Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

BA Theatre

Theatre & New Dance

College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences

CONTACT
Name of Program Assessment Lead Sarah Krainin
Name of Person Completing Report Sarah Krainin

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION No

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)
  o   We don't know.

Other than the [CPP Catalog](#) and the [Office of Assessment and Program Review website](#), where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.
- Department Website - provide URL: https://www.cpp.edu/class/theatre-newdance/index.shtml

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023.** This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?
- 5

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: Develop skills in script or dance analysis.
- SLO #2: Implement production skills (technical theatre dance theatre) in theatre or dance.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Develop skills in script or dance analysis.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)		
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence	• Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
21	Percentage of students scoring 80% or higher	No	This SLO was assessed in AY 21-22, and we decided to re-assess them this year because we made the mistake of assessing a lower division course assignment. There is also a new full-time faculty member teaching not only this course, but most of the courses in the program that address this SLO to some extent. Interestingly, the aggregated scores from this year's assessment were statistically similar to last year's, despite a key difference between the assignments: TH2280 (assessed AY 21-22) required students to identify components of a text (a lower division "developing" learning outcome) whereas the TH3120 project (assessed AY 22-23) required students to express a central idea in conversation with a published article (and upper division "integration" learning outcome). Our interpretation is that the students' score reflect proportionate development of skills between these LD and UD courses. In terms of meeting our goals, only 29% of TH3120 essays met the Department goal of 80% average score, but 52% of essays met the University goal of "proficient" or "advanced"; this score is very much on par with Critical Thinking assessment scores across the University. Text Analysis and Critical Analysis are not the same thing, but have the most overlap between this Program SLO and comparable University ILO's. Our interpretation is that graduating TND students are scoring on par with University scores with regards to discipline-specific learning outcomes involving critical thinking.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Implement production skills (technical theatre dance theatre) in theatre or dance.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Scored direct evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence	• Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework	• Used rubric or scoring guide

Findings			
N of Artifacts	**Criterion Used**	**Goal Met**	**Eye-opening Result**
21	Percentage of students scoring 80% or higher	No	Upon graduating, TND students significantly demonstrated the ability to complete production tasks as directed; they were not as consistent with communication, and sometimes struggled to work independently or to apply learned skills into new contexts. This finding is consistent with faculty observations that students struggle to integrate learning from one course into subsequent courses.

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.
- Program curricular changes (e.g., course sequencing, changes to required curriculum, added or deleted courses)
- Personnel changes (e.g., faculty, laboratory staff, academic advisors etc.)
- Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions are ongoing, etc.)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.
- Program/department faculty as whole

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.
Due to significant lack of funds to support assessment, I resorted to only one lecturer evaluator (whereas I would normally engage three evaluators, to mitigate bias). The discovery I made was that not only did this practice potentially raise the role bias played in the results, but it also minimized the overall value of the assessment process in terms of creating conversation and multi-perspective feedback for the faculty to consider while review the assessment results. This greatly weakened the subsequent conversations and lessen the trove of creative ideas to respond to learning issues that became apart. On the other hand, I found that despite not being involved with curriculum decisions, our professional Department staff offered insights as evaluators for the SLO we assessed where staff members have the opportunity to observe student work. I had not asked staff to participate in assessment activities in the past, but I would do so again, especially considering how little time of theirs it took (two hours in total).

Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, CPP's GI2025 markers, CSU Dashboard, CPP's Student Success Dashboard on Tableau, course evaluations, etc.
As we mentioned in last year's report, we struggle with getting meaningful data from these sources due to the small number of students in the program. This will improve as data covering more years become available moving forward. Also, feedback from alumni comments offered during program review are still being considered in our current curriculum re-design process.

Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?
- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found here. To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan - Yes

Curriculum Matrix - No

If you would like us to review other assessment documents such as your evidence (e.g., assignment, survey, interview questions etc.) or scoring rubric, please upload/provide them. (Select all that apply)

- Other: Assessment reports