7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Information for Outcome 1 and Outcome 3 was not complete as of the writing of this initial summary, but SOTA expects to meet the measures for both outcomes when the assessment cycle concludes on June 30, 2016. An updated summary will address both outcomes when they are complete.

For Outcome 2, SOTA met its measures and compared favorably with peer institutions in two comparison groups. SOTA already has made the information from the two measures available to the chairs/directors, and it will continue to make information from the SNAAP report available to them in coming months. As time allows for a proper review of the report, SOTA will post information to its website and share it with constituent groups. This process is ongoing.

For Outcome 4, SOTA met its measures. The 2015 - 2016 year was the first cycle in which SOTA has reviewed this data for assessment. As SOTA charts the data in coming years, the information will facilitate budget planning. This process is ongoing.

Update on August 11, 2016

For Outcome 1, SOTA exceeded its measures. The School will continue to gather the data in coming years.

For Outcome 3, SOTA fell just short of the first measure, but it exceeded the second measure. All information about gifts and gift revenues inform budgeting discussions within the School.
7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The last two years have been focused on writing skills by comparing draft and final versions of papers for both courses. Our writing rubric is producing data that suggests there is improvement in writing skills for students, and that our emphasis on skill acquisition is being communicated to students. This was clearly demonstrated in the responses to our anonymous student surveys this year, which can be accessed at:

ARTH 299 Fall 2015: https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-9TNJCQ7R/
ARTH 415 Fall 2015: https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-55MFCQ7R/
ARTH 299 Spring 2016: https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-GWTKJQ7R/
ARTH 415 Spring 2016: https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-CJWNJQ7R/

The writing rubric was applied in 299 and 415 to drafts and final papers, and all writing assignments in one section of 299 (fall 2016) to get deeper data. Survey Monkey surveys were sent to all students in both courses both semesters. Poll Everywhere software was used in one section of 299 and one of 415 for peer review of presentations.

The student survey we initiated this year is to help us gauge student awareness of and response to the learning outcomes of 299 and 415. There was a disconnect between how we perceived visual analysis skills being demonstrated in their writing, and how it could be clearly captured with the writing rubric. In recognition of this problem we will score writing assignments for 299 and 415 to assess for visual analysis using a rubric we have developed this year that specifically addresses visual analysis skills.

The assessment of writing skills via the rubric measures remains very valuable to us. Although students are meeting the criteria, we wish to maintain this as an important element in our assessment process. The students find the writing rubric valuable, and certain sections of the rubric address their written communication skills directly.

Acquisition of better communication skills will be pursued through peer assessment of oral class presentations again next year. This year was a trial run with one section of 299 and one section of 415 participating in peer assessment of class presentations. Students respond very positively to this exercise: it has improved their presentation preparation, it engages their peers more directly in the presentation, and it gives the students the challenge to assess the quality of their fellow students' work. In fact, they often valued their peers' reaction more than the professor's.
Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The faculty of Arts Management began a discussion in 2014-15 on academic rigor in our classrooms. It was determined that a review of all assessment tools used in each Arts Management classroom would be examined by faculty in 2015-16. During Fall 2015, the roster and adjunct faculty discussed various methods used in assessing student learning in each class in the Arts Management curriculum. While the faculty have few reservations with the program's instructional goals, the Fall 2015 review revealed that an in-depth examination of specific methods, measures and their associated rubrics used in courses be completed during the 2016-17 academic year so that they might be more closely aligned with assessment, curricular and pedagogical methods among peer programs of the Association of Arts Administration Educators (AAAE). The need to review assessment methods, measures and rubrics among peer AAAE programs was not only discussed during the faculty's 2015-16 assessment review, but it was also expressed in the 2014-15 assessment report of ARTM 310. In that report, faculty who taught the more experiential and hands-on ARTM 310 course where group work was the norm, were interested in rubrics used by AAAE faculty that offer innovative ways that students self-assess in group work outside of class time.

As a result, in our bi-monthly faculty meetings during 2016-17, we will not only examine rubrics used in AAAE undergraduate arts management classrooms for group work and student self-assessment, but also those used in assessing internship experiences by onsite supervisors, academic/faculty supervisors, and students. NOTE: This was our plan for 2015-16, however with our small program of roster faculty, a search for two tenure-track faculty during Spring and Fall 2015, and the sabbatical appointment of the director during Spring 2016, it is preferred that this important review for the program's capstone courses (ARTM 400 and 401) happen with a full complement of roster faculty beginning Fall 2016.

Halsey Institute
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Historic Preservation & Community Planning - BA/Minor

Historic Preservation and Community Planning BA
7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Student assessment results in both HPCP 199 and in HPCP 415 are not at our target of 50% scoring 85% or better in their assessed assignments. Improvements can be made in the three specific assessment areas in the written assignments for each course. With targeted instruction and highlighting of rubrics in these courses, we expect to approach our target in coming assessment cycles.

Music - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The assessment of Outcome 5 (Ensemble Performance) during the 2014-15 cycle provided solid groundwork for this cycle’s assessment of the orchestra in that it provided us a useful the rubric-based assessment of ensemble performance. We did find that the adaptations of that instrument for this year’s assessment provided richer and more data in the following ways:

1. **Improvement to assessment instrument: disaggregating the students’ performance by instrumental section.** Not only are students playing a woodwind instrument demonstrating different sorts of competencies than string or brass students, but each of these sections performance skills are developed by separate applied faculty. The disaggregated data showed that students playing instruments taught by roster faculty (violin and cello) excelled, while the skill levels for instruments supported by adjunct instructors were more varied. This is partially because the department is better positioned to recruit music majors to study with roster faculty; thus students on other instruments are more likely to be minors or non-majors, and therefore also less likely to benefit from instrumental lessons each semester.

2. **Improvement to instructional strategy: additional instructional time for instrumentalists without roster faculty applied instruction.** Considering these results, our orchestra director devoted more rehearsal time to instructing those sections that were not performing as well early in the year. By the end of the year this difference paid off, as scores for all sections improved substantially. Ensemble directors will continue to employ this strategy in the future, as the other potential solution – additional roster lines for applied positions for each of the 9 orchestral instruments currently taught only by adjuncts – is not financially feasible.

3. **Improvement to assessment instrument: performance-based assessment of other curricular goals (Grammar of Music and Music History).** These results were mixed: since all of our students easily cleared these targets at the first assessment of the year, this data did not provide meaningful challenges for future improvement. Nonetheless, the skills necessary to demonstrate competence in the Grammar of Music are substantially different for instrumentalists and vocalists, therefore the department adapted the assessment plan for next year to focus on assessing this SLO through vocal performance. For Music History, the additional data suggested that students are in fact improving in this area during the course of the year in orchestra, and that we should continue to include this outcome in future rubric-
based assessments of instrumental performance. But while historical knowledge is necessary for professional performance, measuring applied knowledge of music history only through performance is not sufficient to adequately assess whether our students achieve this outcome. In future years we will return to assessing this outcome through artifacts related to the Music History curriculum, as we did in cycles 2011-12 and 2012-13.

Studio Art - BA/Minor
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Theatre and Dance

Dance - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

While the program is still in its early stages of assessment, the ongoing process of institutional evaluation has allowed for re-evaluation of the assessment tools; this has led to a considerable strengthening and refinement of learning outcomes. Prior to AY 2015-16, the learning outcomes for the dance program were too vague to be sufficiently measured and assessed. Since the AY2014-15 assessment cycle, the dance program has developed a program-specific mission statement; the Department of Theatre and Dance has also updated its mission statement. Our mission statements can now be anchored to our Learning Outcomes, with demonstrable criteria for assessment.

For the AY2015-16, the dance program met all but one of its measures (SLO #3- Students will demonstrate knowledge of classical ballet vocabulary on written exams with a score of 75% or higher).

As the 2016-17 assessment cycle begins, the dance program is committed to refining rubrics that are more nuanced and accurately reflect specific measures that are being assessed. These new rubrics will be adopted into DANC 285 and THTR 202 courses.

One overarching challenge that the dance program faces is the lack of full-time faculty. There is currently one FTE and seven adjuncts. This places the entire burden of data collection, analysis and assessment onto one person, who is also directing the program, teaching a full
course load, advising students, and engaging in creative research and scholarship. The dance program is primarily delivered through adjunct instruction (90%), which makes effective assessment more difficult.

---

**Theatre - BA/Minor**

**Assessment Report Summary**

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement:** Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The department first began attempting to assess our Production Practicums in 2013-14. These courses had been graded almost solely on the basis of whether or not students completed their production assignments, with little oversight by faculty. Because of difficulties defining the methods of evaluation for those courses, assessment efforts failed for a couple of years. The courses were renumbered and procedures put in place for greater faculty oversight during the school year 2014-15.

In 2015-16 the department assessed the revised Practicum, THTR201 and the advanced class THTR 289, using a newly constructed rubric that expands the criteria that go into each student’s grade. This year serves as a baseline for that rubric, and this course will continue to be assessed according to that rubric in the coming years. Faculty learned that with the change in the rubric they are better able to address student learning on an individual basis and plan to create a survey for students to take at the start of these courses that will help assess their development throughout the course project.

Script Analysis (THTR276) has been assessed in relation to the following Theatre program learning outcome: **students will demonstrate the ability to use and critically analyze primary and secondary source materials.**

In 2014-15 papers from the two sections were assessed, but no rubric was applied. Different faculty teaching multiple sections of this course used their own individual methods of grading and evaluation. For the 2015-16 year a common rubric was used by the faculty teaching the course. For the 2016-17 year the faculty will norm that rubric to ensure consistent grading across sections.

In **Introduction to Theatre (THTR 176)** students are assessed on writing in the discipline. The faculty usually look at the last paper of the semester. Since the department is actually interested in the progress from the first paper to the last, the assessment will change slightly for the next year.

The department also looked at the numbers of dance major students taking theatre classes and theatre major students taking dance classes. The numbers were better than expected so this will not be assessed again next year.