

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in FY13 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Theatre Arts **DATE** May 5, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts (Performance), Bachelor of Fine Arts (Musical Theatre)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Deborah Worley, Bradley Myers, Kyle Thorson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The December 3, 2010 revision to the Department assessment plan outlines two student learning goals for the Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree program and the Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) degree programs (Performance and Musical Theatre): 1) Students will demonstrate skills in critical thinking; and 2) Students will demonstrate skills in creative expression". There is no further information included about these goals, and there is no separation of goals by degree program (BA, BFA in Performance, BFA in Musical Theatre).

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| <u> </u> | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>X</u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <u>X</u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <u> </u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <u> </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <u> </u> | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| <u> </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <u>X</u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”) |

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The mission statement of the BA program indicates that, “graduates will demonstrate critical thinking, creative expression, and social responsibility as artists and scholars of Theatre”. The student learning goals specifically mention development of skills in critical thinking and creative expression.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The 2010 Assessment document only has one sentence about assessment methods: “The Senior Capstone course will be used to assess student learning.” No information was provided about alignment with student learning goals, nor were specific direct or indirect assessment methods mentioned. However, the FY2013 Annual Report includes a bit more detail, indicating that rubrics were applied to assess student learning in the areas of critical thinking and creative expression. The rubric was not provided. In addition, it was mentioned in the FY2013 Annual Report that the faculty chose to also assess student learning in the area of research.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported? YES ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? YES ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? YES ☐ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☒
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

Comments:

The FY2013 Annual Report included an overview of faculty review of capstone projects that seven students completed in THEA 494, the Senior Project course. For example, every student "met or exceeded expectations in critical thinking, creative expression, and research". The report also indicated that students do not recognize the "significance of critical thinking in their process" but that "evidence in their written thesis and final performance piece clearly demonstrate evidence of critical thinking at a very high level." No specific findings are mentioned.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

- ☐ 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
- ☒ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- ☒ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
- ☐ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data...analyze graphical information")
- ☐ 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
- ☐ 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...")
- ☐ 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
- ☐ 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding results and the application of results to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

The results reported in the FY2013 Annual Report generally address critical thinking and creative expression. However, specific findings are not mentioned.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? YES ☐ NO ☒ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? YES ☐ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

Comments:

It does not appear that any actions were taken based on the reported assessment results. The FY2013 Annual Report does include a statement that "Theatre faculty members conclude that we need to be more attentive to explaining the relationship between their critical analysis and their creative expression." However, it does not appear that any actions were taken based on the reported assessment results.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☒ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☒ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.

(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The 2010 Assessment revision does not appear to be a complete assessment plan. The student learning goals are not specific, and the assessment methods are not described. We encourage the Department to revisit this revision and amend it, possibly consulting the previous Theatre Arts assessment plan (2004-2005) for an example of structure, organization, and alignment of student learning goals, objectives, and assessment methods (direct and indirect). Assistance is available through UND's assessment consultants (experienced practitioners of assessment from departments and colleges across UND), from members of the Assessment Committee, and/or from Joan Hawthorne. We encourage Theatre Arts faculty to take advantage of these resources.

Also, there are three bachelor's degrees offered by the Theatre Arts Department: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts in performance, and Bachelor of Fine Arts in musical theatre. It is likely that there is some difference in student learning goals for students in each of these programs. If that is the case, we recommend that your next assessment plan list separate learning goals and assessment methods by degree program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please describe) – *email correspondence with Emily Cherry*

☒ Assessment plan (as posted) – *2010 Assessment revision*
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Bradley Myers	Deborah Worley	Kyle Thorson
	Department	Law School	Educational Leadership	Graduate Student
	Phone Number	7-2228	7-3140	
	e-mail	myers@law.und.edu	deborah.worley@und.edu	kyle.thorson@email.und.edu

Section 1: ☐ Q ☐ Section 2: ☐ Q ☐ Section 3: ☐ Q ☐ Section 4: ☐ NA ☐

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in FY13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Theatre Arts **DATE** May 5, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master of Arts

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Deborah Worley, Bradley Myers, Kyle Thorson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The December 3, 2010 revision to the Department assessment plan outlines two student learning goals for the Master of Arts degree program: 1) students will demonstrate advanced skills in critical thinking in a thesis; and 2) students will demonstrate advanced skills in creative expression in a thesis. There is no further information included about these goals.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The 2010 Assessment document does not mention any methods that were intended to be used to assess student learning in the Master of Arts program.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

In the FY13 Annual Report, the Department included a statement that “Theatre focused on the undergraduate program this past year”. They did not report any results for assessment of the Master of Arts program.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The FY13 Annual Report did not report any assessment results for the Master of Arts program. Thus, there was no mention of actions taken by the Department based on the results.

SUMMARY***Strengths***

- ☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
☐ Results are reported.
☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
☒ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
☒ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
☒ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
☒ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
☒ No results are reported.
☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The 2010 Assessment revision does not appear to be a complete assessment plan. The student learning goals are not specific, and the assessment methods are not described. Based on the contents of the FY2013 Annual Report, it does not appear that assessment is formally executed for the Master of Arts program. We encourage the Department to take specific action steps concerning assessment of their graduate program. For example, begin by amending the existing assessment document so that student learning goals are explicit and well-articulated, assessment methods (direct and indirect) are included, and that there is alignment between student learning goals and the selected assessment methods. Next, implement the new assessment plan in a regular and systematic way. For example, perhaps plan to assess a student learning goal on a specified cycle. Report assessment results for the graduate program in the Annual Report. Think critically about the data that are collected and report any changes that occurred or actions that were taken within the graduate program. Finally, tie those changes or actions to assessment results.

Assistance is available through UND's assessment consultants (experienced practitioners of assessment from departments and colleges across UND), from members of the Assessment Committee, and/or from Joan Hawthorne. We encourage Theatre Arts faculty to take advantage of these resources.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please describe) – email correspondence with Emily Cherry
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted) – 2010 Assessment revision
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Bradley Myers	Deborah Worley	Kyle Thorson
	Department	Law School	Educational Leadership	Graduate Student
	Phone Number	7-2228	7-3140	
	e-mail	myers@law.und.edu	deborah.worley@und.edu	kyle.thorson@email.und.edu

Section 1: Q Section 2: N Section 3: N Section 4: N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
 Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
 N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
 NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13