**2019-2020 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, 2020**. 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 include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name.**

**College: Mike Curb College of Arts, Media, and Communication.**

**Department: Theatre, Program: BA**

**Theatre Assessment liaison: Dr. J’aime Morrison**

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

**A. \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.**

**C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.**

**D. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Arts and Humanities student learning outcomes**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s)**

As stated in last year’s assessment report, it was proposed that, ”one area that may be beneficial to review using the tool of assessment concerns the implementation of a capstone or culminating project, assignment or performance for our students. We have discussed this idea in the past, however it seems that using assessment to understand what our senior theatre majors have learned may be fruitful.” As such, this year’s assessment report details the findings resulting from analysis of scores earned in three culminating major courses. It is hoped that the faculty will find these results informative and will consider them in curricular discussions and any subsequent modifications of our upper-division major offerings, which have not been reviewed in quite some time. Further, results from this initial report should indicate the extent to which theatre graduates are meeting the PSLO’s, and thus will serve as a foundation to help us identify skills that need strengthening in our graduating students.

a. Previous assessment projects examined student learning outcomes in lower division major courses and GE course offerings. This year the faculty, in discussion with the Assessment Coordinator, decided to measure department PSLO’s #1 and #3 in relation to our upper division courses offered Spring 2020. Reviewing results in upper division courses in each area (Design, Performance, History), faculty sought to assess the extent to which students met the PSLO and the level at which competency was met. Our assessment activity was primarily focused on collecting data, measuring the data and discussing the results among the faculty. As a department we have discussed the possibility of providing a culminating experience for our upper-division students and we hope the assessment results will inform how, when and if such a program modification would be beneficial to students. We also sought to understand the level at which students are achieving competency specific to stated PSLO’s.

b.

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES OF THE UNDERGRADUATE THEATRE PROGRAM**

1. The student will know and be able to process sensory information and respond to sensory information through the language unique to theatre.
2. The student will know and be able to apply their knowledge of artistic and theatre processes through production participation.
3. The student will know and be able to apply historical, cultural, and literary understandings to the creation of theatre.
4. The student will know and be able to apply appropriate criteria to make informed assessments of quality in works of theatre.
5. The student will know and be able to develop intra and interpersonal skills essential to the collaborative process in theatre.

The Theatre Department chose to assess the following PSLO’s for assessment based on previous assessments which examined SLO’s #2 and #4:

**PSLO’s Assessed 2019/2020:**

**PSLO 1** - Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills inherent to the varied and distinct processes of theatrical development and presentation.

**PSLO 3** - Demonstrate an understanding of the relevant context in which theatre is created and presented.

**Rubric**: Please see **Appendix A.**

The rubric was revised several times prior to assessment in consultation with the College Assessment Liaison Lynette K. Henderson and past theatre department Assessment Coordinator Larry Biederman. The 4 point Likert scale rubric was designed to identify skills and actions that would demonstrate the PSLO’s above. Broadly, the columns broke down into four areas.

Column one: understanding and analysis of the text/context -- objective analysis of the source material.

Column two: point of view, what does the STUDENT thinks about the source material. Interpretation.

Column three is about generating a concept or hypothesis—how would they approach the work as a director, designer, critic, etc.? Idea

Column four is about results—how will student achieve the concept or prove the hypothesis? Template/Argument

**Courses**:

In consultation with each reviewer, the Rubric was modified several times in order to develop a unified instrument for use across all three courses. Both PLSO’s were broken down into skill sets and then arranged according to the progression of a creative process. Through discussion, the reviewers arrived at agreement with regard to the specified subskills that comprised the larger PSLO. The reviewers discussed the Rubric in detail, which proved essential to gain consensus about the skills/ knowledge being assessed. Further, through discussion, each reviewer defined key terms and further classified the distinctions between activities and skills. The assessment rubric was not changed, but the interpretation of the elements listed took on slightly different emphasis for the different courses.

**Courses**:

The following upper division courses were identified for date collection.

**Theatre 426: Contemporary Theatre and Drama of Europe and America**

**Theatre 444: Principles of Directing**

**Theatre 457: Theatre Design Tutorial**

Each of the above courses represents an upper division or culminating course in each major area or option: Performance, Design and History. All courses were offered during the Spring 2020 semester. Noteworthy is the fact that the COVID pandemic resulted in the closure of CSU Campuses, thus instruction was moved from an in-person environment to a virtual learning environment. For example, the musical production *Pippin*, for which the students enrolled in Theatre 457 would have prepared a design presentation, was cancelled. As such, students created an electronic portfolio submission. In Theatre 444 students were originally assigned to direct a scene using student actors, however, the assignment was modified to require an essay detailing their staging ideas. Although we questioned the validity of these assignments with regard to measuring the identified PSLO’s, we proceeded with data collection. As such, these results should be interpreted with some caution.

The student work samples to be assessed were collected throughout the Spring 2020 semester:

**426: Essays about the period of Late Modernism in European and American theatre were reviewed. 10 papers were read out of 16 submissions. Reviewers: Professors J’aime Morrison and Anamarie Dwyer**

**444: Student papers detailing their approach to directing a final scene including a rehearsal plan, directorial concept and notes on the text. 13 papers were read out of 13 submissions. Reviewers: Professors J’aime Morrison and Garry Lennon**

**457: Design portfolio for *Pippin* submitted electronically. This course had two students enrolled and both were reviewed. Reviewers: Professors J’aime Morrison and Larry Biederman**

1. **Assessment Results Discussion and Areas for Further Actions:** (see appendix including score sheet)

Scores obtained from the rubric for students enrolled in **426 Theatre History** highlight the reviewer’s belief in the importance of a common understanding of the concept of “analysis,” “interpretation,” and “point of view” among instructors. One reviewer indicated that, included in “analysis”, is a student’s own personal history and background and how they used this experience as a lens or perspective when viewing or reading theatre and drama. This aspect of analysis is not explicitly stated in the rubric. As such, it will be included in future iterations of the rubric and will serve as an interesting point of departure for another assessment task. We hold that modifying future rubrics to include this better reflects the theatre department’s commitment to highlighting our student’s lived experiences and background in making curricular decisions and production selections.

Data collected from **457 Theatre Design** must be interpreted with caution as the sample is very small. However, both reviewers found that Student B developed a more sophisticated and better executed design idea but provided no evidence of research or justification to back it up- it was a results oriented submission. The reviewers agreed that there was a lack of process demonstrated. Student A presented more research and explanation but the reviewers felt that the justifications were weak— demonstrating a superficial application of the research.  The reviewers felt that reworking the rubric to reflect the distinction between skills related to a creative process and skills for attaining results – as an artist needs to engage both at some level, would yield better results/data. For example, there are many artists who do great work in an intuitive way and probably couldn’t articulate well why they made the choices they did.  Conversely, some artists can captivate you with their thought process, but their work doesn’t always engage.

The results obtained from **444 Theatre Directing** indicate that students were not as skilled at demonstrating their understanding of the play within the context of theatre history and that analysis of the play in relation to the bigger ideas and trends in the field was less formulated. Students were able to express a vision for their scene, but because the assignment was discursive as opposed to performance based, it was harder to assess students’ fundamental understanding of the play. Student scores reflect greater competency in conceptual articulation and application and less – in these examples – on identifying context and analysis. Again, not all of our courses or assignments need to be aligned with every PSLO all the time.

This assessment process provides an opportunity for faculty to discuss, reflect, and identify what we value, what we want our students to learn and be able to demonstrate at the 400 level. This process provides the department with opportunities to discuss the progression of courses in the major in which students are required, sequentially, to demonstrate and practice an understanding of **context, analysis, interpretation and application**. We recommend that the department engage in “backwards” planning activities to assess how each course in the major, in its own way, builds upon these skill sets which are directly derived from our PSLO’s.

To this end, we recommend that faculty in each area review their courses to determine which assignments will introduce students to these skills, which provide opportunities for practicing the skills and finally, which projects will provide opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of the skills. Initially, the faculty should have productive discussions about what **context, analysis, interpretation and application** mean to them and how they are embedding assignments in their courses that allow students to practice and demonstrate the PSLO’s.

1. **Future planning and Assessment 2020/21**

As the Assessment Coordinator position will not be supported this coming year, the faculty, working as a committee-of-the-whole, will need to discuss how to proceed. The results of this assessment indicate it would be beneficial to increase student competency in certain PSLO’s. Based on this sampling, faculty may wish to discuss the feasibility and value of implementing a culminating experience. Moving forward, and additional task would be to create an assessment plan that considers virtual learning as well as virtual theatrical productions and how this move impacts the dissemination of our PSLO’s.

Below please find the Rubric and tables outlining the data results.

**Appendix A: RUBRIC**

PSLO 1 - Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills inherent to the varied and distinct processes of theatrical development and presentation.

PSLO 3 - Demonstrate an understanding of the relevant context in which theatre is created and presented.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Scale (1-3) | **A Understanding of Source Material**  Key: Analysis of a dramatic text within its aesthetic, historical, social or political contexts. | **B Articulating Point of View**  Key: Articulate a clear point of view about the play. | **C Conceptual articulation or hypothesis of student’s approach to the play**  Key: Discussion, statement or creative representation of student’s approach to the play. | **D Application of concepts into practice (writing, performance, design)**  Key: Creating or devising an achievable plan, outline or template for execution of student’s approach. |
| Exceptional – 3 | Exceptionally clear and supported analysis of a dramatic text within its aesthetic, historical, social or political contexts. | Exceptionally clear and supported articulation of a point of view about the play. | Exceptionally clear, supported, and in-depth discussion, statement or creative representation of student’s approach the play. | Exceptionally clear and achievable plan, outline or template for execution of student’s approach. |
| SATISFACTORY – 2 | Mostly clear and supported analysis of a dramatic text within its aesthetic, historical, social or political contexts. | Mostly clear and supported articulation of a point of view about the play. | Mostly clear, supported, in-depth discussion, statement or creative representation of student’s approach the play. | Mostly clear and achievable plan, outline or template for execution of student’s approach. |
| MINIMAL -1 | Rarely or never clear or supported analysis of a dramatic text within its aesthetic, historical, social or political contexts. | Rarely or never clear or supported articulation of a point of view about the play. | Rarely or never clear, supported, or in-depth discussion, statement or creative representation of student’s approach the play. | Rarely or never clear or achievable plan, outline or template for execution of student’s approach. |
| Not Applicable - NA |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix B:**

**Appendix B Cont.**

Theatre 426

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Composite data. Student** | **Understanding of  Source Material** | **Articulating  Point of View** | **Conceptual Articulation or hypothesis of student's  approach to the play** | **Application of concept into practice (writing, performance, design)** |
|  | Student #1 | 2 | 1.5 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Student#2 | 2 | 1.5 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Student #3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1 |
|  | Student #4 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 1 |
|  | Student #5 | 3 | 2 | 2.5 | 2 |
|  | Student #6 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2 |
|  | Student #7 | 3 | 3 | 2.5 | 3 |
|  | Student #8 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Student #9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Student #10 | 3 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2 |
|  | **Mean** | 2.35 | 2.05 | 2 | 1.8 |
|  | **Median** | 2.5 | 2 | 2.25 | 2 |
|  | **Mode** | 3 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1 |
|  | **High** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | **Low** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TH 444 | Student | Understanding of Source Material | Articulating POV | Conceptual Articulation | Application of concepts |
|  |
| Average | Student A | 1.5 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 |
| Average | Student B | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Average | Student C | 1 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 |
| Average | Student D | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Average | Student E | 2 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Average | Student F | 2 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Average | Student G | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1.5 |
| Average | Student I | 1.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Average | Student J | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 1.5 |
| Average | Student K |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Average | Student M | 3 | 3.5 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Understanding of Source Material | Articulating POV | Conceptual Articulation | Application of concepts |
|  |  |
| High |  | 3 | 3.5 | 3 | 3 |
| Low |  | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 |
| mean |  | 1.55 | 1.65 | 1.68 | 1.73 |
| median |  | 1.5 | 1.75 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| mode |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.5 |
|  |  | Understanding of Source Material | Articulating POV | Conceptual Articulation | Application of concepts |
| TH 457 |  |
| Average | Student N | 2 | 1 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
|  | Student O | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |