

Annual Assessment Report

Department: Theatre Arts
Academic Year: 2015-2016
Date of Submission: September 15, 2016
Department Chair: John Blondell

I. Response to the previous year PRC’s recommendations

Item: N/A See Below	Response:
Item:	Response
Item:	Response:
Item:	Response:
<p>Note from PRC Committee: “The reviewers determined that this category is not applicable as 2014-2015 represented your first year of a new assessment cycle.” In response to the department’s 2014-2015 assessment update, the PRC suggested that the department attach the PRC and E Team’s 2015 response to the department’s Action Plan and Multi-year Assessment Plan. It is attached here as Appendix A.</p>	

II A. Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment

If your department participated in the ILO assessment you may use this section to report on your student learning in relation to the assessed ILO. The assessment data can be requested from the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.

Program Learning Outcome	Students apply discipline-specific research methodologies in crafting effective writing about theatrical practice.
Who is in Charge /Involved?	John Blondell
<u>Direct Assessment</u>	Students undertake a research project that uses research methodologies appropriate to the discipline. The project assessed by the course instructor, using a rubric and key. Students receive written and oral feedback from the instructor.

Methods	
Indirect Assessment Methods	
Major Findings	Assignment, rubric, and key create clear expectations for students, and are useful for professor and student alike; the rubric's categories are appropriate; revision and rewriting process participates significantly in the development of student writing; students do continue to struggle with Structure and Organization, especially in relation to the creation of effective thesis statements and the support of those theses in the initial draft.
Closing the Loop Activities	At this point, the department has not used Livetext for assessment purposes relative to this project, though the instructor is interested in pursuing this option in the future.
Collaboration and Communication: The project is "housed" in the department's upper division Theatre History courses. Findings and data are communicated to faculty through discussion and faculty meetings.	

or/and

II B. Key Questions

Key Question	Develop language, projects, and changes with respect to Design and Technology for PLO 1. Continued from 14-15.
Who is in Charge/Involved?	Jonathan Hicks, with John Blondell and Mitchell Thomas
Direct Assessment Methods	Senior Project evaluations
Indirect Assessment Methods	Student self-analysis, end of semester student oral evaluations, senior project evaluations.
Major Findings	Following changes made in 2014-2015, it is the perspective of the department that students display elevated design aesthetics, show strong basic knowledge of building principles and terminology, and display significant increase in number and quality of student designs, in main stage, senior project, and Fringe Festival productions.

Recommendations	Develop new courses in Design and Technology, expand unit hours of stagecraft class(es), develop new requirements in Lighting Design. See further discussion in IV below.
Communication and Collaboration: Numerous departmental discussions relative to the enhancement of the design program, relative to the Follow-ups represented in Numbers III and IV below.	

III. Follow-ups

Program Learning Outcome or Key Question	Department discussed and evaluated changes made in 2014-2015 for PLO 1: Students display appropriate skill in creation, development, and presentation of theatrical performances.
Who was involved in implementation?	Mitchell Thomas, in collaboration with Jonathan Hicks and John Blondell
What was decided or addressed?	The department discussed the changes made to criteria, rubrics, and evaluative categories, as they relate to student success and achievement in senior projects in 2015-2016.
How were the recommendations implemented?	Rubrics were changed, new criteria developed, and new categories were instituted. Students received updated course requirements, and faculty instruction, oversight, and mentoring.
Collaboration and Communication Faculty evaluated student success and achievement in three-member faculty committees, provided written responses to student projects, discussed projects with students in one hour post-performance evaluations, followed up with students in end of semester oral reviews and evaluation for each senior in question.	

IV. Other assessment or Key Questions related projects

Project	Can we streamline the major to encourage more students to double major, and restructure the major to incorporate Design and Technology more fully into curricular and program design?
Who is in Charge /Involved?	Mitchell Thomas, with Jonathan Hicks and John Blondell
Major Findings	A low unit “Liberal Arts” track will help students who want to double major but find it difficult or impossible to do so with the Major’s relatively high unit count. The creation of four separate though related tracks will provide students opportunities to double-major, and develop emphases and competencies in Performance, Design and Technology, and History and Writing.
Action	Create four separate tracks for the Theatre Arts major, which includes Liberal Arts, Performance, Design and Technology, and History and Writing Tracks.
<p>Collaboration and Communication Over four long meetings in May of 2015, professors Blondell, Hicks, and Thomas researched, discussed, brainstormed, and presented alternatives to its present major and minor. Each faculty member developed and suggested a unique track for his unique disciplinary emphasis and background, and the three faculty members collaborated to create a new “Liberal Arts” track. Faculty will finish this work in the fall of 2016, create new courses for new tracks, and submit the new tracks for approval by December 2016. Please find a draft proposal for a new “Liberal Arts” track in Theatre Arts, listed as Appendix F.</p>	

V. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan (optional)

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing
N/A		

VI. Appendices

- A. Prompts or instruments used to collect the data
- B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data
- C. Relevant assessment-related documents (optional)