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Please organize your report by the following topics.

I. Mission
The Missouri Valley College theatre program is committed to providing experiential opportunities and personal instruction while encouraging intellectual inquiry which will allow students to become enhanced learners, citizens, and performers.

II. Goals
Ensure that students have a solid grounding in theatre history and literature
Ensure that students have a solid grounding in dramatic theory
Ensure that students have an understanding of script and performance analysis
Ensure that students have an understanding of the collaborative process
Ensure that students have an understanding of the role of theatre within society
Ensure that students develop solid vocal techniques
Ensure that students develop solid movement techniques
Ensure that students develop a solid process for character development

III. Student learning outcomes
SLO #1 Students will be able to identify and describe the historical dimensions of theatre including the works of the major playwrights, practitioners and theorists.
SLO #2 Students will demonstrate the ability to apply script and performance analysis to practical situations.
SLO #3 Students will Explain and practice the basic communication processes related to collaborative theatrical production.
SLO #4 Students will Demonstrate the ability to apply process and performance techniques to theatrical production.
SLO #5 Students will Identify and work conceptually with the elements of theatre including literature, performance, and design.
SLO #6 Students will exhibit proficiency in a focus area developed by the student and the academic advisor.

IV. Course map
V. Assessment tools
SLO 1-6 are assessed as part of TH 450 Portfolio Review
This assessment includes:
Exit exam - designed to assess SLO #1, SLO #2, SLO #3, and SLO #5
The exit exam can be divided into 4 sections. The first section focuses primarily on SLO #1 covering history and literature. The second section focuses on SLO #3 and the collaborative process, The third focuses on SLO # 5 the understanding of aesthetic qualities, and the fourth section focuses on SLO #2 script analysis.

Senior Exit Review/ Interview w/ portfolio or Monologues - designed to assess SLO #4, SLO #5, and SLO #6
Students present resume and headshot along with either a monologue presentation(for performance emphasis) or portfolio presentation. Students also prepare written responses to the following prompts:

1. How do you see yourself applying your education to your future endeavors?
2. Compare yourself now to where you were when you started your college career.
3. Where have you, as an artist, grown the most?
4. How do you want to affect other people by the art that you produce?
5. Identify the challenges that you, as an artist, face. How do you plan to address these challenges?
6. What is the next step in your professional growth development?
7. What have been your most beneficial experiences at MVC?
8. What do you consider the strengths of the MVC program to be?
9. What suggestions would you have to strengthen this program?

During the Interview & portfolio/monologue presentation, students are asked to clarify or expand on these questions, their resumes, or on their portfolios or monologues.

They are evaluated by department faculty based on their achievement of the student learning outcomes #2, #4, #5, and #6

Below is a copy of the rubric used by faculty:

Based on the student’s performance in practical theatrical situations, in the classroom, and on the exit audition/interview, please rate the student’s abilities to do the following:

1. demonstrate the ability to apply script and performance analysis to practical situations. SLO #2
   a. Excellent
   b. Average
   c. Inadequate

2. explain and practice the basic communication processes related to collaborative theatrical production SLO #4
   a. Excellent
   b. Average
   c. Inadequate

3. identify and work conceptually with the elements of theatre including literature, performance, and design SLO #5
   a. Excellent
   b. Average
   c. Inadequate

For performance students add – SLO #6

4. exhibit proficiency in diverse acting techniques and styles
   a. Excellent
   b. Average
   c. Inadequate

For design/tech students add –

5. exhibit proficiency in various technical and design concentrations and styles
   a. Excellent
   b. Average
   c. Inadequate

To determine numbers for the ratings, the following scale was used:
Excellent = 3
Average = 2
Inadequate = 1
Describe the assessment method(s) used for each student learning outcome. Classify each tool as a direct or indirect measure. Are assessment methods feasible, efficient, cost effective, and appropriate for the learning outcomes in the major? What assessment measures do you use with your seniors as a summative measure of how well they have achieved the program level learning outcomes? The list of tools does not include every method you have used to assess your students throughout the program.

VI. Summary of findings/Level of achievement of student learning outcomes

The exit exam was given to the two graduating seniors. The individual results were an 83% and a 69% percent for an average of 76%. For section one of the exam (SLO #1) the students scored an 82% and a 64% for an average of 73%. For section 2 of the exam (SLO# 3) the students scored 80% and 56.7% for an average of 68.35%. For section 3 of the exam (SLO #5) both students score an 80%. For section 4 of the exam (SLO #2) the students scored 87.1% and 83.9% for an average of 85.5%.

While we don’t have entrance exam numbers for these individual students to compare to, we did give the exam to our incoming freshman and can make some comparisons to these scores. The exam was also given to two other seniors who will be graduating later in the summer.

The incoming freshmen who took the exam scored an average of 32% on the exam; scoring an average of 24.2% on the first section (SLO #1), 39.9% on the second section(SLO# 3), 44% on the third section (SLO #5), and 25.85 on the fourth section(SLO #2).

Two graduating seniors completed the exit interview/ monologue process for SLO # 2 the scores were 2(average), and 1.75(slightly below average) for an average of 1.875 (slightly below average). For SLO #4 the scores were 2.25 (slightly above average) and 3 (excellent) for an overall average of 2.65. For SLO #5 the students score 2.125 and 2 for an average of 2.0625. For SLO # 6 both students scored 2 for an average of 2.

Using the exam as a measurement for level of achievement for SLO #1 we see that while one student fell below the 70 % threshold, on average our students achieved a 73%. We can also see a significant increase over the freshman score of 24.2%.

In evaluating SLO # 2 we can look at two measures. One is the exam result the second is the exit interview result. Both students scored above average on this section of the exam scoring 87.1% and 83.9% for an average of 85.5%. During the exit interview, the combined score were just below average with a 1.875 score.

For SLO # 3 we have the exam results to draw from. The average was 68.35%. One student scored above average with a score of 80% while the other scored far below average with a 56.7%. It is interesting to note that of the incoming freshman, one equaled the lower score of 56.7%, and one surpassed it with a score of 60%.
For SLO #4 we have the results of the exit interview to draw on. Both students scored above average with scores of 2.25 and 3 for an average of 2.65.

For SLO #5 we can look at both the exam and the exit interview scores. Both students scored 80% on this section of the exam. During the exit interview the students scored 2.125 and 2 for an average of 2.0625.

To evaluate SLO #6 we used the exit interview where both students scored a 2 or average.

Summary- Based on these results, it would appear that our students are meeting the expectations of all of the student learning outcomes except for SLO #3 (Students will explain and practice the basic communication processes related to collaborative theatrical production.) With a sampling of only two it is difficult at this point to determine if this is a trend, or an anomaly. It is important to note that the student with the low score in this section rarely worked outside the realm of performance, but the sample is really too small.

While we also had a student fall below 70% on SLO#1 (Students will be able to identify and describe the historical dimensions of theatre including the works of the major playwrights, practitioners and theorists.) the trend has been to have low scores in this area.

A major improvement is in SLO #2 (Students will demonstrate the ability to apply script and performance analysis to practical situations.)

VII. Analysis/Interpretation

There are still a large number of unknowns in terms of what these results tell us as they are essentially an assessment of a program in transition. It does appear that efforts to bolster the analytical skills of our students are paying off. It also seems as if the understanding of the importance of theatre history is increasing as well.

Facilities and equipment upgrades would help with SLO #3 as it would allow our students to learn protocols associated with the latest technology.

A look at the total number of majors indicates that we still need to improve recruitment and retention. Increased numbers will have a positive impact on our ability to teach the collaborative process in practical setting. It will also increase competition among students providing a stronger motivator for excellence. It will also impact our ability to attract and retain higher quality students.

VIII. Action plan/Closing the loop

We have just implemented significant changes to the theatre Major curriculum. Part of this was driven by previous assessments and a desire to improve our offerings, and part was driven by a downsizing of the department by one faculty position.
We are also a year in to a push to strengthen our recruiting efforts. Some of these efforts are paying dividends in terms of making contacts with more students and teachers who have the ability to influence the college choices of students. We need to make improvements in our ability to close the deal (getting more students to visit our campus, audition for scholarships, sign on as freshmen). This past year our recruiting efforts included:

**Attending the International Thespian Conference**

This was attended by Professor Jay Rozema and adjunct professor Dyann Rozema. They served as adjudicators for the tech challenge. This resulted in a stack of inquiry cards, several applications, and a follow up recruiting trip by professor Rozema to Jonesboro, AR. The 2 students from this trip have been packaged; we are waiting to see if they sign.

**Attending the Speech Theatre Association of Missouri annual conference**

This was attended by professors Rozema and Hynick, both presented workshops.

It resulted in booking additional workshops at individual High Schools.

**Attending recruiting fairs in St. Louis and Kansas City**

**Presenting workshops at High Schools**

Professor Hynick and the MVC Flatliners presented improv workshops at Truman High School, and at Belton High School. This produced some inquiry card action, but no packaged students at this point.

Professor Rozema ???

**Attending the Missouri Thespian Conference**

This was attended by professors Rozema and Hynick. Both presented workshops and judged events as well as recruiting at the department display table. We also invested in the audition callback breakfast which allowed us to have a more focused recruiting session with seniors. It resulted in a stack of inquiry cards, application. We are waiting to see if we get signatures from the students who were packaged from this event.

**Judging Speech and Theatre Tournaments**

Professor Hynick judged a district tournament at Mexico, MO in March. While no hard recruiting can occur at such an event, some scouting was accomplished, and a possibility for additional recruiting at Moberly Community College emerged.

Accepted Recruiting Web Site
Professor Hynick has contacted numerous recruits through this site. Two of the freshman we signed this past year were from Acceptd.

Improv Jam
This spring we implemented the Improv Jam as a means to promote our improv program, and bring students to campus. There was a great deal of interest, and we managed to generate some solid publicity for our program, but the timing conflicted with proms and other theatrical organization meetings, resulting in a low turnout.

What we hear from prospects who have a great deal of interest in our new program but don’t sign is that they are able to get more aid elsewhere, or the technical facilities at another institution would provide them with more advanced training elsewhere.

Given the analysis above, we have developed the following action plan:

1. Increasing Number of Majors to 25 in the next 5 years
   A. Sign 10 freshman theatre majors each year
      a. get 10 applicants from the international Thespian Festival packaged by Jan. 1 get an additional 10 by March 1
      b. get 4 applicants packaged from referrals at the STAM conference packaged by Jan. 1 and additional 2 by March 1
      c. get 4 applicants from HS workshops packaged by Jan. 1 and an additional 6 by March 1
      d. get 10 applicants from the North Texas Auditions packaged by Jan. 1 and an additional 10 by March 1
      e. get 4 applicants from the Fall Improv Jam packaged by Jan. 1 and an additional 4 by March 1
      f. get 20 recruits to attend our Fall production of Pippin of these, get 5 packaged by Jan. 1 get an additional 5 by March 1
      g. get 6 Accept’d applicants packaged by Jan. 1 and an additional 10 by March 1
      h. get 15 applicants from the Missouri Thespian Festival packaged by March 1 and an additional 5 by April 15
         • These numbers would allow us to reach the 100 threshold we would need to get the magic 10% signee to packed applicant ratio
   
   B. Retain at least 50%
      a. assign incoming students an upperclassman to serve as a mentor
b. meet with freshmen on a bi-weekly basis to cover departmental and institutional expectation issues, and to provide them with an opportunity to express concerns

c. provide more opportunities for informal social networking

C. Bolster upper division numbers with at least 2 transfer recruits per year

a. Work with State Fair Community College, Moberly Community College, Highland Community College, and Metropolitan Community College to present improv performances and workshops on their campuses

b. Work with State Fair Community College, Moberly Community College, Highland Community College, and Metropolitan Community College, to identify potential transfer students.

D. Investigate ways to offer more to incoming students, and implement these incentives.

E. Investigate Best Practices for Growing Student Numbers in the Performing Arts and Implement these Strategies

a. Visit Bethel University and find out how they managed to build their program so quickly.

b. implement those strategies here!

F. Increase public awareness of our program.

a. Increase performance opportunities in and outside of Marshall

b. Send publicity materials to arts related media outlets in Columbia, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Springfield.

c. livestream Flatliners and other non-royalty performances

d. increase YouTube and other social media presence

2. Facilities and Equipment Improvements –

Theatre size limits the style and scope of shows. No fly house restricts our ability to fly scenery as well as prohibits us the ability to teach flying operating and safety procedures.

Without sufficient storage for costumes we are limited in what our stock can hold, thus limiting the amount of period and modern costumes we build, also limiting our ability to teach sewing (costuming) techniques. Without sufficient storage for scenery we waste more due to having to “throw away”.

The lack of LED and moving light capabilities, along with the support equipment needed for them, becomes a little problematic for the teaching of DMX protocol, a necessary skill for the modern lighting technician.

The lack of a dedicated design space limits our abilities to teach certain rendering and model making techniques.

The lack of access to theatre specific software and design software reduces what we can offer technologically for design / tech focused students. We have
no Vectorworks, Lightwright, DAW software, etc., as well as no way to print larger plotted drawings.

The MET makes an excellent laboratory theatre for acting classes, workshop productions (focused on acting), and improv performances, but lacks an adequate power supply to serve as a fully functioning theatre or lighting lab. It also need internet access and smart classroom capabilities in order to be used more effectively as a classroom. Also, the lack of restroom facilities and a lobby area make it problematic as a performance venue. The lack of backstage water also limits our abilities with makeup in this space.

We have limited resources for technology. Lack of modern moving lights, LED fixtures, Digital sound, Large format printer (plotter), et. al. severely limit what we can offer our students in the world of the modern entertainment industry.

Theatre size limits the style and scope of shows. No fly house restricts our ability to fly scenery as well as prohibits us the ability to teach flying operating and safety procedures.

Lack of proper storage for costumes and scenery. Without sufficient storage for costumes we are limited in what our stock can hold, thus limiting the amount of period and modern costumes we build, also limiting our ability to teach sewing (costuming) techniques. Without sufficient storage for scenery we waste more due to having to “throw away”.

Limited dressing room / make up space. This restricts our ability to teach larger make up courses, perform larger musical, and limits the number of students who can enroll/participate.

Limited costume help. Our strength is also a weakness in that our costume shop manager is part time and not always available for student opportunities.

We need to develop a plan for how to proceed in addressing the needs we have with equipment and technology.

IX. Faculty/Student information

Table 1. Program Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-TIME*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*The definition of ‘full-time’ for this table coincides with our standard MVC definition. Include all full-time faculty who taught in the program regardless of their division affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ADJUNCT
Include all adjunct faculty who taught at least one course in the program in the past year regardless of their division affiliation. (No list of names required.)

Number of adjunct: 1 - Dyann Rozema

### Table 2. Student Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating seniors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### X. List of individuals who assisted in the completion of this report
Harold Hynick