

I&II. Objective, course/learning experience

JMU School of Theatre and Dance
2011-2012 APT

(note: the following are newly revised objectives)

Dance Concentration Objectives

D-1 The student shall develop an articulate individual choreographic voice, through formal coursework in improvisation and composition, frequent feedback from faculty and peers, and substantial opportunities to present work in both formal and informal settings.

Linkage to Course/Learning Experiences: (see Appendix 2 for course titles)
DANC 245, 320, 345, 445. Ensemble Series: DANC 110,210,211,212,311,312,
411, 412.

Process(es) By Which Objective Receives Faculty Review:
Interim Technique Evaluations, Dance Assessment Test, Faculty Caucus Student
Ratings.

Theatre Concentration (T) and Musical Theatre (MT) Concentration:

T-2 The student shall employ correct theatre terminology in all areas of theatrical production.

Linkage to Course/Learning Experiences: (see Appendix 1 for course titles)
THEA 171, 200, 300, 251, 261, 271, 273, 331, 333, 336, 354, 355, 371, 374, 376,
390, 471, 473, 481.
Course content/ assignments also linked to STAD production program

Process(es) By Which Objective Receives Faculty Review:
Senior Assessment Test, Student Academic and Production Activity Record,
Faculty Caucus Student Ratings, Senior Assessment Production Response,
Student Survey.

Linkage to Course/Learning Experiences: (see Appendix 1 for course titles)
THEA 357. MUAP 114, 115, 214. MUS 100, 101, 141, 143.

Process(es) By Which Objective Receives Faculty Review: Senior Assessment
Test, MT Assessment Test, Listening Analysis and Response, Student Academic
and Production Activity Record.

Comment [A1]: NOTE from the PASS Office: This APT was reduced in size for brevity. Several objectives are highlighted to exemplify the quality of the entire report.

Comment [A2]: This objective is typical of the objectives for this program. Objective clarity, specificity, and orientation refer to element I. A. and I. B. on the APT rubric.

Notice how the objective includes a rich description of the content area being assessed. Likewise, the objective is stated in student centered terms (e.g., "The student shall..."). The verb "employ" is precise and measurable. However, the objectives do not specify *when* students are assessed (e.g., graduating seniors shall demonstrate). This minor area can be easily improved. Overall, this objective is good and a nice representation of the other objectives of the program.

Comment [A3]: All theater and dance objectives have at least one course or activity linked to them. This corresponds to APT element 2. The clear linkage that is provided beneath each objective would likely yield a rating of 4 (exemplary) on the APT Rubric.

M-6 The student shall participate regularly in music theatre performances of various scales and styles.

Linkage to Course/Learning Experiences: (see Appendix 1 for course titles)
THEA 353, 354,454, 455, THEA 200/300 Performance Practicum. Public performances in support of Forbes and CVPA events.

Process(es) By Which Objective Receives Faculty Review:
Student Academic and Production Activity Record, Faculty Caucus Student Ratings.

III. Evaluation/Assessment Methods

School of Theatre and Dance 2011-2012- APT

III Evaluation/Assessment Methods

Description of Instruments:

1. Theatre and Musical Theatre Senior Assessment Test –

Administered in proctored setting, University Assessment Day.

50 item multiple choice test covering content areas of the academic core: history/theory/ criticism; design and technology; performance; production practice and management. 44% of items related to history/genre/style/criticism/theory; 36% related to design/technology/production practice; 10% related to management/producing; 10% related to acting/directing.

Total students: 36/38 Theatre and Musical Theatre concentrators in residence Spring 2011

Grading method/ scoring: Scantron

Expected student achievement: 75/100

Median Score: 76

Mean/Average student achievement: 74/100
75th percentile -79/100

1B. Theatre and Musical Theatre Freshman Pretest

Administered in proctored setting, Saturday before classes began Fall 2011.

[Same 50 item multiple choice administered to Seniors. See Test 1 description]

Total students: 41

Comment [A4]: Section Three provides a nice description of the program's systematic method for evaluating assessment objectives. This information is again repeated in the Results area so the reader can recall the measures used.

Only measures that link to the objectives listed within this abridged document are included here, but it should be noted that the Theatre and Dance program uses multiple measures to assess their objectives. Use of multiple measures provides robust information about what their students know, think and are able to do as a result of their program.

Comment [A5]: Most descriptions contain enough information to indicate the relationship between the measures and the objectives. While the program links the measures to objectives in the "Objectives" section of the report, providing that information in Section 3 as well would help the reader to see this connection. Aligning measures to objectives corresponds to APT Element III. A.

Comment [A6]: Each instrument has an expected criterion set by the faculty of the program. These criteria communicate what faculty expect and serve as a benchmark when interpreting results. This corresponds to element III. C. This area could be further strengthened by providing a rationale for the expected result.

Comment [A7]: This program uses a variety of direct measures to assess their learning outcomes including multiple choice tests and an array of performance assessments. Such direct measures allow one to have a better indication of what a student knows, thinks, or can do. Measuring objectives with direct measures corresponds to APT Element III. B.

Grading method/ scoring: Scantron

Median Score: 56

Mean/Average student achievement: 55.95/100

4. Theatre Faculty Caucus Senior Student Ratings

Total Students 37/38 Theatre and Musical Theatre concentrators in residence Spring 2012

Eight faculty raters representing all content areas of Theatre/Musical Theatre and each having a four-year experience with the graduating seniors.

Dr. Dennis Beck – history/theory/criticism/performance
Dr. Roger Hall – acting/directing/playwriting/history
Kate Arecchi – musical theatre area coordinator
Emily Becher-McKeaver – design/technology
Richard Finkelstein – design/technology
Pamela S. Johnson – design/technology
Kevin ‘Wolfe’ Sherril – acting
William Buck – design/technology/former School Director

Faculty were provided with Excel sheet combining Student Production Activity Record Summary and Student Academic Record and asked:

“With respect to the rubric enclosed, and based on your observation of this student in classes and production work, and in consideration of their GPA and Production Activity Record, at what level has the student met your expectations for a senior in terms of the following”

1. Academic skills and accomplishments
2. Overall production skills and accomplishments
3. Overall knowledge of basic production processes
4. Proficiency in a collaborative theatrical process
5. Knowledge of/exposure to various theatrical genre/production styles and staging formats
6. Knowledge of/preparation for entering professional world

Scale: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 U (unable to judge/limited experience)

Rubric: See Appendix 4. New rubric developed by Dr. Dennis Beck in Summer 2010 in a PASS workshop and approved by the faculty in 2011. See Appendix 4.

Faculty raters worked independently then caucused to discuss each student and compare ratings. In the few cases where faculty had little or no knowledge of the student three to four raters did have experience. Ratings were averaged, per student, per item.

Expected/Acceptable Ratings each item: 3

Results: Averages

- | | |
|----------------------------|------|
| 1. Academic Skill/Acomp. | 3.3 |
| 2. Production Skill/Acomp. | 3.5 |
| 3. Production Practice | 3.54 |

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| 4. Collaboration | 3.7 |
| 5. Genre/Style | 3.6 |
| 6. Professional prep. | 3.6 |

7. Musical Theatre Listening Evaluation

Administered in proctored setting after Spring Break 2012.

Total Students: 11/13 musical theatre concentrators in residence Spring 2012

Students listen to two songs with music and lyrics by the same writer.

Part A – Students made notes detailing what they heard in terms of the orchestration, instrumentation, musical style, song form, tempo, meter and the setting of the lyrics. Sheet music from the piano vocal scores was provided. Appropriate terminology was expected in notes.

Grading Method: 2 Faculty Raters

Part B – Students discriminated for musical style, orchestration, tempo, meter, and lyrics in these two songs to determine how a picture of character, location, culture, and story was created. Students made a written response in traditional essay form using appropriate terminology.

Grading Method: 2 Faculty Raters

Kate Arcchi, coordinator of musical theatre

Emily Becher-McKeaver, theatre faculty with extensive music background

Expected/Acceptable Results: 76/100 minimum

Results: Mean/Average 74

55% of students scored above 76

7 B Freshman Pre-Test Musical Theatre Listening Evaluation

Administered in proctored session , Saturday before classes began Fall 2011

[Identical to Senior Musical Theatre Listening Evaluation (see 7)]

Total Students: 8 musical theatre concentrators

Results: Average 39/100

Comment [A8]: Notice that the program is using a performance assessment, requiring students to describe important aspects of musical pieces. Although performances assessments can be logistically challenging, they can also provide programs with exceptional information regarding student learning.

Comment [A9]: For most measures, information is provided regarding how many students participated in assessment relative to how many students could have possibly taken the instrument. Additionally testing conditions are reported that allow the reader to understand if students were motivated to provide responses. Finally, multiple faculty raters assess the performance assessments, which is best practice.

Overall, this program provides a nice detailed description about data collection, the sample, and testing conditions for each measure. This corresponds to APT Element III. D.

Comment [A10]: Multiple faculty are used to rate student performance helping to mitigate any potential error/bias due to only having one rater (Element III. D). In addition, using multiple raters allows the program to assess inter-rater reliability, which could be used as validity evidence in Element III. E. PASS can aid with conducting and interpreting reliability analyses.

IV. Objective Accomplishments/Results

School of Theatre and Dance 2011-2012 APT

IV Objective Accomplishments/Results Interpretation

Description of Instruments:

1. Theatre and Musical Theatre *Senior Assessment Test* –
Administered in proctored setting, University Assessment Day.

1B. Theatre and Musical Theatre *Freshman Pretest*
Administered in proctored setting, Saturday before classes began Fall 2011

Objectives measured:

- T-2 Correct terminology/all areas production
- T-3 Genre/Staging formats
- T-4 Styles/ western/ non-western
- T-5 Dramatic literature/theory,criticism
- T-6 Theatre history/periods/movements
- T-7 Theatre re: /arts/tv/film
- T- 11 Professional practice/org./expectations/opportunities
- M-3 Relationship/acting,dance,choral&instrumental music to field
- M-4 History/literature/genre musical theatre

Instrument Description

50 item multiple choice test covering content areas of the academic core: history/theory/ criticism; design and technology; performance; production practice and management. 44% of items related to history/theory/criticism.; 36% related to design/technology/production practice; 10% related to management/producing; 10% related to acting/directing.

Total students: Senior 36/38 census (Theatre and Musical Theatre concentrators)

Total students: Freshman 41 (Theatre and Musical Theatre concentrators)

Grading method/ scoring: Scantron

Senior Expected student achievement: 75/100

| | | |
|--|-----------|--------|
| <u>Senior Mean/Average student achievement</u> | 2011-2012 | 74/100 |
| <u>Senior Mean/Average student achievement</u> | 2010-2011 | 82/100 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <u>Freshman Mean/Average student achievement 2010-2011</u> | 55.95/100 |
| <u>Freshman Mean/Average student achievement 2010-2011</u> | 56.55/100 |

INTERPRETATION: Senior results are within 1 point of acceptable and within 3 points of the 2010 class whose mean was 77/100. Results are 8 points below the average of the 2011 senior class. Consistent with the former tests, items relative to history/literature/genre (22 of 50) were most challenging. Typically students who have recently taken the courses requiring command of factual material have a higher retention rate. In this population of seniors, more than 50% had the courses over two years ago. Other factors considered by the area heads in the analysis and interpretation of this test are motivation, student academic acuity and proclivity and the particular timing of the

Comment [A11]: Each measure includes a presentation of results in relation to corresponding objectives, which are seen above (i.e. correct terminology/all areas production, etc.). Likewise, it is easy to see how observed scores match with expected faculty criterion from the presentation. Clarity of results corresponds to APT Element IV A .

test. In the 2009 APT it was noted that motivational levels to prepare for such a test should be considered and that students might be provided with a study guide in advance of the testing day. To prepare for the 2010-2011 test students received an email by way of the Blackboard site stating the seriousness with which the faculty and staff take Assessment tests and including a study guide and advice to consider studying in groups. Evidence collected in informal interviews of 2011 seniors suggested that motivation was heightened due to these strategies. To prepare for the 2011-2012 Assessment tests identical emails, messages and study suggestions were sent to seniors. A possible explanation of the lower scores is the timing of the test. Due to the high subscription and participation rates of the seniors in the large musical production which was in technical rehearsals, time available to study in groups or individually was severely limited. The faculty might consider administering this particular test at a point in the semester when the production schedule has less direct effect on the students out-of-class time and also address motivational levels and strategies. Since the KR 20 level of the test result was at .58 the faculty might re-examine the test and consider redistributing or rewriting some items in the history/literature/genre area. Despite the lower mean score of the senior test, comparisons to the Freshman Pre-test results from both 2010 and 2011 are highly significant. While a true pre-and post comparison will not be available until 2014 there is still value in comparing the two Freshman Pre-tests. Freshmen entering in 2011 were less than 1 point below the 2010 freshmen.

Comment [A12]: KR20 is an estimate of internal consistency, or reliability. This corresponds to APT element III. E. Providing information about test reliability and validity allows one to better understand the degree to which they can trust inferences made from assessment results. Higher values reflect greater internal consistency on a measure.

4. Theatre Faculty Caucus Student Ratings

Objectives measured:

- T-1 Proficiency/skills in collaborative process
- T-2 Correct terminology/all areas production
- T-3 Genre/Staging formats
- T-4 Styles/ western/ non-western
- T-5 Dramatic literature/theory, criticism
- T-6 Theatre history/periods/movements
- T-8 Informed critical writing/performances
- T- 10 Performance participation/experience
- T- 11 Professional practice/org./expectations/opportunities
- M-6 Performance/experience musical performance

Total Students – 36/38 Theatre and Musical Theatre concentrators in residence Spring 2012

Instrument Description:

Seven faculty raters representing all content areas of Theatre/Musical Theatre and each having a four-year experience with the graduating seniors.

- Dr. Dennis Beck – history/theory/criticism/performance
- Dr. Roger Hall – acting/directing/playwriting/history
- Kate Arecchi – musical theatre area coordinator
- Emily Becher-McKeaver – design/technology
- Richard Finkelstein – design/technology
- Pamela S. Johnson – design/technology
- Kevin “Wolf” Sherrill – acting
- William J. Buck – design/technology, former school director

Comment [A13]: As noted previously, use of multiple raters is a great practice. If only one rater is used, it is possible for an individual to argue that ratings may be biased. By having multiple raters that agree, one is better able to trust results. Use of multiple raters is related to reliability, and thus corresponds to element III. E.

Instrument Description

Faculty were provided with Excel sheet combining Student Production Activity Record Summary and Student Academic Record and asked:

“Based on your observation of this student in classes and production work, and in consideration of their GPA and Production Activity Record and the Rubric, at what level has the student met your expectations for a senior in terms of the following?”

1. Academic skills and accomplishments
 2. Overall production skills and accomplishments
 3. Overall knowledge of basic production processes
 4. Proficiency in a collaborative theatrical process
 5. Knowledge of/exposure to various theatrical genre/production styles and staging formats
 6. Knowledge of/preparation for entering professional world
- Scale: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 U (unable to judge/limited experience)

Faculty raters worked independently then caucused to discuss each student and compare ratings. In the few cases where faculty had U (limited experience) three to four raters did have experience.

Ratings were averaged, per student, per item.

Expected/Acceptable Ratings each item: 3

| Results: _____ 2011-2012 | Averages |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Academic Skill/Acomp. | 3.3 |
| 2. Production Skill/Acomp. | 3.5 |
| 3. Production Practice | 3.54 |
| 4. Collaboration | 3.7 |
| 5. Genre/Style | 3.6 |
| 6. Professional prep. | 3.6 |

| Results: _____ 2010-2011 | Averages |
|----------------------------|----------|
| 1. Academic Skill/Acomp. | 3.5 |
| 2. Production Skill/Acomp. | 3.5 |
| 3. Production Practice | 3.6 |
| 4. Collaboration | 3.5 |
| 5. Genre/Style | 3.7 |
| 6. Professional prep. | 3.6 |

| Results _____ 2009-2010 | Averages |
|----------------------------|----------|
| 1. Academic Skill/Acomp. | 3.6 |
| 2. Production Skill/Acomp. | 3.7 |
| 3. Production Practice | 3.7 |
| 4. Collaboration | 3.7 |
| 5. Genre/Style | 3.8 |
| 6. Professional prep. | 3.6 |

Comment [A14]: Most assessment measures include presentation of results in concordance with past results. This corresponds to APT Element IV. B. Presenting past results aids program's in identifying trends over time.

INTERPRETATION:

This instrument has high participation by faculty, with one more rater added this year bringing the number to 8. Results are highly acceptable. Even though the academic unit is small, the opportunity for faculty to meet and discuss each student continues to be regarded as valuable and productive. With few exceptions 7 of the 8 raters had close contact with or observation of each student. Although our average has been nearly 3.7 in the past two years, this year was the first time of using the rubric, the effect of which may have been a reduction the average since it might have decreased the variability of rater response and sets a clear "acceptable" level. The faculty shall re-evaluate the Rubric.

7. Musical Theatre Listening Evaluation

Administered in proctored setting Assessment Day

7B Freshman Musical Theatre Listening Evaluation Pre-Test

Objectives addresses:

M – 3 Relationship/acting, dance, choral & instrumental music to field

M – 4 History/literature/genre musical theatre

M - 5 Fundamental principles/ music theory

Total Students: 11/13 musical theatre concentrators in residence Spring 2012

Instrument Description

Students listen to two songs from two musicals with music and lyrics by the same composer/lyricist.

Part A – Students make notes detailing what they hear in terms of the orchestration, instrumentation, musical style, song form, tempo, meter and the setting of the lyrics. Sheet music from the piano vocal scores was provided.

Appropriate terminology is expected in notes.

Grading Method: 2 Faculty Raters

Part B – Students discriminate for musical style, orchestration, tempo, meter, and lyrics in these two songs to determine how a picture of character, location, culture, and story is created. Students make a written response in traditional essay form using appropriate terminology.

Grading Method: 2 Faculty Raters

Kate Arecchi, coordinator of musical theatre

Emily Becher-McKeever, theatre faculty with extensive music background

Expected/Acceptable Results: 76/100 minimum

Results 2011-2012: Mean/Average 74

Results 2010-2011: Mean/Average 81

Total Students Freshman Pre-Test – 8 musical theatre concentrators

Results 2011-2012: 39/100

Results 2010-2011: 58/100

INTERPRETATION: Results of the senior Listening Evaluation are 2 points below Expected/Acceptable and 5 points below the previous year. This is considered accountable to a significant number of seniors having come into the program with a limited musicianship background and the necessity to develop those skills over a shorter time. In consideration of this there is no apparent need to adjust expectations or acceptable ratings at this time. The nature of the program, even with an entry audition and higher academic expectations of freshman, might present such anomalies on occasion. There is no real concern. Expectations were for higher scores in 2011-2012 after THEA 353 and 453 increased attention to perceptive and effective listening skills. Results are still highly acceptable in relationship to the scores on Freshman Pre-test where students scored 35 points lower on average, a lower performance than the Freshmen of 2010-2011.

Comment [A15]: Each area in the results section includes a rich interpretation of results. A thoughtful reflection provided by multiple faculty is provided. The interpretation ties back to objectives, and includes a discussion of how classes and activities might have impacted results. This is a wonderful interpretation example. This corresponds to APT Element 4C.

*All results were not shared for brevity.

V. Dissemination

V Dissemination

- I 2012 Blackboard Senior Assessment site has been created:
All faculty / staff and graduating seniors are members.
-Student scores on tests are available to students and faculty/staff
- Student Survey results will be posted by June 15, available to all faculty/staff
- II Results from all assessment instruments have been shared with area coordinators in each concentration.
Area coordinators and school director have received survey results.
The Assessment report will be summarized and presented to the faculty/staff at a school meeting in Fall whose agenda will be focused on Assessment results and the impact on current and future programmatic issues.
All tables, spread sheets and contributing data are available in digital form for faculty/staff use.
- III The full Assessment Report, including instruments, will be available in the School office in hard copy form, and in digital form on the local drive.
- IV The full Assessment Report was included in the documents submitted for the reaccreditation process to NAST (National Association of Schools of Theatre) and NASD (National Association of Schools of Dance).

Comment [A16]: Below is a very strong assessment dissemination description. The Assessment results are available to all faculty, staff, and graduating seniors through a Blackboard website. The assessment report will also be available in other forms at other locations (e.g., the School office). All faculty receive the results and other stakeholders (e.g., seniors) have access to the results as well. Finally, the mode of communication of results is very clear. This corresponds to APT Element V.

VI. Uses of evaluation/Assessment Results and Actions Taken

Changes/Augmentations to the Assessment Process 2012

I **Assessment Testing situation was further formalized** and with additional faculty proctors in an effort to increase motivation, engender a more serious tone, and raise expectations. As in 2010-2011 a Blackboard organization site was created for Assessment 2011-2012.

1. Theatre and Musical Theatre Concentrators:

Students were emailed through Blackboard and provided instructions for Assessment Day testing in the Forbes Center. Students were told what to expect in terms of the testing instruments, given a study guide and encouraged to create study sessions. They were informed that the faculty and staff took Assessment very seriously and that their test scores would be made available to the faculty and staff. Sessions were fully proctored by faculty who also administered the instruments and the experiential portion of the test.

Comment [A17]: Below is a list of revisions made to the assessment process. This list corresponds to APT element VI. B. This program has made great strides on improving their assessment quality, which is evidenced through the narrative below. Quality assessment practice enables one to better trust their assessment results.

All testing was conducted in two adjacent rooms. Computers were made available to all students.

2. Dance Concentrators:

Students were emailed through Blackboard and provided instructions for Assessment Day testing in the Forbes Center. They signed up for either a morning or afternoon session.

Testing was proctored. Students met with advisors individually to complete program histories and update resumes.

II Revisions to Existing Instruments:

1. Student Production Activity Report – updated to reflect period 2008-2012 seasons
2. Dance Interim Technique Evaluation developed in to a caucus modality.
3. Student Anonymous Survey – Added Musical Theatre and Dance objectives to the instrument for students to rate program success. Formerly, only Theatre objectives were included.
4. Pre-test Rubric Jury and Technique Evaluations honed for Musical Theatre and Dance concentrators, respectively, as derived from the Audition Rating Rubric. Post-Evaluation beginning in 2013 can be conducted in the Junior or Senior year using the same Rubric.

III New Instruments

1. Freshman Pre-test Theatre and Musical Theatre Experiential: Production Response Essay computer generated.

IV Changes/Additions Accomplished

1. Completed revisions to Theatre Concentration objectives focusing on making them more measureable.
2. Completed revisions to the Musical Theatre Concentration objectives focusing on making them more measureable.
3. Revised Course to Objective correlations resulting in higher numbers of courses serving and directly linking to objectives.
4. Added computer enabled Freshman Theatre/Musical Theatre Production Response Essay. Two additional faculty proctors provided.
5. Instituted Rubric for Production Response Essay instrument to be used for Senior test and Freshman Pre-Test. (Developed by Dr. Dennis Beck through PASS Summer 2010 workshop.)

5. Instituted Rubric for Theatre/Musical Theatre Faculty Caucus instrument. (Developed by Dr. Dennis Beck through PASS Summer 2010 workshop.)
6. Developed for applicability in the near future Guidelines for Acceptable/Expected ratings for the 4 major instruments in Theatre/Musical Theatre Assessment. (Developed by Dr. Dennis Beck through CARS Summer 2010 workshop.)The Guidelines will be revisited at the Fall Faculty meeting where Assessment2011-2012 is discussed.
7. More time was allowed for the Theatre/Musical Theatre Experiential Production response on Assessment Day with increased faculty proctoring.
8. Met with CARS representative Chris Orem to discuss feedback from APT 2010- 2011 report and receive suggestions/clarification towards improving process and reporting. Continued relationship with CARS representative Chris Coleman who assisted in making modifications to the Student Survey and uploading it to Qualtrics.
9. Added new raters
 - (3) in to the rotation for Freshman and Senior Experiential Production Response
 - (1) faculty caucus member
10. Paper presented by Dr. Dennis Beck on the JMU School of Theatre and Dance Assessment program at the Mid-America Theatre Conference, Chicago, IL, March 1-4, 2012 Title: "Anyone Can 'Have' High Standards. Who Can Prove Their Students Attain Them? : Methods of Self-Assessment for Theatre Programs"; Part of the Panel "Assessing the Work – A Panel on Methods". According to Dr. Beck, the paper was positively received with a number of questions regarding details about how our program conducted Assessment and philosophical discussion about negotiating the balance between quality of education and creation of quantitative measures. There was general recognition/comments about how developed our methods were compared to those of other programs.

Program Actions related to Assessment (ref: from previous reporting and APTs)

1. The mandatory audition requirement for admission to the Theatre concentration was more formalized and instituted at an increased number of audition days with expectations to improve the quality of students. (ref: from APT 2006-2012 indirect measures: Student Survey, student course evaluations and faculty recommendations from within the program and from school administration.)
2. The curriculum was expanded to include the THEA 354 Musical Theatre Revue class, formerly a THEA 303 Special Topics course. A new musical theatre faculty-directed production was added to the production program via this change. (ref: from Student Survey, student course evaluations and faculty recommendations from within the program and from school administration and accreditation advisement.)

Comment [A18]: Below, the program details curricular changes made based on assessment results. Details regarding the changes are present and there is a reference to the assessment result that spurred the change. This connection between changes and results is critical. The main reason for practicing assessment is to make informed programmatic changes, which this program is clearly doing. This corresponds to APT Element VI. A.

3. The curriculum was expanded to include Sound Design in Theatre, formerly a THEA 303 offering. Also included and to be added to the next catalogue are courses in Scene Painting and Movement for the Theatre. (ref. from: Student Survey, student course evaluations and faculty recommendations from within the program and from school administration.)

4. The curriculum in Theatre has been formalized into Tracks. [Performance, Design/Technology and Theatre Studies]. to provide students with more focused coursework, particularly to prepare them for post-graduate or professional work. Auditions for the tracks, both for incoming and current students, have been instituted and multiple sessions were held this year. Students from earlier catalogs who wish to be in the Theatre concentration track system are required to audition, interview or undergo portfolio review (ref. from 2006-2010 APTs indirect measures: Student Survey, student course evaluations and faculty recommendations from within the program and from school administration and 2010-2011 direct measurement instruments). .

5. More direct career counseling has been introduced in courses and as resources have permitted more guest artist have brought into the classroom. A guest artist committee has been formed at the departmental and the area levels. (ref. from 2010. 2011 APT direct measure instruments and student indirect survey instrument).

6. The unit has maintained increased awareness of the need to encourage and develop internship channels. As in 2011, 20% of graduating Theatre/Musical Theatre seniors have accepted internships. Dance concentrators continue to have high percentages in summer internships and formal intensive training programs. (ref. from 2010 and 2011 APT direct measure instruments and indirect Student Survey)

7. Increased support for student participation in Theatre regional and national conferences and auditions has been offered. Departmental funds have been allocated to assist students with fees and to provide transportation. The JMU student chapter of the USITT (United States Institute of Theatre Technology) is the largest in the state of Virginia. In the recent year more than 10 JMU students traveled to the national USITT convention in California and all received offers for work and/or internships. (ref. from 2006-2011 APT indirect measures: Student Survey, student course evaluations and faculty recommendations from within the program and from school administration and 2010 direct measurement instruments).

8. As resources permit, and with the generous assistance of the CVPA and their sharing of Encore season guests and artists, there has been increased influx of guest artists and professionals to work directly with students in the production program and in classes. A Guest Artist Committee has been established at the school level to solicit and screen recommendations from across the school. (ref. from 2006-2011 APT indirect measures: Student Survey, student course evaluations and faculty recommendations from within the program and from school administration and 2010 direct measurement instruments).

9. The Theatre objective specific to Theatre and its relationship to Television, Film and other recorded media has been modified extensively and current course offerings have undertaken modifications to insure that the objective is met. Under discussion is an offering soon of Acting

for the Camera, even if in a THEA 303 form, and pending faculty resources. (ref. from: 2009-2011 APT direct and indirect measures and 2011 student surveys.)

10. Theatre/Musical Theatre faculty continue to address the important areas of Academic counseling, writing skills support, writing across the curriculum, career counseling and pedagogical approaches in performance tracks. (from 2009-2011 APT direct and indirect measures and 2011 student surveys.) The unit is undertaking a major Advising Initiative.

11. The method for reporting student activity in productions is undergoing a major revision. Where the former instrument, the Production Activity Report, was student-reported, the new data system will be managed by departmental personnel who upload information to a central data base which will be capable of tracking and reporting student activity in productions and programs in the same categories and in expanded and more detailed categories than the current instrument allows. Information about student participation will be provided to the departmental personnel by the supervising faculty and staff members, rather than the faculty and staff verifying student reporting after the fact, as in the previous system. JMU's Nick Harvey has been consulted and reports that the university will be adopting a new program, SharePoint, over the next 3-6 months, for which Nick is advocating CVPA be an early adopter. Until that point, and in the transition to the new centralized data system, the current Production Activity Report template will be utilized. Another program called E-Forms is being adopted in the next 6-12 months by the University which will allow students and faculty continuous reporting and updating of spectatorship rather than the attempt to recall everything in the student's senior year. (from NAST and NASD re-accreditation process, faculty and staff of the unit and administrative heads who recognize an inconsistency/under-reporting trend in student Production Activity Report APT 2009-2011).

VII. List of accomplishments (Optional)

Paper presented by Dr. Dennis Beck on the JMU School of Theatre and Dance Assessment program at the Mid-America Theatre Conference, Chicago, IL, March 1-4, 2012
Title: "Anyone Can 'Have' High Standards. Who Can Prove Their Students Attain Them?: Methods of Self-Assessment for Theatre Programs"; Part of the Panel "Assessing the Work – A Panel on Methods".

According to Dr. Beck, the paper was positively received with a number of questions regarding details about how our program conducted Assessment and philosophical discussion about negotiating the balance between quality of education and creation of quantitative measures. There was general recognition/comments about how developed our methods were compared to those of other programs.

Comment [A19]: Quality assessment practice is quality scholarship. It is great when a program can present its assessment processes at conferences!