

**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: **2010-2011** College: CAH
Department Theatre Arts Program: **BFA** (Design and Technology Specialization)

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.

The following outcomes/goals were assessed because they are connected to the BFA student jurying process.

Related Program/ Departmental Goals	Related College Goals	Related University Goals	Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement (How good does performance have to be?)
To integrate the curriculum and production whenever possible.	Ensure that students develop disciplinary specific competencies for success in their field	Goal 1 "maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life"	<p>Student must receive a 70% or higher.</p> <p>Student must be able to construct legible, logical technical graphics, renderings and drawings within his/her field.</p> <p>Student can create a legible, logical technical drawing for production which employs appropriate graphic standards for the design field.</p> <p>Student safely and competently works with tools to advance the production build schedule without wasting resources or creating an unsafe situation.</p> <p>Student is a contributing member of any theatrical run crew he/she is assigned to.</p> <p>Student will have worked a variety of jobs successfully.</p> <p>Student will have representative work of more than one staging configuration in their portfolio.</p> <p>Student will have evidence of design/technical work from 1-3 shows.</p> <p>Student's portfolio contains evidence of working drawings, sketches, elevations, models, and design paperwork.</p> <p>Student's portfolio contains full designs for more than one realized design in their field.</p> <p>Student will be able to connect visual elements of their proposed design to emotional, historical, and artistic ideas that relate to the theatrical piece in written format.</p>

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.

Students were assessed in a jury setting on 7 January 2011. Each student presented their portfolio materials to a panel of five faculty from the Design and Technology area of the Theatre Arts Department. The juries were for all continuing (2nd-4th year) BFA candidates. All 13 continuing students participated.

A) What methods were used?

We used the following rubric to assess the students' portfolio materials:

Design/Tech BFA Jury Rubric

Rev. 1/6/11

Student:

Year in Program:

Assessment: 5= all the time (Yes). 4= most of the time. 3= some of the time (NA). 2=rarely. 1= never (No)

		The Student Showed Evidence of:	
Resume	A brief account of your educational and work experience, for the information of possible future employers.	Diversity of positions and experience.	<input type="text"/>
		Increasing levels of responsibility	<input type="text"/>
		Attractive and professional formatting	<input type="text"/>

		The Student Showed Evidence of:	
Examples of Design Work	Production photos, Renderings and other images of projects, (scans or originals) both class and production work or other related work.	A comprehension of design principles and aesthetics in both subject matter and presentation.	<input type="text"/>
		A close relation of photos Images and associated paper work	<input type="text"/>
		A high quality of presentational material arranged professionally and clearly labeled.	<input type="text"/>

		The Student Showed Evidence of:	
Associated Paperwork / Research	Using any of the following items: Research, sketches, studies, models, story boards, drafting, run sheets patterns, prompt book, light plot, sound plot. Other documentation of technical work/class work.	Paperwork that is well organized, informational and professionally presented.	<input type="text"/>
		Paperwork consistent with standard industry practices.	<input type="text"/>
		A correlation between "The Design Idea" and paperwork.	<input type="text"/>

		The Student Showed Evidence of:	
Personal Interview	Appearance, attitude, growth and goals	Clean and neat "hirable" appearance?	<input type="text"/>
		A positive attitude, attentiveness, and engaged in the conversation.	<input type="text"/>
		Communicating about themselves and specific professional goals.	<input type="text"/>

Total Score

<input type="text"/>

60-50 excellent. 50-40 good. 40-30 average. 30-20 probation. < 20 non-retention.

Evaluator:

Comments on other side

B) Who was assessed?

All continuing (2nd-4th year) BFA candidates.

C) When was it assessed?

Juries are scheduled yearly. This year it was 7 January 2011.

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.

Second year averages are between 33.25 and 42.8 (average)

Third year averages are between 42.8 and 54.6 (good and excellent) with 5 of 7 in the excellent range.

Fourth year averages are between 36.75 and 47.2 (average and good).

Third year students who have been in the BFA program from their Freshman year have the highest scores (as a group) on the Jury Rubric. The second year and fourth year students have scores that are slightly lower. The scoring was designed to reflect student growth year to year and as this is the third year of this program, this seems appropriate.

The outcomes that the program has identified seem as though they are largely unmeasurable by data that can be collected during the students' career at Central. This fails to address programmatic success in student learning.

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.).

The Design and Technology Area will revise it's learning outcomes and assessments for the program so they may be measurable.

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.

Last year's assessment focused on the structure for laboratory classes. We discovered that students needed to have fundamental skills in order to function safely and productively in lab classes. We responded by scheduling labs more strictly in SAFARI so students had a concrete expectation of when they were to be in class and we connected a laboratory class to the introductory skills classes in each area.

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