

## 2016-2017 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 30, 2017. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.

**College:** AMC

**Department:** Theatre

**Program:** B.A., M.A.

**Assessment liaison:**

**1. Please check off whichever is applicable:**

A.  **Measured student work.**

B.  **Analyzed results of measurement.**

C.  **Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision.**

**2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet, provide a brief overview of this year's assessment activities, including:

- an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, and/or application) that it enacted
- if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year's measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
- if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year's analyses and past and future assessment activities
- if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
- in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university's commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
- any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for next year.** Include a brief description and explanation of how next year's assessment will contribute to a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

2. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet, provide a brief overview of this year's assessment activities, including:

I took over the Assessment Liaison position in Fall semester 2017. As liaison, I continued to attend and participate on the Electronic Assessment System (EAS) Refinement Program committee. This committee is comprised of departmental liaisons throughout the university in support of improving the efficacy of the EAS and the relevance of the information it provides. Our department submitted student work in the EAS system in the 2016 academic year. As I took over I learned that in order to benefit from the EAS system, it is helpful if specific decisions about the goals for assessment are made prior to collecting the data in order to determine how the data is used for assessment.

Centering on Option B, the goal in the previous year (2015-2016) was to use analysis of student work to inform the needed revision to our Masters Program SLOs. As anticipated, the rubric and data collected from that year indicated the need to change the Master's Program's SLO's. The department faculty agreed that the MA SLOs should reflect higher expectations and performance levels and should promote higher expectations than-SLO's from the undergraduate program. Our three-person Graduate Qualifying Committee worked on developing new SLOs for the Master's program, and then brought our final version to the full faculty. After suggestions, discussions and a final revision, the new SLOs for the Master's Program were created and approved by the full faculty.

OLD SLOs: Students will:

1. Develop competent research skills.
2. Develop competent critical thinking and writing abilities.
3. Develop competent knowledge of world theatre history, literature and criticism.
4. Demonstrate abilities to apply and integrate skills and knowledge into their professional development.

NEW SLOs: Students will:

1. Define and evaluate the connections between theatre, entertainment, popular culture, and digital media arts.
2. Describe and apply the aesthetic, sociological, political, and historical frameworks of global theatre.
3. Analyze and interpret scholarly writing in the areas of world theatre history, literature and criticism.
4. Critically examine contemporary debates and emerging disciplinary discourses in theatre.
5. Create and design interdisciplinary applied theatre projects, incorporating audience analysis, dramaturgy, and community engagement.

**UNDERGRADUATE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

1. In the previous year (2015-2016) there was a decision to compare work between our introductory Acting for the Camera course (TH345) and our Advanced Acting for the Camera course, currently an experimental topics course (TH396CAM). Although evaluation would be best conducted using the EAS, the use of video files, uploading and organizing, has proved challenging. I met with a small committee to determine which SLO could be assessed using the downloaded video files from MOODLE, rather than the EAS system because the EAS was not equipped to handle video content at the time of the assessment. I was able to create a rubric that would assess SLO's 1 and 2:

(SLO 1) Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills inherent to the varied and distinct processes of theatrical development and presentation.

(SLO 2) Students will apply essential knowledge and skills through participation in theatrical projects.

After developing the rubric, I had a pre-assessment norming session, which helped prepare me to meet with two of my colleagues for the actual assessment of the videos. I made revisions to that rubric and then met with two colleagues to discuss the rubric and assess the student performances. Our findings were that the vocabulary in the rubric needed to be more reflective of the expectations of the assignment as indicated from the professor. Therefore, as a result of two norming sessions, the rubric revealed to us that the assessment could not be completed due to discrepancies in the language between the rubric evaluating the program SLO's and that of the criteria assessed by the assignment. Therefore, the assessment will be revisited this year once the language clarification in the rubric has been made.

Below is the finalized rubric used:

**RUBRIC FOR ACTING FOR THE CAMERA**

<b>*CRITERIA*</b>	<b>4 OUTSTANDING</b>	<b>3 ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>2 SKILLS NOT REFINED</b>	<b>1 MISSING SKILLS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>LISTENING</b>	Student has a very strong balance of listening and reacting to the dialogue and situation presented in his/her own POV.	Student has an acceptable balance of listening and reacting to the dialogue and situation presented in his/her own POV.	Student needs to develop listening skills as part of the performance process with his/her partner and POV is unclear.	Student is not listening and is only consumed with his/her dialogue and no POV is apparent.	

<b>CIRCUMSTANCE</b>	The circumstances that justify what the student is doing and saying and specific and clear.	There are some circumstances that justify what the student is doing and saying.	There are few circumstances that justify what the student is doing and saying.	There are no clear circumstances that justify what the student is doing and saying.	
<b>CHARACTERIZATION</b>	Student establishes a character arc AND creates and embodies a beginning, middle and end to the scene.	Student establishes a character arc and/or creates and embodies a beginning, middle and end to the scene.	Character arc is weak and/or beginning, middle, end is not clear or established.	Character arc and/or beginning, middle, end are not apparent or established.	
<b>OBJECTIVE/TACTICS</b>	Character's objective is clear throughout the scene. Actor uses scene partner to achieve his/her objective. Actor uses a number of tactics/actions to achieve his/her objective throughout the scene	Objective is apparent at certain points in the scene, but is inconsistent. Only 1-2 tactics used throughout the scene.	Objective is apparent at one or two points in the scene and is unclear. Tactics unclear or missing.	No objective or tactics are present in performance.	
<b>PREPARATION</b>	Student was completely memorized, committed and fully dedicated and involved in the performance.	Student missed a few lines but was well prepared overall.	Student struggled with memorization and appeared nervous and self-conscious.	Student was not memorized and had a difficult time committing to the performance,	

### 3. Preview of planned assessment activities for next year.

The upcoming year includes the continuation of existing projects and the designation of new projects. At the end of 2017, I had reached out to two faculty members in the Design area to send me projects that could be assessed. According to past records, this area has not done any assessment for several years. I was not able to get the entire Design faculty on board so late in the school year so it is a goal to come together with the Design Faculty to create an assessment project in which we can assess one or several of the SLOs. Our department has also formed a Graduate Program Task Force who will be addressing Graduate Qualifying Exams and the future of the program. It is my goal to follow through with the performance assessment of the Acting for the Camera class now that I have a better understanding of doing a program assessment vs. a course assessment. We will also complete an assessment in the Design area on the SLO's that were not evaluated in the performance assessment.

We will also be looking ahead to the General Education Assessment in Arts and Education next year for our TH 110 course, which has a high DFU history and has remained a problematic course for our department.