week of class.
MUSIC 111 – Summer 2018
The student attends two live music events throughout the course of the semester. One is a concert of classical form, such as a symphony orchestra concert, an opera, an oratorio, a ballet, or any concert that would be featured in a concert hall setting. The other music event is anything of their choosing and can be “classical” or contemporary (e.g.. Adele concert, Jazz in the Park, Slipknot, Mariachi, etc.) They turn in a typed two-page report outlining the concepts of music that they’ve learned throughout the semester. A rubric is provided and available to them on the website and in the course pack. The student demonstrates aesthetic responsiveness by taking a position on the work of music that they experience and discuss how the live music they witnessed reflects human values.
SPANISH 001
The test consists of two parts: In the first part, the students answered the questionnaire of 20 questions using the three present tenses and periphrastic future (the students learned this during class). The test was 15 minutes long. The second part consisted of an oral examination. Students must immediately answer the question by conjugating the verb at the appropriate time.

Appendix B: Rubric

Exemplary (6 pts.)	Good/Above Acceptable (5 pts.)	Acceptable (4 pts.)	Unacceptable (3 pts.)	Not Applicable
Takes a position on and assesses/communicates the aesthetic merits of creative works				
Displays excellent ability to independently form and clearly articulate judgments about creative works.	Displays proficient ability to independently form and clearly articulate judgments about creative works.	Displays adequate ability to independently form and clearly articulate judgments about creative works.	Displays inadequate ability to independently form and clearly articulate judgments about works.	Criteria does not apply to assignment.
Demonstrates understanding of relevant terminology and concepts				
Displays exceptional grasp and use of relevant terminology and concepts.	Displays proficient grasp and use of relevant terminology and concepts.	Displays adequate grasp and use of relevant terminology and concepts.	Displays inadequate grasp and use of relevant terminology and concepts.	Criteria does not apply to assignment.
Evaluates the personal and formal factors that shape one's response to creative works				
Analyzes, interprets and explains with in-depth and full detail the relationship between the personal and/or formal factors of creative works that shapes response.	Analyzes, interprets and explains with clarity the relationship between the personal and/or formal factors of creative works that shapes response.	Acceptably analyzes, interprets and explains the relationship between the personal and/or formal factors of creative works that shapes response. Descriptions could be more elaborate or detailed.	Inadequately provides interpretation and explanation of the relationship between the personal and/or formal factors of creative works that shapes response.	Criteria does not apply to assignment.
Demonstrates understanding of how creative works reflect human values and are connected to broader contexts				
Expresses deep and insightful understanding of the relationship between the creative works and human values with evidence connecting it to broader contexts, such as historical placement and significance.	Expresses a proficient understanding of the relationship between the creative works and human values with evidence connecting it to broader contexts, such as historical placement and significance.	Expresses an adequate understanding of the relationship between the creative works and human values with evidence connecting it to broader contexts, such as historical placement and significance. Evidence could be more elaborate or detailed.	Unable to or very minimally demonstrates understanding of the relationship between the creative works and human values with evidence connecting it to broader contexts, such as historical placement and significance.	Criteria does not apply to assignment.