COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2019-2020

College of Visual and Performing Arts:

School of Music

Department of Art and Design

Department of Theater

College: Visual & Performing Arts

Contact: VPA Assessment Committee Chair, Robert Shoquist - Theatre

Report Date: 1.25.21

PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs _____ 1
Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments _____ 4
Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings _____ 6
Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions _____ 7
Attachments _____ 9

PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs

Music

- All program level Student Learning Outcome's (SLO's) are stated with clarity, specificity, and in student-centered terms. They are mapped to common classes or learning activities and are aligned to all foundational areas of PFW's Baccalaureate Framework (BF). Specific items on the assessment are linked to the SLO's and the SLO's are assessed using at least two measures. There appears to be a consistent pattern of an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assesses student performance related to SLO's.
- The curricular map clearly identifies progression of student learning relative to all SLO's.
- The data collection process appears to be sound and specific enough to be actionable. And the methods used to ensure reliability of findings are clearly explained and support drawing meaningful conclusions however, statements of desired results (data targets) are missing.
- Results are clearly present and directly related to the SLO's and the interpretations of the results are reasonable given the SLO's and desired levels of student learning and methodology employed; however, historical data prior to the current assessment was not provided. The assessment data appears to be used to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and reassess learning.
- It appears as though the information has been routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration. The sharing of information with stakeholders beyond faculty is unclear.
- Past and current assessment process appears to be critically evaluated and specific changes to the assessment process are detailed.
- The department's report is very well executed and should serve as a model for other departments in terms of format, succinctness and content.

Art and Design

- While all program level Student Learning Outcome's (SLO's) contain rich description of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students and in student-centered terms, it was noted that a great number of the department's SLO's used on the word "demonstrate" and that some of Interior Design's SLO's could be more concise. Common classes or learning activities are identified for all students completing the program but most SLO's are not clearly mapped to classes or activities. The SLO's mapped to the work featured in exhibitions, portfolio reviews and capstone projects seems limited. The current SLO's appear to be aligned to all foundational areas of PFW's Baccalaureate Framework

(BF). A description of how SLO's relate to assessment is too general to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress toward SLO's although each SLO's is stated to be assessed using at least two measures. There is some evidence reported that demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's.

- The curricular map clearly identifies progression of student learning relative to all SLO's; however; in many cases this is a generalization of 100, 200 or 300/400 level classes.
- Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns but as is alluded to within the department report, the methods used to ensure reliability of findings are sometimes insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions. Statements of desired results (data targets) are missing.
- Results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLO's. Results inconsistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLO's. Use of generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment is unclear. Historical data was not provided. It appears likely that the assessment data is used to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and reassess learning, however, that is only evidenced by the departmental assertions within their report.
- It appears as though the information has been routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration. The sharing of information with stakeholders beyond faculty is unclear.
- Past and current assessment processes appear to be critically evaluated and general plans for improvement of the assessment process are proposed for some but not all areas within the department.

Theatre

- The department assessment report is not a summary of the department's assessment efforts which would be preferred. As such, Curricular Map A (which maps Student Learning Outcome's (SLO's) to the BF) and Curricular Map B (mapping the SLO's to common classes and learning activities expected of all students) were not presented for the whole department and for all learning activities and therefore the SLO's were difficult to locate and evaluate.
- At the class-level, the SLO's were mostly stated with clarity, specificity, and in student-centered terms. Most of the classes reviewed are shown to be mapped to SLO's (Theatre & Society II was not. Voice for the Actor used "D" in mapping progression (others used "I", "R" or "M") but no explanation was given as to why). The SLO's appear to only be assessed using one direct measure. Most of the classes are shown to be aligned to foundational areas

of PFW's Baccalaureate Framework (BF) (Voice for the Actor was not. Theatre and Society II didn't list or map all SLO's but then did map some as blank.). The Interim and Exit interviews were not addressed in the curricular maps to correlate to either the SLO's or the BF.

- At the class-level, most evidence reported demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's and describes curricular and/or pedagogical changes planned to reassess learning; however, no assessment findings are reported showing evidence of curricular or pedagogical changes for Interim and Exit interviews. Overall, limited or no evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/reassess is demonstrated due to a lack of historical data.
- Information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns at the class-level; however, with regards to the Interim and Exit interviews, methods to ensure reliability of findings are insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions. At both the class-level and for Interim and Exit interviews, statements of desired results (data targets) are missing.
- No details are given that the assessment report is distributed to all faculty. The report provides insufficient detail to be meaningful. The sharing of information with stakeholders beyond faculty is unclear.
- No details are given about past and current assessment process being evaluated, although the acknowledgement of flaws in the Interim & Exit interviews is noted. No evidence of improving upon past class-level assessment reporting is detailed but there is a suggestion of plans to improve assessment in future iterations of the Interim & Exit interviews.

SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments

Music

- Statements of desired results (data targets) are missing from the report; it is recommended to include them in future reports.
- Historical data prior to the current assessment was not provided; it is recommended to include it in future reports.

Art & Design

- It is suggested that the department revisit the SLO's to arrive at a fewer number within each degree program or possibly have a common set of SLO for multiple degree programs (BA vs. BFA). Overall, the departmental SLO's should be revisited so that they are more clearly defined and better correlate to assessment activities.
- Since exhibitions, portfolio reviews and thesis/capstone projects are the department's main means of assessment, it is suggested that they correlate to additional SLO's to assess the work featured therein on multiple levels.
- There appears to be little assessment within the Interior Design program outside of the class-level. The committee recommends exploration of additional assessment benchmarks to become consistent with the rest of the department and to ensure collection of evaluations from internships.
- The curricular maps should be expanded and updated to link to SLO's on a class-by-class level and not simply on the 100, 200 or 300/400 level.
- In order to ensure the reliability of findings, the methods for assessment that are employed throughout the department should be evaluated so that there is less potential for subjectivity in the reviews of student portfolios.
- It is suggested that all areas within the department critically evaluate their assessment process including an acknowledgement of flaws and intended improvements.
- The committee suggests the department review the School of Music's Assessment report as it is very well executed and serves as a model for other departments in terms of format, succinctness and content.
- It is suggested that the department consider a similar approach used by the School of Music with regards to their simple but comprehensive SLO's and curricular maps, as well as their proposed assessment review schedule.

SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

Theatre

- The decision (intended or otherwise) not to follow the Department/Program Assessment Outline https://www.pfw.edu/offices/assessment/academy/resources/Department%20Assessment%20Report%20Outline.pdf makes it extremely difficult to locate the requisite data and review the department's ongoing and overall assessment efforts. The committee suggests adherence to the outline going forward to aid the committee in reviewing the department assessment using a standard approach for the entirety of CVPA.
- What has been submitted is indeed an important step in department's *internal* review process but does not expand upon that process and produce a report of summary data that this committee can review. The committee suggests a more robust summary of the department's overall assessment efforts which includes historical data (including analysis and results), data targets and a full mapping to, and definitions of, SLO's for all assessment opportunities (Interim & Exit interviews and/or other learning activities expected of all students completing the program.). As such, class-level supporting documents (syllabi, grading rubrics, sample course work) need not been included in the summary submitted to this committee.
- It is suggested that the department critically evaluate the entirety of their assessment process and be sure to include an acknowledgement of flaws and/or intended improvements.
- The proposed changes to the Interim and Exit interviews are a good first step in addressing some of the stated flaws of the current process but the committee agrees that a correlation to the SLO's is necessary and suggests that the effort warrants continued revision and restructuring in order to produce meaningful conclusions as the department's only overarching assessment tool. As such, the committee strongly suggests incorporating a comprehensive audition, portfolio review or other applicable overarching assessment into the Interim and Exit interview process.
- The committee suggests the department review the School of Music's Assessment report as it is very well executed and serves as a model for other departments in terms of format, succinctness and content.
- It is suggested that the department consider a similar approach used by the School of Music with regards to their simple but comprehensive SLO's and curricular maps, as well as their proposed assessment review schedule.

SECTION 3: RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS

Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings

Describe changes in your review process based on last year's review and changes you expect to make in coming years based on the current year review.

The CVPA Assessment Committee consisted of:

1) Pamela Pierson - Music

2) John Hrehov - Art and Design

3) Robert Shoquist - Theater (Chair).

This committee met for several weeks in December 2020 and January 2021 to review the submitted Departmental Assessment Reports for 2019-2020. Kent Johnson, Director of Assessment attended one of our meetings to advise us of our responsibilities as members of the College Assessment Committee and to help us understand the rubrics used to evaluate the departmental reports. A summary of this committee's conclusions is expressed throughout this report.

- The CVPA committee adjusted their review process for each of the department level reports this year. Last year, each report was reviewed mainly by the department representative on the committee due to their unique viewpoint in understanding the discipline and, for the most part, their point-of-view was accepted by the committee on the whole. This year, each committee member was tasked to review and evaluate the assessment reports submitted by the other two departments within the college using the evaluation rubrics provided to us by the Office of Assessment. The review findings were then discussed amongst the entire committee (with the department member whose departmental report was being reviewed providing context and clarification) and consensus was reached. This proved to be much more objective and highlighted a desire by the committee for a more uniform approach to the departmental assessment reports in order to review them more consistently and fairly. It also emphasized a need for the departmental reports to include additional context for the different measures used within the department, the inclusion of more historical data and succinct summaries in order for the departmental report to be viewed by someone less familiar with the department, and to draw meaningful conclusions.
- There seemed to be some confusion at the department level as to when their reports were to be completed, leaving the committee with less than ideal time to conduct their review. More communication about and enforcement of deadlines would remedy the situation.

SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions

Describe, based on this years' experience, the overall quality of assessment in your college, provide recommendations for improving the assessment process at the department/program, college and institutional level and any additional resources your college might need to insure that assessment is being used to improve student learning.

- This committee very much appreciated the correlation between the School of Music's departmental report to the Department/Program Assessment Outline https://www.pfw.edu/offices/assessment/academy/resources/Department%20Assessment%20Report%20Outline.pdf especially the included parentheticals referencing specific sections of the guiding Senate Document SD 15-6 (supersedes SD 98-22). It would be most helpful if all departments would create and submit their reports within the framework of these two documents since the evaluation rubrics provided by the Office of Assessment correlate directly to them.
- Last year there was some mention from Kent Johnson, Director of Assessment, that the department level reporting would be moved to an online submission format. This committee welcomes this advancement and hopes that it will be implemented for the next departmental cycle because it may bring additional consistency to the departmental reports. As such, college-level review rubrics found in SD 15-6 (appendix D) are referenced by the Department/Program Assessment Outline (referenced above) with roman numerals but those roman numerals do not appear on the downloadable college-level review rubrics on the Office of Assessment website. It would be helpful if they were added to the downloadable rubrics and to any subsequent online rubric submission formats.
- This committee suggests that a greater system-wide emphasis on the correlation between SLO's and the department's assessment efforts is needed to better ensure that the department assessments are meaningful to improving student learning.
- This committee respectfully requests a more clearly communicated and comprehensive process/schedule that allows for a longer period of review for the departmental assessments and before submission of the college-level review to the Dean and/or Office of Assessment.
- This committee suggests more education is needed at the department level to develop robust, data-driven analysis, as well as, to increase support for the assessment review process as a tool to increase student learning.
- This committee has two questions regarding the college-level rubrics (Appendix D):
  A: Section I references "expectation levels". This committee would like more information as to the what these "basic expectations established by the University and other necessary

approving organizations required of the submitting unit" entails and/or where to find this information.

B: Section VI references "documents and results are shared with other stakeholders". This committee would like more information as to who or what is defined as "stakeholders (beyond faculty)".

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments

1. Departmental/Program Annual Assessment reports.
2. The completed Appendix D Rubrics for all departments/programs in CVPA. (It should be noted that the rubrics contain rough working notes from the committee discussion(s) and are only provided as reference and are not intended to be this committee's official response).