

PCC Theatre SAC Assessment 2010-11

Part 1: Communication

SAC Chair: Patrick Tangredi

SAC participants: Dan Hays, Frances Marsh, Tobias Peletier, John Duncan, and Barry Hunt

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from outcome assessments carried out in the previous academic year.

Our critical thinking assessment leads to the following changes:

Two TA classes' implemented clearer guidelines regarding critical thinking outcomes. The PCC outcome categories (identified parenthetically in *bold italics* in the notes below) that were identified as lacking or in need of improvement.

TA 101 -Theatre Appreciation: Added/Revised assignments:

- Written "theatre production reviews" were transitioned to "theatre critiques", which replaced plot summary and subjective opinion centered writing, with criteria and objective evidence.
(Distinguish relevant from non-relevant data, fact from opinion.)
- Final project for this course was reconfigured to focus on the student's creation of a lighting, costume or scenery design for an assigned play. The students were put into collaborative teams to mirror the theatrical collaboration process.
Identify, evaluate and synthesize information (obtained through library, world-wide web, and other sources as appropriate in a collaborative environment.
Interpret and express quantitative ideas effectively in written, visual, aural, and oral form.
Interpret and use written, quantitative, and visual text effectively in presentation of solutions to problems.

TA 141 - Fundamentals of Acting: Added assignments:

- Assess play text to discern and identify actions, subtext, and obstacles.
Research and analyze data relevant to issues from a variety of media.
Make a decision and take actions based on analysis.
- Create non-verbal version of acting scene in order to better understand the sub-textual implications of a play text.
Engage the imagination to explore new possibilities.
Reason toward a conclusion or application.

2. Identify the outcomes assessed this year, and describe the methods used.

What were the results of the assessment (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?

* "Communication"

* "Community and Environmental Responsibility" PCC Core Outcomes.

Summary of our rationale: After reviewing our Mapping Level Indicators and discussing the many options in our October 2010 SAC meeting, we determined that assessing our Fall quarter Theatre program production,

(“*Woyzeck: Never the Same Show Twice*”, the play’s title, heretofore “*Woyzeck*”), and the Spring term Annual Student One Act Festival (*Inclement Weather*) would give us the widest array of assessable material.

Since each production gathers students from the widest variety of our courses (Areas such as the Design of Lighting, Scenery and Costumes, as well as Acting and Improvisation) we determined that we could assess not only the effects of a single class, but rather a program wide achievement of two **PCC Core Outcomes**; ***Communication*** and ***Community and Environmental Responsibility***. Though this year’s assessment is centered on Sylvania’s production related theatre classes we recognize that future assessment choices (Cultural Awareness and Self Reflection next year) will allow for more inclusivity for the classes that are taught at all campuses. Cascade and Rock Creek offer classes in Acting (TA 141) and Theatre Appreciation (TA 101), but they have no current production classes or models to contribute to this year’s assessment. This is due to the limited resources that their campuses have in terms of theatre related infrastructure; viable theatre, lighting, scene shops, costume shops, and the skilled designers and laborers to make theatre production possible.

a. Describe the method(s) you used.

Regarding the ***Communication*** core outcome, the students involved in acting, designing, assigned to running crew and stage-managing the fall term production (*Woyzeck*), were all assigned individual tasks and assume unique responsibilities. In this way, the assessment of communication was an appropriate one to assess, as the success of the production was dependent on their abilities to effectively communicate through a variety of means. In theatre production successful collaboration is founded in accomplished written, verbal and non-verbal communication skills. In order to assess our student’s experience, we created two rubrics, a faculty/staff “production check-in” and a final “all cast & crew post-mortem ” for *Woyzeck* focusing on each area of the core outcome. The rubrics, assessments and Areas to improve appear below.

To support the *Indirect Assessment* area, we created a questionnaire. The questionnaire (attached below, with results) had simple “ratings” (1-10, 1 being low, 10 being high) followed by an opportunity to comment. The questions are variations on the sample indicators found on PCC’s Core Outcomes web page, and adapted specifically for the theatre production model.

How was the assessment evaluated?

Direct Assessment: We, (Dan Hays, Frances Marsh, Tobias Peletier and Patrick Tangredi) met weekly during each production to discuss and assess how the ***Communication*** outcomes were manifesting in our students work. At this time we listed the skills that the students were required to develop, articulate and utilize during the preparation, rehearsal/building, and performance. Because *Woyzeck* had a larger than average student-based production team, we had the rare opportunity to see these student’s communication skills in play for at least a 10-week pre-production experience, as well as the entire rehearsal period. Here are our rubrics, and our observations:

Indirect Assessment: We created the survey/questionnaire for the nearly 30 students involved in the *Woyzeck* production and gave it to them at the post-mortem. I have included the questions, comments and results of this survey below.

b. Results: What did you learn?

How well did your students do? Do the assessment results match your aspirations for your students? Did your assessment indicate any areas or aspects in which student achievement could be better?

It is clear that our students fall into two categories: Observers and participants. The majority of students taking TA classes are “testing the waters”, while the ones involved in theatrical productions (main-stage or student work) are participants, meaning that they are actively relied upon to serve in roles in the manstage productions. These students were the ones assessed, and they did extremely well. One possible reason would be the level of buy-in” that we introduced- we gave the students an opportunity to be involved at the earliest stages of conceptual work and designin the production’s overall look and structure.

We learned a great deal about our student’s potential, but also about the (immense) amount of time ot took to individually empower these students, as each one of them had a specific role to play in the process, unlike a classroom of 25 students doing the same assignment, we had 30 doing individual assignments, thus communication was crucial in pulling the production together. But, it worked well. We are hesitant to reproduce such an experiement, as it took more effort from other areas, but with such positive outcomes, we’re still learning how to improve the quality of the student’s experience without increasing our already taxed workloads.

3. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented towards improving students’ attainment of outcomes.

Our ability to communicate and broaden our student’s ability to develop communication skills can be improved in the following ways: Our “Basecamp” protocols have been questioned, and we are dipping into our meager budget to purchase a more flexible and coherent production communication system. From a mentorship point of view, we are now experimenting with including/mentoring more students in the production meeting process. In the *Woyzeck* model, we had 15 students involved, a rare and high water mark for us, and each of those students went on to mentor other students in future productions, so clearly we have a model worth repeating. The downside of this model is the amount of energy and coordination facilitating such meetings entails. The result, however, is noteworthy, based on day-to-day observations of these students. We continue to wrestle with our ability to support such a model realistically.

Rubrics for Communication Assessment.

We went directly to the PCC Core outcomes for our criteria.

Below is the format that we used to assess our students.

Our “grading” categories were:

“The student was able to achieve this outcome...

Independently or With Minimal Instructor Help or With Extensive Instructor Help

READING RUBRICS:

Did the student's reading of the play reflect the following outcomes?

Where are we in need of improvement?

- Identify the play's central idea (or theme)
- List any non-thematic secondary ideas.
- Measure the writer's viewpoint against your own experiences.
- Think about the writer's assumptions about experience. What does the writer assume?

Assessment: PCC Assessment Survey with Minimal Instructor Help

The play itself is considered fairly difficult, and, of course, the cast, crew and designers each had their own unique task to achieve to fulfill their particular role in the production. This result was predictable, as the student's involved are often cast or selected for their roles through an audition process or have been involved in previous productions. Interestingly, since our program does not offer any dramatic literature courses, the reading of a play for production is a unique skill set that is taught almost individually from each faculty member's interaction with the student involved.

Area of improvement: Expand the section of the rehearsal process known as "table work" (Where the cast reads the play aloud together, and discusses the themes, actions and characters in some detail.) Previously the first two rehearsals were set aside for table work, and following this assessment, I will be expanding this to 3-4 rehearsals, with more emphasis on sub-textual areas as well as more focused time on actor/designer dialogue about their interpretations of the play's text, and their interpretations.

WRITING RUBRICS:

Did the student's writing reflect the following outcomes?

Where are we in need of improvement?

(**Note:** As the production required fewer graded writing assignments, the intercommunications of the production team (through our communication system "Basecamp") were assessed.

- Understand and use writing as a way of thinking and imagining.
- Focus on a central purpose, determine audience, and write coherent and effective prose using standard English conventions.
- Use creative problem-solving techniques and knowledge of various modes of critical thinking to create and evaluate text.
- Use collaborative techniques to explore and test ideas.
- Apply knowledge of writing process.
- Develop and organize a text by using details, examples, data, metaphor, etc.

Assessment: The student achieved this outcome with Extensive Instructor Help.

This was the most revealing assessment area. Writing about a production while working on it is not a common practice, but the electronic trail reflected the limitations of the medium used. In essence, as email is a format more inclined to the exchange of data (and not other more crucial nuanced forms of interpersonal communication) that is what we found, a great deal of highly efficient data was exchanged, but very little

exploration of ideas, coherent prose, or application of knowledge. Though this area was covered in the next section very well (“Speak”), the majority of our students could certainly improve in this area.

Area of improvement: This is a conundrum for us, as we already ask for a great deal of time and effort from our students involved in productions, but a pilot assignment will be to keep a “production journal”, where the students will be required to keep notes from production meetings, rehearsals and collaboration meetings as a written record, to be graded when the project is completed.

SPEAKING RUBRICS:

Did the student’s verbal interactions reflect the following outcomes?

Where are we in need of improvement?

- Identify and apply communication strategies appropriate to interpersonal, group, and public speaking contexts.
- Organize and deliver verbal and non-verbal messages for effective audience reception and retention.

Assessment: The student achieved this outcome Independently

Perhaps this defies the assumption that many students in our media heavy climate cannot (or will not) practice effective interpersonal communication, but our students had an exceptionally difficult communication task, and they were (for the vast majority) exceptional in their ability to organize and deliver their messages, information, and more importantly, critical ideas and collaborative inputs.

Area of improvement: One area worth improving was “Apply communication strategies appropriate to interpersonal, group, and public speaking contexts.” Our assessment was based on the (understandable) amount of non-relevant, inappropriate dialogue that often accompanies the gathering of many students. While the need for social interaction is certainly understandable, our solution is to create “buffer times” before production meetings and rehearsals to facilitate the necessary socializing that has become a challenge to extricate from our business oriented meetings.

LISTENING RUBRICS:

Did the student’s listening skills reflect the following outcomes?

Where are we in need of improvement?

- Check personal understanding of a message by summarizing.
- Question as appropriate.
- Analyze message critically for assumptions, purposes, use and misuse of rhetorical and argumentative forms.
-

Assessment: The student achieved this outcome with Minimal Instructor Help.

The students expressed some fairly complex abilities to communicate throughout this process, and our observations ranged quite a bit, with some students handling their abilities to analyze messages critically, or reflectively listen (or check by summarizing) became stronger through peer and staff modeling. While assumptions were present, they did not reflect an alarming tendency.

Area of improvement: Continue to model appropriate listening skills. We have consciously set aside our early production meetings to create scenarios where that modeling can be observed.

INTERPRETING VISUAL IMAGES & COMMUNICATING VISUALLY RUBRICS:

Did the student's interpretation and communication skills reflect the following outcomes?

Where are we in need of improvement?

- Use visual elements and materials effectively to convey a message or idea.
- Analyze visual elements to assess their influence on perception of purpose and assumptions.
- Use technology as appropriate (e.g. computers) to convey ideas visually.
- Appreciate the various forms of art and the contexts from which they emerge.
- Make and defend judgments about the quality of artistic expressions.
- Explain how personal and formal factors shape own responses to works of art.
- Take a position on the merits of specific artistic works and reconsider own judgments about specific works as knowledge and experience change.

Assessment: The student achieved this outcome Independently/ With Minimal Instructor Help.

This area was weighted toward our design students, who, in this particular case were truly exceptional in their abilities. For example two of the student designers (scenic and costume) were nominated to represent PCC at the Kennedy Center/American College Theatre Festival Regional competition, and each won their respective category for their visual interpretations of their designs (costume renderings, scenic elevations, etc). From the regional festival they were able to compete at the national level. At this point, these students represented PCC extremely well, with our scenic designer taking an honorable mention. This is a PCC first. While the other designers were not at that level, the "rising tide raises all boats" principal certainly applied, and they enjoyed great symbiotic support while developing this skill set. The best critique that they received was at the festivals, where professional adjudicators reflected that our students could have improved their ability to articulate their process in their work.

Area of improvement: This was an exceptional generation of designers, and their work reflected a serious interest in their skills building. In the future, we will continue to prepare students as we have, while incorporating more opportunities to make and defend judgments about the quality of artistic expressions.

APPENDIX A

PCC Theatre Assessment Survey of Students

PCC Assessment Survey (Communication) Fall 2010

PCC is focusing on how each program at the College is utilizing the PCC Core Outcomes in the work that we do. We have been asked to assess our own use of two of the six core outcomes (In this case communication and we would appreciate if you would take a few minutes to reply or rate the questions below. These can remain anonymous, or you are welcome to include your name if you would like us to follow up on any of these questions or your comments.

Appendix A – Survey given to Students involved in Woyzeck

Note: The results are in BLUE, at the end of each question, and when students added commentary where appropriate. A total of 30 surveys were given out, 21 were returned completed.

Key:

Use a scale of 0-10. 0=Not applicable to my role. 1=Not really. 10=Absolutely.

* The numbers in between offer degrees of agreement or disagreement.

* Comments section is optional, used to draw attention to a particular aspect, or raise our awareness of how that issue may be improved or reviewed. Try to be concise, but if more space is needed, feel free to use space as needed. Please print.

1. Was good communication important to your role in the production team?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 8.1 Hi -10 Low-6

2. Did this production experience allow you to Make a decision and take actions based on analysis of information?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 7.7 Hi -10 Low-6

4. Did this experience give you the opportunity to measure the writer's (playwright's) viewpoint against your own experiences.

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 7.2 Hi -10 Low-6

5. Were you required to think critically about the writer's assumptions about experience?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 6.7 Hi -10 Low-0

Comments: Didn't understand the question (multiple variations on this)

6. Did this production experience allow you to use creative problem-solving techniques and knowledge of various modes of critical thinking to create and evaluate the script (text)?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.1 Hi -10 Low-7

6. Did this production experience allow you to use collaborative techniques to explore and test ideas?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 7.8 Hi -10 Low-3

Comments: "Yes" "This was the BEST collaboration experience I've had in theatre."

7. Did this production experience allow you to develop and organize a script or other aspect of text by using details, examples, data, and metaphor?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 8.0 Hi -10 Low-5

8. Did this production experience allow you to identify and apply communication strategies appropriate to interpersonal, group, and public speaking contexts?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 8.5 Hi -10 Low -4

Comments: Yes (multiple), “We had to develop a system to compensate for the special needs of the show”

9. Did this production experience allow you to organize and deliver verbal and non-verbal messages for effective reception and retention?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 8.6 Hi -10 Low-4

10. Did this production experience allow you to analyze a message critically for assumptions, purposes, use and misuse of rhetorical and argumentative forms?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.4 Hi -10 Low-7

11. Did this production experience allow you to use visual elements and materials effectively to convey a message or idea?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.1 Hi -10 Low-7

Comments: “Um, duh...yeah!” “Totally” “Yes!”

12. Did this production experience allow you to analyze visual elements to assess their influence on perception of purpose and assumptions.

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 8 Hi -10 Low-3

13. Did this production experience allow you to use technology as appropriate (e.g. computers) to convey ideas visually.

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 7.8 Hi -10 Low-5

14. Did this production experience allow you to use available resources to find information.

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 6.3 Hi -10 Low-6

Comments: Not applicable (multiple).

15. Did this production experience allow you to use the methods of inquiry or expression of a discipline or profession, such as observation, experimentation, experience, analysis, diagnosis or creative processes?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.5 Hi -10 Low-6

Comments: “We got to do the things you do! What else do you want?” “Yes!!”

16. Did this production experience allow you to Identify and/or recreate concepts, terms, and facts?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.2 Hi -10 Low-8

17. Did this production experience allow you to perform tasks, procedures, and processes with competence?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.7 Hi -10 Low- 6

18. Did this production experience allow you to se basic terms, concepts, and facts to gain additional or more complex knowledge as a lifelong learner?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.7 Hi -10 Low-4

19. Did this production experience allow you to produce a product, project, or presentation in an academic, professional, or technical setting?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.2 Hi -10 Low-5

20. Did this production experience allow you to use knowledge and skills to increase their understanding of themselves and others, and to expand their abilities?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 8.7 Hi -10 Low-6

21. Did this production experience allow you to Explain concepts and skills to others?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 7.5 Hi -10 Low-6

Comments: “Not necessarily.” “Sometimes.” “Yes.” “OK” (?)

22. Did this production experience allow you to apply appropriate technologies to analyze, solve, and present solutions to problems?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.7 Hi -10 Low-5

Comments: “Best Toys EVER” “The Congo was tough at first, but it got better”

23. Did this production experience allow you to collaborate, take risks, demonstrate multi-disciplinary awareness, and use the imagination to achieve creative responses to problems?

Scale of 1-10 Average score: 9.7 Hi -10 Low-8

PCC Theatre (TA) SAC Assessment 2010-11

Part 2

ASSESSMENT TOPIC *Community and Environmental Responsibility*

SAC Chair/Assessment coordinator: Patrick Tangredi

SAC participants: Dan Hays, Frances Marsh, Tobias Peletier, John Duncan, and Barry Hunt

- 1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from outcome assessments carried out in the previous academic year.** Please see Part 1 where this question is addressed.

- 2. Identify the outcomes assessed this year, and describe the methods used. What were the results of the assessment (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?**

We chose the *Community and Environmental Responsibility* core outcome for our second assessment. Our assessment strategy was to look at our own in-class/mentoring modeling of the *corresponding outcomes*. As the target area, we assessed our annual spring student "One Act Festival". This year's group of 3 10-minute plays was entitled "*Inclement Weather*". In essence, "*Inclement Weather*" was a hands-on, process-to-product "capstone" style class project co-produced by TA staff and our advanced students. Their task was to produce three original 10-minute plays from conception through closing night in the course of one term (Spring 2011). This process begins from the generation of short scripts in the Scriptwriting class (offered by the English department in the Winter term) to directing, designing, publicizing, stage managing, acting, crewing; virtually all aspects of production are done by students with staff mentorship. By assessing their work in the *Community and Environmental Responsibility* core outcome, we were able to see if we were "walking our talk", and if the students were responding to our modeling and our expectations (which are drawn up in "job descriptions") given to each member of the production team.

- a. Describe the method(s) you used.**

We utilized both constant observation/dialogue (for "Staff Assessment") as well as our "post-mortem" process (for "Student Feedback") for *Inclement Weather*. The "post-mortem" is a regular post-production process, which involves interviewing students after a production ends to engage in an assessment of our mutual goals and expectations. This is a valuable part of our process, as it includes giving the students the opportunity to assess our work as collaborative artists as well. During the post-mortem, Patrick took notes, based on questions provided below.

Rubrics for *Community and Environmental Responsibility* Assessment.

We went directly to the PCC Core outcomes for our criteria.

Below is the format that we used to assess our students.

Our “grading” categories were:

“The student achieved this outcome...”

a) Independently b)With Minimal Instructor Help c)With Extensive Instructor Help

The assessment below records two different important responses to the questionnaire

We recorded both “Student Feedback”, where the students were able to choose their “grade” based on the three choices above, followed by the “Staff Assessment”, based on one term’s worth of observation and a reflection of the student’s self evaluation. Our assessment involved both the student feedback, as well as the staff’s regular weekly check-ins with each other regarding the progress of the production, in light of the rubrics below.

A variation on the *Community and Environmental Responsibility* core outcomes was handed out to the 14 students involved in the post-mortem as a questionnaire. The responses were not done as a written response, but rather as a group discussion, with Patrick Tangredi taking notes.

“Post Mortem” Questions and responses on “*Community and Environmental Responsibility*”

1. Did you demonstrate effective community interaction? If so...How?

***Student Feedback:* The student achieved this outcome Independently.**

Student Comments:” Yes, we did.” (Multiple agreement)

(How?)

“We had to look at what each student’s skills were before we assigned them a role (*or position*) in the show.”

“Most of the time, yes.”

“We had weekly production meetings where the Stage Manager brought up logistical problems or planning and we had to solve the problems.”

“It takes a village....”

Staff Assessment:* The students achieved this outcome *With Minimal Instructor Help

The students were demonstrating very effective interaction both within their own community (“Theatre students”) and outside of their immediate community (reaching out to the rest of the campus, as well as local businesses and their social networks (such as Facebook, or Twitter “friends”). Beyond this, the students did not reflect their growing dependence on electronic modes of communication, which is strong in creating community by communicating data (schedules, information, facts) but not always effective in creating the necessary trust and reliability that personal interaction does.

Though the core experienced students respect the need for weekly production meetings as a means for creating a stronger collaborative community, we recognize the importance of strengthening the context for newer students.

2. Looking at the criteria below, did this production give you the opportunity to...

Demonstrate Effective Community Interaction

- Assess own knowledge, participation, and skills in thinking about and acting on local issues.
- Analyze community and global issues and develop strategies for informed response.
- Evaluate personal and organization characteristics, skills, and strategies that facilitate the accomplishment of mutual goals.
- Respond to community issues and contribute to the community.

Student Feedback: The student achieved this outcome Independently.

Student Comments: “Yes, especially the part about evaluating personal mutual goals” “Not so much about responding to community issues”, “One of the plays was about community issues, and we made an effort to research those.”

Staff Assessment: The students achieved this outcome Independently.

Theatre productions vary in their ability to empower students to community action. Some productions offer more impact possibilities than others. This set of plays had a medium” level, meaning that the students were very active in a localized way (these plays were “homegrown” to PCC Sylvania’s campus), and therefore the project indigenously had a community element.

3. Looking at the criteria below, did this production give you the opportunity to...

Apply Scientific Methods

- Interpret social, natural, and physical phenomena using scientific methods of assessment.
- Identify how natural phenomena impact human activity.
- Apply scientific standards and practices that recognize the interdependence between people and the natural world.
- Identify and evaluate solutions to community and environmental problems.

Analyze Cultural Impact

- Analyze varying viewpoints, priorities, and standards regarding how humans interact with the environment and its limitations and resources.
- Identify how culture affects people’s responses to and sense of responsibility toward the community and the environment, including the creation and dissemination of images and ideas through various media.

Student Feedback: The student achieved this outcome With Minimal Instructor Help

Student Comments: “We’re not really dealing with a ‘natural world’, we’re creating our own world, so that one doesn’t make any sense” “Audiences give us real time feedback.” “Maybe we can do talkbacks after, to get audiences talking more?” “One environmental problem was solved, we recycle a lot of our created stuff- window units were put in

storage to be used in future productions, leftover playbills are recycled, costumes went back to stock...”

Staff Assessment: The students achieved this outcome Independently.

We were in agreement with the student’s comments, but felt that they achieved this independently (as opposed to their feeling that they needed help).

4. Describe the relationship of the democratic process to community problem-solving in this production of “Inclement Weather”.

Student Feedback: The student achieved this outcome Independently.

Student Comments: “We ran the production meetings, we built it, directed it...we solved our problems ourselves! We didn’t need you! (Much laughter ensued).
“Most of the problems were getting everyone on the same page, we handled everything pretty well once that happened.”

“The hardest part was when director’s changed their minds but didn’t realize how that changed everything for everyone else”

(Follow up: How did that affect you as a community?)

“It made it harder for us to do our jobs, but it eventually worked out fine because the directors stepped in to help pick up the pieces”

Staff Assessment: The students achieved this outcome Independently.

Though their statements reflect a degree of over-confidence our students are truly remarkable in this area, and deserve to be applauded. It’s fascinating to observe their ability to adapt to issues using the democratic process in a theatre production context, which is arguably a non-democratic system (director/producer center decision making is a common model).

5. Did you each take active roles in community problem solving? How did that work?

Student Feedback: The student achieved this outcome Independently.

Student Comments: “Yes.” “No.” “Not everyone could do that, some of us had to just do our jobs, like the ASM (Assistant Stage manager) had to focus on their show, not everyone else’s problems, or there would be too many bosses.”

Staff Assessment: The students achieved this outcome Independently.

In my observation, this group had a better than average experience in community problem solving. The maturity level required to achieve this is a wide variable at PCC, with some students having more ability to integrate problem solving opportunities into their work than others. In this group’s case, there was a healthy ongoing dialogue about problem solving, to the point where the issues never rose to heights that required staff intervention.

b. Results: What did you learn? How well did your students do?

Do the assessment results match your aspirations for your students?

Did your assessment indicate any areas or aspects in which student achievement could be better?

We learned that our system of empowering students in this particular core area is effective, but limited to the local (not the global) community awareness building/skill set. The assessment did meet our aspirations, as the expectation for it to be anything but local would be unrealistic. Changing the scope of the project in the future is possible, but unlikely as other areas of our program do emphasize global community (Plays read from diverse cultural viewpoints in many other classes support this.)

Our students did very well, and compare to previous one-act festivals, these students did well above average.

This assessment showed areas where student achievement could be better:

- Create more opportunities for them to assess their cultural impact (on the PCC community).
- Develop a more contained system of evaluate personal and organization characteristics, skills, and strategies that facilitate the accomplishment of mutual goals.

3. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes.

Our constant struggle is to refine our many, complex systems of empowering students. The nature of theatre production makes these systems complex, and that's a great attribute of the field. Changes that were identified were as follows:

- a) Integrate the student One Act Festival into an all PCC campus wide event (so that Cascade and Rock Creek students could enjoy the process as well. This is unlikely, as the support needed would require more labor hours, which is currently not in our budget.
- b) Integrate the One Act Festival as the sole Main-stage production in the Spring, adding more opportunities for more students to undertake these challenges, and free up the staff to focus on mentorship roles rather than their traditional roles of lead designer, director, producer, technical direction, etc. This is ambitious, and after further dialogue with our dean and internally, it may happen in the 2012-13 year, following next year's program review.
- c) Develop a specialized aspect of the process whereby the traditional roles are reversed, director oriented students would design or stage manage, and design students would direct, thus creating a more congruent sense of each other's responsibilities, thus creating more opportunity for community building through mutual support and respect for the challenges of the various roles.