



ASSESSMENT REPORT

Performing Arts and Social Justice Major with concentrations in Dance, Music, and Theater

ACADEMIC YEAR 2020 - 2021

I. LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Megan Nicely
Performing Arts Chair
Dance Program Co-Coordinator
nicely@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) an aggregate report for a Major & Minor (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

Performing Arts & Social Justice Major with concentrations in Dance, Music, and Theater

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Has there been any revisions to the Curricular Map since October 2019?

We updated the Map last year and it is attached at the end of this document.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2020? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below.

Mission Statement (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

Our Department offers the unique Performing Arts and Social Justice major, with concentrations in dance, music, and theater. The faculty and staff are committed to providing coursework, activities, and productions that acknowledge and study the performing arts' role as an agent of creative and social change. We strive to achieve academic and artistic excellence in the classroom, on stage, and in the community, offering students professional preparation for a variety of careers in the performing arts, as well as for further study, while working towards a more humane and just society.

No changes

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2020? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below.

PLOs (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

1. Analyze principles, works, and methodologies in the Performing Arts within their socio-historical contexts.
2. Apply technique and conceptual skills to creative and scholarly practices.
3. Explain how the Performing Arts contribute to a humane and just society.
4. Prepare for professional work or graduate studies in Performing Arts and related fields.

No changes

3. State the particular Program Learning Outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2019-2020. PLO(s) being assessed (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

PLO #1 Analyze principles, works, and methodologies in the Performing Arts within their socio-historical contexts.

III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s)
Methodology used (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

This is the first time the Department has assessed this PLO, which was developed after our 2016 APR, so the alternate assessment methods offered were not applicable. Since the Senior Capstone does not have a sufficient assignment at this time, and since it is used to assess a number of other PLOs (in fact nearly all of them), the Department opted to use a new assignment/work product from a relatively new junior majors course, PASJ 280 Research Methods (now re-numbered to PASJ 385) which leads to PASJ 480/485 Senior Capstone sequence, as a way to measure development/mastery of PLO #1. The work product was a written project proposal, and we used a direct method of evaluation. The course instructors gathered the work products and the Chair organized them and redacted names. The Chair (Megan Nicely) and one other FT faculty (Amie Dowling) designed the Rubric based on similar Minor PLO rubrics and calibrated it using two of the work products. The Program Assistant (Jesica Bockelman) created scoring sheets and distributed them to FT faculty scorers using Google Drive.

Four of seven full time faculty members completed the Assessment during the week of October 4, 2021. The scorers were: Alexandra Amati, Amie Dowling, Megan Nicely, and Christine Young. One faculty member, Peter Novak, was on leave and therefore did not participate. Two faculty members, Byron Au Yong and Roberto Varea, recused themselves from participating. There were 11 student work products and each was intended to be evaluated by 2 faculty members and the data gathered and averaged. Due to reduced participation and efforts not to overburden the participating scorers by simply adding additional work products to their docket, we asked for volunteers to take on extra work products. One faculty member (Christine Young) took on an extra work product. As such, the work products overall were not evenly scored and one was not scored at all; many were only scored by one person.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

Results (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

The major takeaways from assessing PLO #1 were as follows:

1. The data, as noted above, is not robust and it is difficult to draw concrete conclusions. Based on what we do have, 50% of students scored in the Mastery area for PLO #1, yet nearly all of the other 50% scored in the lowest range. As seen in the table below; 20% of students displayed complete mastery of the outcome, 30% displayed mastery of the outcome in most parts, 10% of students displayed some mastery of the outcome, and 40% showed no mastery of the outcome. We stress that this is the first time we have assessed this PLO, we did not have a representative work product, and we also did not have enough scorers to complete the assessment according to best practices.
2. Note to remove the word “Mastery” from the verbiage going forward and re-evaluate the rubric for equitable language.

Assessment Data

Level	Percentage of Students (11 students were evaluated)
Complete Mastery of the outcome (3.5-4.0)	20% (2/10)
Mastered the outcome in most parts (2.75-3.5)	30% (3/10)
Mastered some parts of the outcome (2.0-2.75)	10% (1/10)
Did not master the outcome at the level intended (1.0-2.0)	40% (4/10)

3. This was the first time the Department assessed this PLO and it is clear that a) we do not have an assignment directly tied to it to evaluate and b) the rubric did not fully match the assignment, even as it linked to the PLO. Evaluating a work product that did not quite meet the PLO or the rubric definitely lowered the scores. The full-time faculty will meet with the course instructors to develop or replace the current assignment in order to address this PLO going forward, and we also note that a new rubric will need to be developed once an appropriate work product is selected. That said, the assignment itself was a good addition to the curriculum overall in preparing students for their Senior Capstone project, so it may be that this is just not the right assignment to evaluate the PLO.
4. One item for discussion is where this PLO is developed and “mastered” in the major curriculum. The PLO is introduced in PASJ 110 Intro to PASJ and most significantly in the PASJ “ASH” classes (Dance/Music, Theater and Social History), but it is unclear in the major “spine” classes where PLO #1 is further developed in the students’ junior and senior years, given that the Sr. Projects class did not have a sufficient assignment. It may be, based on the curricular map, that this PLO is best assessed in discipline-specific classes instead. Further, it seems worthwhile to discuss how this PLO is meaningfully taught and integrated into classes and if the expectations about this PLO differ by discipline. Other questions such as is the PLO properly articulated/worded to align with the PASJ Major mission and values also remain. We will soon be making adjustments to the curriculum, and this PLO

will be an area of focus.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP

1. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

Closing the Loop (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

For future assessments of this PLO, our Department will consider the following:

- Look at the curriculum map and determining if discipline-specific classes are a better location for evaluating this PLO
- Develop a new assignment in a junior or senior-level majors class and directly addresses the PLO
- Develop a new rubric that better addresses the current assignment used but that also addresses the PLO as written
- Revise the PLO itself

The university, the department, and the performing arts as a discipline are undergoing significant re-evaluation of their values, teaching and grading methods, labor practices, and skills and practices that support students graduating and entering the field. We continue to see a disconnect in some cases between the PLOs written in 2016 to align with Core F arts outcomes, and the content we actually focus on around community engagement, facilitation and teaching skills, and creative work in relation to social justice. This PLO in particular: “Analyze principles, works, and methodologies in the Performing Arts within their socio-historical contexts” takes a historical lens on the arts that is not emphasized in all 3 disciplines. However, it would be incorrect to say that our students are not aware of social issues and their impact on the arts--quite the contrary. Student work directly focuses on social issues, but less within a historical arts trajectory. This leads me to state that a better understanding of the PLO’s intention is needed within the Department.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2018-2019, submitted in October 2019)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

Suggestions (Performing Arts & Social Justice Major):

Last year’s report also assessed a PLO for the first time (#4), and in a similar vein we did not have an appropriate work product to actually gather meaningful data. Last year we felt our data showed “below average” results, but this was a purely numeric evaluation and not reflective of work being done. We face a similar situation this year. This year marks the completion of assessment of all 4 of our PLOs. It is now time to create assignments -- different assignments -- that specifically speak to these PLOs and embed them in classes in the curriculum, or rewrite the PLOs to better reflect the Department’s Major areas of focus.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

1. **Assessment Rubric for PLO #1**
2. **Raw Data**
3. **Curriculum Map**

PASJ Major PLO #1: Analyze principles, works, and methodologies in the performing arts within their socio-historical contexts.

PASJ PLO #1 Rubric				
Criteria	Exceptional (4)	Acceptable (3)	Developing (2)	Inadequate (1)
Can situate works, artists, and social issues within their historical time period and geographic location [Please use # 3) Background for evaluation]	<i>Can confidently, clearly, and correctly place performance works and artists within historical and geographic contexts</i>	<i>Has a good idea of where artists and works fall within historical and geographic contexts and can express it clearly</i>	<i>Has an approximate idea of where artists and works fall within historical and geographic context</i>	<i>Cannot (or did not) place artists or works within the chronological continuum</i>
Can analyze trends and/or make connections between artistic/performance styles, forms, and/or cultures [Please use # 3) Background and #4) Position in the Field for evaluation]	<i>Can discuss coherently and completely the connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles within a culture and/or across cultures</i>	<i>Has a demonstrated competent but not comprehensive understanding of the connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles within a culture and/or across cultures</i>	<i>Can sometimes discuss connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles within a culture but not always, and not always with a broad understanding</i>	<i>Cannot see connections between works and styles within a culture</i>
Can contextualize works within their appropriate socio-economic environment [Please use #4) Position in the Field for evaluation]	<i>Can situate most or all performance works within their socio-economic context and can explain the relationship between the works and society/social issues</i>	<i>Has a demonstrated awareness of socio-economic context for dance works and can make a link between them</i>	<i>Can sometimes and/or only superficially discuss connections between performance works and social issues.</i>	<i>Is not able to recognize that works of art are dependent on and related to their socio-economic environment</i>
Uses appropriate methods to analyze and discuss works within their cultural context [Please use # 1) Title, #2) Questions/Objectives, and #6) Plan for evaluation]	<i>Has a broad and deep understanding of what methods and terminology are appropriate for analyzing performance works within a culture or across cultures, and can demonstrate their use</i>	<i>Has a good, if at times limited/incomplete grasp of the methods and terminology used to analyze performance works within a culture or across cultures, and can demonstrate their use</i>	<i>Has an approximate but acceptable understanding of the methods and terminology used to analyze performance works</i>	<i>Does not understand the methods and terminology used to analyze performance works</i>

Adapted by Megan Nicely and Amie Dowling - September 2021 from earlier Dance and Music Minor assessments of the same PLO

Raw Assessment Data

WP Number	1 Can situate works, artists, and social issues within their historical time period and geographic location			2 Can analyze trends and/or make connections between artistic/performance styles, forms, and/or cultures			3 Can contextualize works within their appropriate socio-economic environment			4 Uses appropriate methods to analyze and discuss works within their cultural context			Average Total	Notes
	rating 1	rating 2	Average	rating 1	rating 2	Average	rating 1	rating 2	Average	rating 1	rating 2	Average		
1_ReresrchMethods	3		3	4		4	4		4	4		4	3.75	only 1 scorer
2_ReresrchMethods	4		4	4		4	4		4	4		4	4.00	only 1 scorer
3_ReresrchMethods	2	1	1.5	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1.63	
4_ReresrchMethods														Not scored
5_ReresrchMethods	2.5		2.5	3		3	3		3	3		3	2.88	only 1 scorer
6_ReresrchMethods	2	4	3	2	3	2.5	3	4	3.5	2	3	2.5	2.88	
7_ReresrchMethods	2		2	1		1	1		1	1		1	1.25	only 1 scorer
8_ReresrchMethods	1	2	1.5	2	2	2	1	2	1.5	2	2	2	1.75	
9_ReresrchMethods	2		2	2		2				2		2	1.50	criteria 3 not scored
10_ReresrchMethods	3	3	3	3.5	4	3.75	3.5	4	3.75	3.50	3	3.25	3.44	
11_ReresrchMethods	3		3	2		2	2		2	3		3	2.50	only 1 scorer
Overall Averages			2.55			2.63			2.75			2.58	2.56	

Curriculum Map

A	B	C	D	E
last updated 10.19.20	PLO1	PLO2	PLO3	PLO4
PASJ Curriculum Map	Analyze principles, works, and methodologies in the Performing Arts within their socio-historical contexts.	Apply technique and conceptual skills to creative and scholarly practices.	Explain how the Performing Arts contribute to a humane and just society.	Prepare for professional work or graduate studies in Performing Arts and related fields.
PASJ SPINE (all concentrations)				
PASJ 110 Introdution to PASJ	I	I	I	I
PASJ XXX Lab Electives (2)		I		I
PASJ 120 Workshop in Stage Production		I		I
PASJ 220 Design Lab		D		D
PASJ 280: Research Methods	D	D	D	D
PASJ 380: Performing Arts and Community Exchange	D	D	D	D
PASJ 480: Senior Project	M	M	M	M
Dance Concentration (in addition to spine)				
DANC 180 Dance and Social History	I	I	D	I
DANC 200 Dance Composition I	I/D	I/D		
DANC 300 Dance Composition II	D/M	D/M		D
DANC 200-300 series Adv. Technique Electives		D/M		D/M
DANC 200-level Core F classes	D	I	I	
DANC 360 Dance in the Community	D	D	D	D
DANC 480-01/02 Workshop in Dance Production		D		D
Music Concentration (in addition to spine)				
MUS 181 Music and Social History	I	I	D	I
Music 110/111: Instrumental or vocal ensembles	I	D		
Music 120 series: Applied: Private Lesson		D/M		I
Music 200 series Core F Music Elective	D		I	
MUS 205 Anthropology of Music	D	I	I	
MUS 300 Music Theory I	I	D		
MUS 301 History of Western Art Music to 1800	M			
Music 310 series: Theory II	I	D		I
MUS 392 Seminar in Western Art Music from 1800	M			I
Theater Concentration (in addition to spine)				
THTR 182 Theater and Social History	I	I	D	I
THTR 110 Acting Foundations		I		I
THTR 220 Acting II - Scene Study		D		D
THTR 320 Theatrical Composition	I/D	I/D		D
THTR 300-level (Core F/CD) Performance and Cultural	D	D	D	D
THTR 330 Theater Technique Electives		D/M		D
THTR 340-series Technical Craft electives		D/M		D
THTR 372 Workshop in Play Production		D		D
Key:				
I = Introductory				
D = Developing				
M = Mastery				