1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:**  Area II: Humanities

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 11: Students will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing and engaging with the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   For SLO11, a rubric has been constructed that identifies key measures and also offers evaluative categories for those measures. I have attached it to this report. This is our second full academic year of collecting data. For SLO11, each section of THEA 2010 administers an identical Pre and Post Test to assess student’s progress in relation to the three stated criteria for demonstrating aesthetic appreciation and engagement. A random anonymous sampling of around 10 tests per course will then be evaluated using the above mentioned rubric at both the beginning and end of the semester. The Test will be administered through Blackboard at the beginning and end of each semester and will be given a point value to assure student participation. It will consist of three open-ended, short answer questions, each relating to a specific subcategory of the SLO (#1 aesthetic judgment, #2 societal impact/engagement, #3 creative process). The head assessor will then collect print outs of both the pre and post tests from each of the instructors and select 10 random student responses (identified by number only) for both the pre and post test from each course. The head assessor will then complete a rubric for each of the submitted pre/post tests and will then hand of the stack of materials to a second assessor (a rotating faculty member who also teaches the Intro course). Once both have completed their rubrics they will meet with the other Introduction to Theatre teachers to discuss the results and make plan of action for the following year. Rubric categories include: - Understanding of creative process (#3)- Demonstration of knowledge historical context (#2)- Evidence of artistic criteria or standards (#1)

   Introduction to Theatre for NonMajorsTHEA 2010/2011PreTest/Post Test Questions
   
   **QUESTION #1:** Briefly describe the process of a play going from page to stage. What are some of the main elements involved in translating the written play text into the three-dimensional performance? SLO Targeted: Be able to study, create, or participate in some form of artistic expression as a means of understanding the creative process.

   **QUESTION #2:** Describe the relationship between theatre and society. Use an example of theatre, either historic or modern, where the piece of theatre made some sort of statement or commentary on society. What message did the theatre try to convey? What issues was the performance tackling? How did the performers, designers, etc. go about expressing that message? SLO Targeted: Understand how various art forms and/or works of art both reflect and inform society at large, historically and/or in the present.

   **QUESTION #3:** Identify an issue that is occurring in contemporary theatre (theatre of the last twenty years). Describe that issue and the various debates surrounding it. What is at stake in the argument for the future of theatre? Use as many specific details as possible (play titles, people, places, etc). SLO Targets: Develop and articulate criteria for aesthetic judgment.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   Like last year, we received an equally good data set using our above outlined assessment method. In each course we received around 80 to 85% participation in the pre/post test which gave us a really strong data set.
will break down our findings by question. For Question #1: Similar to our first year’s data, we found that most students entering into Introduction to Theatre for NonMajors had some general information about the theatrical process including the presence of actors and a script. Where the students again came up short (although not unexpectedly) was in providing much additional depth in terms of the various component parts of that process. While they understood the complexities of the process they could not really identify many of the parts. Again similar to last year’s data, the post-test revealed that while the Intro classes did an excellent job in explicating many elements of the theatrical process (directing, casting, producing and designing to be specific), most Intro students left the class with deficits of knowledge when it came to a few crucial components. While students made strides in terms of understanding broader concepts such as the function of a dramaturg, issues of theatrical space and/or venue continued to come up short across the Intro classes. For Question #2: Our random sampling revealed that, much like the previous year, students entering the course could speak to some general vague notions of the relation between theatre and society but most could not identify a specific theatrical movement or event and discuss the specific issues circulating around it. They remained at the level of generalizations and vague notions. We were incredibly encouraged that yet again the post-test revealed that almost across the board, the Intro class was doing a rather good job of providing students with concrete examples of how theatre and society interplay - whether through Medieval Theatre or The Phantom of the Opera or American Realism. Almost all students in the sample group could identify a specific example and describe the message of the movement or piece and how it influenced society. The answers to this question encouraged us that we were successfully accomplishing this goal and the SLO of providing students with knowledge of historical context. For Question #3: Our responses to this question for this past academic year revealed that many students struggled in the pre-test to identify a issue affecting contemporary theatre. Some responded that they did not know and hoped to learn by the end of the semester while some said they thought theatre was just meant to entertain and not educate. While a few random responses, like last year, sadly reflected that they did not learn of those issues over the semester, we were really amazed at the level of response the students gave on this particular question. The majority responded with a very specific issue affecting contemporary theatre (everything from diversity and casting issues to economic concerns and commercialism). These responses were encouraging to us and really hit on the multiple points we identified on the rubric and demonstrated to us that the students were taking away a more nuanced, detailed understanding of the state of contemporary theatre than some of us even believed possible. We aim to keep up the good work in this area. We are still striving to better connect these answers to the issue of aesthetic judgment or criteria.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?
[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

For the next year, the Intro instructors have chosen to tackle a couple of the issues raised out of the rubric results. 1. While we improved and met our goal of expanding the knowledge of dramaturgy, we now wish to focus on expanding the knowledge of theatrical space and will look to incorporate more knowledge and activities relating to that topics across the courses. 2. We will continue as a faculty to have discussions on how to hone aesthetic judgment skills in our students and perhaps figure out a fourth, even more targeted question to add to our rubric to ascertain if students have developed that skill. We are also investigating adding an additional question to specifically address the role of the critic as that seems to perhaps be one way to incorporate “aesthetic judgement” a bit more directly. 3. Since we have now had two years of relatively positive returns on questions two and three, we as a faculty will undertake reviewing these pre and post test
questions to determine if we need to adjust them for the subsequent academic year. 4. We as a faculty will also undertake a revision of the rubric to make sure that the rubric itself is providing the best tool possible to yield the kinds of information we desire from the assessment process. We believe that with these changes, we will see better responses in those areas of the pre/post test that we have highlighted above.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   We will continue to hone our rubric and assessment strategy as we move forward, but in general we continue to be quite pleased with the structure and the information we received from it. We will also explore options to try to increase participation - perhaps through requiring the pre/post test as part of a participation grade, etc.

7. **Committee Comments**
   Mean rubric score= 3.78 (out of 4) I continue to find the annual report generated for theater to be excellent. The use of the pre and post test here is very appropriate to the SLO. The data collected from the test is appropriately interpreted and provides actionable, specific areas where the faculty can improve.