Academic Program
Assessments
Bobbi McKean, Associate Director, Theatre
Undergraduate Degree Programs

• BA in Liberal Arts
• BFA in Musical Theatre
• BFA in Theatre Production
  – Emphasis in Acting
  – Emphasis in Design and Technology
  – Emphasis in Dramaturgy and Theatre History
Overview of Assessments

For each degree program:

• Mission Statement
• Student Learning Outcomes
• Assessment Tools
• Findings/Changes
BFA in Theatre Production
Emphasis in Design and Technology
Student Learning Outcomes

Graduates with a BFA in Theatre Production (Design and Technology) should...

1. have attained and demonstrated advanced knowledge of: the theatrical production process; theatre history and the historical development of theatrical design; the visual history of architecture, furniture and costumes; dramatic text analysis; craft skills relevant to their interest area; and the expression of artistic intent and design ideas through research.

2. be able to collaborate with the production team while taking on a leadership role in a theatrical production in a design/technical area of their specialty, organizing appropriate resources to facilitate the process.
BFA in Theatre Production
Emphasis in Design and Technology
Student Learning Outcomes, con’t

Graduates with a BFA in Theatre Production (Design and Technology) should...

3. demonstrate the ability to express design ideas through freehand, digital and technical drawing and to communicate their ideas orally in public presentations.

4. should demonstrate skills compatible with the working principles and standards of the American professional theatre and an understanding of the expectations of the workplace.
Assessment Tools

1 - Semester Evaluations (Outcome #1 - #4)
   Written feedback and rubric every semester

2 - Portfolio Evaluations (Outcomes #1, #2, #4)
   Course work and realized production work presented every semester

3 - Production Evaluations (Outcomes #2, #3, #4)
   At least one production situation

4 - Showcase Evaluation and Placement
   (Outcomes #3 and #4)
**Tool #1 - Semester Evaluations**

**Numerical Rankings:**
- 5- Exemplary
- 4- Above Average
- 3- Satisfactory
- 2- Needs Improvement
- 1- Needs Major Improvement
- 0- Unacceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAR Class work (Quality of class work, ability to complete work, indication of improvement)</th>
<th>Artistic abilities (Analytical skills, artistic expression, creative thinking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall academic evaluation (Progress to graduation, improvement)</td>
<td>Technical skills (Craft and organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Studies/Internships (Ability to work independently)</td>
<td>Presentational skills (Ability to communicate ideas, information to a group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside work (Ability to take additional duties)</td>
<td>Communication abilities (Ability to convey vital information to collaborators on a daily basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As TAR employee (Performance a student worker or supervisor)</td>
<td>Professionalism (Ethical behavior, reliability, time management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative abilities (Abilities in team based activities)</td>
<td>Recommendations (Areas of improvement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2010 Seniors

## Semester Evaluation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
<th>Semester 5</th>
<th>Semester 6</th>
<th>Semester 7</th>
<th>Semester 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A -scene</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - scene</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - sm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - cost</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E -sound</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-scene</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-td</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - sm</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-lights</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J - sound</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - scene</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Tool #1 Findings/Changes

If the evaluations demonstrate that 75% have met or exceeded the criteria, we deem that the students have met Learning Outcomes #1, #2, #3, and #4. 75% = 8 students

Findings: One (1) student out of the 11 students scored below a 3; two (2) students scored a 3.3; seven (7) students scored at the average 3.5 or higher.

Changes: Scoring was consistent across faculty and areas although some categories were not given scores. Suggestion is to revise rubric adding numbers in each area for faculty to circle.
Tool #2 – Portfolio Evaluations

Criteria

• Quality and clarity of verbal presentation
• Quality of drawings
• Quality of photographs or slides
• Quality of relevant supporting paperwork, drafting, or organizational documents
• Quality and appropriateness of portfolio format
• Presentation of conceptual thinking or work process
• Appropriateness of portfolio content for the student
• Quality of résumé
• Faculty recommendations
2010 Seniors
Portfolio Evaluation Data

No numerical rankings
Individual comments to students in each area with an eye toward improvement every semester.

Generally – “good” to “very good” to “much improved”; one indicated progression the other way – “good” to “not good enough”
Assessment Tool #2 Findings/Changes

The results of the portfolio evaluations will be compiled and evaluated by the faculty each semester using the above mentioned categories. If the evaluations demonstrate that 75% have met or exceeded the criteria, we deem that the students have met Learning Outcome #1, #3, and #4. 75% - 8 students.

Findings: Based on qualitative comments, one (1) student performed less successfully as time went on. Ten (10) students showed progressively improved progress.

Changes: Given the qualitative comments are intended to guide students in creating a professional portfolio, revisions to evaluation form are suggested to include some kind of ranking of progress that can be quantified each semester with perhaps a different rubric for the final portfolio. This would provide more reliable assessment of student progress and attainment of student learning outcomes.
Tool #3 – Production Evaluations

Job Description Summary

Numerical Rankings
5- Exemplary, 4- Above Average, 3- Satisfactory, 2- Needs Improvement, 1- Needs Major Improvement, 0- Unacceptable and Written Comments

Four Primary Areas of Evaluation
- Artistic, managerial and technical achievement
- Communication and collaboration
- Execution of assignment
- Personal Qualities and Professionalism
## 2010 Seniors Production Evaluation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Prod #1</th>
<th>Prod #2</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A -scene</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - scene</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - sm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - cost</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-scene</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-td</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - sm</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-lights</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J- sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - scene</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Tool #3 Findings/Changes

The results of the individual advisors’ written production reports will be compiled and summarized by the Division Chair each spring. These results will be discussed with the Division faculty the end of each academic year. If the evaluations demonstrate that 75% of students are meeting or exceeding the production criteria, we deem that the students have met Learning Outcome #2, #3, and #4. 75% = 8 students

Findings: Seven (7) students scored between 4.9 and 3.8; three (3) of the eleven (11) students did not have production evaluations in their files.

Changes: Given the stipulation of one production situation per student, advisors and chair need to ensure that each student has at least one production assignment and the evaluation is placed in the student’s file.
Tool #4 - Showcase Evaluation and Placement

Showcase of Talent
  Presentation of portfolio to industry professionals with written feedback provided to students. Occurs in senior year.

Placement Data
  Professional activity after graduation
Showcase:
Ten (10) students out of the eleven (11) participated in the Showcase of Talent, 2010.

Placement:
Eight (8) students are currently placed in the profession:

Two (2) students have full time employment:
  Audio and lighting technician for Carnival Cruiseline
  Sound technician and engineer, Arizona Theatre Company

Three (3) students have part time employment:
  Art director for film, Tucson area.
  Free-lance scenic production work and U of A School of Music Opera technician, Tucson, AZ
  Assistant audio engineer, UA Presents, Tucson, AZ

Three (3) students have full-time fellowships or internships:
  Scenic artist internship at The Julliard School, New York
  Stage management fellow, Arena Stage, Washington, D.C.
  Production management fellowship at the Berkeley Repertory Theatre, Berkeley, CA
Assessment Tool #4 Findings/Changes

If the data indicates that 80% of students are favorably reviewed by outside professionals and at least 75% are placed in professional theatres, then we assume they are meeting objectives #3 and #4. 80% - 9 students

Findings: Data for Showcase of Talent relies on participation only. Evaluations from industry professionals during the event are orally given. Placement data indicates professional activity for eight (8) out of the eleven (11) students.

Changes: It is unlikely that written evaluations can be reliably obtained during this event. Suggestion might be to ask students to self-evaluate the impact of Showcase and oral evaluation on their learning.

Given the nature of professional theatre work, tracking placement beyond the anecdotal continues to be a challenge.
Benefits of Assessment

• Offers a common language for students and faculty to evaluate student progress and achievement. “What does good look like?”

• Provides a way of seeing the “holes” in the evaluation process. “What is missing in the work and/or the communication about the work?”

• Validates the teaching and learning that occurs.
Challenges to Assessment

In order to ensure reliable and consistent data across faculty and degree programs, time and staff must be devoted to...

- Create and evaluate effective measurements
- Record and enter data each semester
- Analyze data for each set of students in each degree program
- Update assessment web page with accurate information and data