

**Central Washington University
Assessment of Student Learning
Department and Program Report**

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: **2011-12** College: **CAH**
 Department **Theatre Arts** Program: **BA**

NB: This review measured universal student learning outcomes common to all undergraduate degree tracks within the department and therefore is identical in all undergraduate report for the year.

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

In answering this question, please identify the specific student learning outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

Student Learning Outcomes (performance, knowledge, attitudes)	Related Program/ Departmental Goals	Related College Goals	Related University Goals	Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?)*	Who Assessed (Students from what courses – population)*	When Assessed (term, dates)***	Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement (How good does performance have to be?)
4. Student will be able to analyze and identify a variety of genre of dramatic literature and the themes each presented to the society in which it was developed.	Students will have the ability to analyze and interpret dramatic literature and performance as a performer, designer, director, or educator.	Goal 1 & 2 – “maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life”		Facilitate integrative learning, disciplinary and interdisciplinary. Develop students’ intellectual and practical skills.	Comprehensive entrance exam upon admission to the program and an exit exam prior to graduation	All students complete the intake exam upon admission to the program and complete the exit exam during their senior year in TH 495 Senior Research Project	90% of students will successfully score higher on the entrance/exit exam section of History and Literature. 90% of students will reach the bench mark of 65%, when taking the exam during the Senior Research course (typically their senior year) than on entrance when accepted in the program.

2. How were they assessed?

In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

A) What methods were used?

The department administers an intake examination followed up by an exit examination. The exam consists of five topic sections—General Theatre, Acting/Directing, Design and Technology, History and Literature, Youth Drama Education—equally divided within one hundred multiple-choice questions.

B) Who was assessed?

Individual students are required to complete the intake examination upon admission to the department. Students completing the program are also asked to take the test.

C) When was it assessed?

The intake exam is administered during new student orientation as part of the process for declaring the major. The exit exam is administered in their senior year, generally as part of the capstone course, Senior Research.

3. What was learned?

In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

	General Theatre	Acting /Directing	Design/Technology	History/Literature	Youth Drama/Education	Overall
Entrance Mean	52.72%	63.37%	36.80%	32.67%	37.98%	44.79%
Entrance Median	50.00%	64.00%	35.00%	30.43%	36.00%	43.09%
Exit Mean	63.48%	71.21%	48.97%	53.31%	43.38%	56.30%
Exit Median	62.50%	72.73%	45.00%	56.50%	45.45%	56.44%

Change in Mean	+10.76	+7.84	+12.17	+20.64	+5.40	+11.51
Change in Median	+12.50	+8.73	+10.00	+26.07	+9.45	+13.35

Students achieving a better score on the exit exam than on the entrance exam	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
--	------	------	------	------	------	------

Every student who completed both examinations scored higher in each section, without exception. Thus exceeding the standard set: “90% of students would score better.”

Students achieving the 65% benchmark	40%	32%	13%	10%	0%	5%
--------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----

However, seeing students reach the examination benchmark rate of 65% was less successful.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.).

Some of the results were not surprising to the faculty. It is well known, within the department, that the students attracted to our program are not scholars in the traditional sense. They have less interest in history and literature and are primarily focused on the application of the theories and skills. Faculty were pleased that strong growth was evident in the history and literature areas, being the area with greatest increase. History and Literature are the areas that high school students are the least prepared. Additionally, we have seen a sharp decline in student interested in youth drama and education to the extent we have closed those program—youth drama in 2007 and theatre education in 2011.

Some faculty felt the examination tool, having been in place since 1994, was flawed and still too focused toward our former program and student learning outcomes in the BA tracks, which were disbanded in 2007. Others could see the need to look at methods of increasing the student rate of information retention.

In individual score analysis, it became clear that students focusing in BFA areas better reflected learning connected in those specialty areas, while falling, at times, woefully short in areas not associated with the plan of study, thus biasing the results. For example, acting students are required foundational courses in technology and therefore fall short in examinations in advanced theories and practice in technical areas. The same is true, in reverse, with Design and Production students who only having one fundamental course in acting required in their study. Music Theatre students focus their studies in literature and history of the musical theatre genre which, being a relatively new addition to the department, is not even included in the assessment tool.

On a positive note, faculty we pleased to see every student had score higher, often much higher, on the exit exam than on the entrance exam.

No evaluation was undertaken in this review to examine scores by specific degree tracks.

Three tactics are planned for the coming year:

- 1) Re-evaluate the examination tool to better address student learning in the current programs.
- 2) Add at a senior-level course in script analysis to better prepare our students in the literature area as well as putting the text in historical and culture context.
- 3) Re-examine all courses to strengthen student learning outcomes.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year's assessment information?

In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

No action was required on last year's assessment as it was put in place to assess changes from the previous year and did not require changes or further follow up.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University: