

## **DATA Reflections for SPEECH THEATRE 2011-2012**

| Assessment   | Description / Analysis  | Action?  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>STANDARD 1 – COMMUNICATION &amp; PUBLIC SPEAKING</b>                    |   |  |
| <b>5A<br/>CT101</b>  | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).   | N/A  |
| <b>3<br/>CTE Rubric<br/>Goal 6</b>   | Additional rubric designed to focus on teaching and critically evaluating intrapersonal, interpersonal, small group communication, public speaking, listening and communication theory. | Collection began in Spring of 2012                           |
| <b>STANDARD 2 – DEBATE &amp; FORENSICS</b>                                 |   |  |
| <b>5A<br/>ED416</b>  | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).   | N/A  |
| <b>1a Praxis II<br/>Sub-score<br/>VII</b>                                  | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).   | N/A  |
| <b>3<br/>CTE Rubric<br/>Goal 6</b>   | Additional rubric designed to focus on teaching and critically evaluating debate and forensic co-curricular activities.   | Collection began in Spring of 2012                           |
| <b>STANDARD 3 – MASS MEDIA</b>   |   |  |
| <b>5c<br/>CT107</b>  | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).   | N/A  |
| <b>STANDARD 4 – THEATRE</b>  |   |  |
| <b>5D<br/>CT370</b>  | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).<br><br>We will be using an additional assessment to determine student competency in this area.    | Collection of new assessment date will begin in Fall of 2013 |
| <b>STANDARD 5 – MANAGING THEATRICAL PRESENTATIONS IN COLLABORATION</b>     |   |  |
| <b>6<br/>One Act</b>   | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).   | N/A  |
| <b>STANDARD 6 – EVALUATING THEATRE FOR LEARNING ABOUT SELF AND CULTURE</b> |   |  |
| <b>5E<br/>CT130</b>  | Data demonstrates standards are consistently met with As (Target) and Bs (Competent).   | N/A  |

## Documentation of Department Discussions

### **Strengths of the Program**

Review of assessment data demonstrates strong outcomes in professional understanding, performance, and content area knowledge. Candidates scored at the high end of the national average for the PLT, indicating solid professional understanding. Candidates' professional skills are exemplary as evidenced by evaluations submitted by cooperating teachers, teacher education supervisors, and content advisors. Candidates also exhibit thorough content knowledge scoring well above average in course grades assessments as well as on the Praxis II Speech Communication content exam. Data suggests that current offerings in the Communication & Theatre Arts Curriculum have proven effective in developing candidates who have a thorough base of knowledge in mass media, communication theory, and theater.

### **Areas to Improve**

In an effort to further demonstrate that Standard 1 and Standard 2 are being met, we have created Goal 6 (referenced in the rejoinder), which will serve as an addendum to the existing CTE Evaluation Rubric, which is currently used to evaluate all students enrolled in ED498 Clinical Teaching Experience. This data was collected for the first time in the Spring of 2012. We will be re-examining this pilot rubric again in the next year to determine whether it is an accurate representation of student skills as per Standard 1 and 2. **The rubric addendum is attached.**

In response to the AFI regarding Standard 4, we will be using an additional assessment to demonstrate that the standard has been met. We will be using a portion of an existing assessment (#6), and disaggregating the data specific to teaching and critically evaluating technical theatre, design, history, dramatic literature, performance techniques, and directing as demonstrated by the One Act Play Project. **The portion of the rubric that pertains is attached.**

### **Changes / Updates / Topics for Discussion**

(syllabi, college catalog, curriculum, specific courses, specific assessments, etc.)

The changes reference in the "Areas to Improve" section will both be re-examined in the next year to determine effectiveness.