

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH
Core Competency Assessment Report (for Undergrad Programs)
(rev. 3/2019)

Academic Year: **2018-2019**
Degree Program Name: **BFA**
Department Name: **DANCE**

Name of Chair: **Betsy Cooper**
Campus Extension / email: **betsy.cooper@csulb.edu**
Program Assessment Coordinator: **Rebecca Bryant**
Campus Extension / email: **rebecca.bryant@csulb.edu**

1. Which WSCUC core competency for this degree program was assessed over the past year and how is it connected to your Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)?

Critical Thinking

Connected Department PLOs:

- Majors will demonstrate substantial knowledge of the historical and scientific dimensions of dance, to give depth and perspective to the performance and pedagogical aspects of the dance discipline.
- Majors will demonstrate the skills necessary to analyze and review dance, both orally and in writing the history, concepts and aesthetic qualities of dance.

2. Briefly describe how these outcomes are linked to CSULB's Institutional learning outcomes (http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/assessment/institutional_objective.html).

The aforementioned PLOs are linked to the following ILOs:

- 1 – Oral Communication
- 2 – Written Communication
- 4 – Critical Thinking
- 7 – Disciplinary/Professional Competencies

3. Briefly describe the direct assessment used to measure this competency.

Our three-person committee reviewed **Paper II: Appropriation & Identity** from DANCE 442: Dance and Social Identity in the U.S. DANC 442 is usually completed in the final semester of BFA coursework, and Paper II is due at the end of the semester (after students incorporate revisions from earlier drafts). Each student paper was read and scored by two assessment committee members using the Critical Thinking Value Rubric (which can be found at the end of this document).

4. What were the results of the assessment? Include also a narrative about what the results suggest about the skills students possess when they graduate from your program.

Critical Thinking competency scores for all undergraduate students reviewed were fairly similar, with students exhibiting general competency bordering on advanced competency; please see the score summary at the end of this document for specifics. BFA students scored similarly to BA students and BA Dance Science students, however the BFAs exhibited slightly higher scores on their ability to introduce and explain the issues surrounding their subject matter. Like the rest of the undergraduates, these students exhibited lower proficiency in clarifying their position and personal perspective on the subject matter, although they did average in the general competency level. Past educational trends in K-12 grades, which necessarily emphasized memorization of concepts for standardized testing rather than hypothesis generation, may play a role in our findings here. BFA students also scored well in their ability to provide evidence, indicating more proficiency than general competency; this data seems consistent with the fact that both studio and dance studies instructors emphasize students' ability to give examples and evidence to back up their propositions, whether they be aesthetic, choreographic, or ethnographic. Overall, these results, which are more favorable than last year's assessment of written communication proficiency, seem to suggest that degree curriculum is successfully fostering critical thinking skills in BFA students; that being said, there is always room for improvement in this regard, as evidenced by the fact that 2 of the 12 BFA students averaged slightly below general competency.

5. How will you use the results used for improving student learning (how are you "closing the loop")?

Our department is in the midst of a curriculum overhaul of all undergraduate degree paths. As part of this process, we plan to include more dance studies courses in the first semesters of study that use viewing/writing assignments to bolster critical thinking skills, asking students to posit opinions and/or readings of dance material.

6. How might the strategies and results of this year's assessment inform your department's approach during the next cycle? In other words, will you duplicate this assessment method or try a different technique? If you used a rubric, will you continue to use it? Enhance calibration methods? Etc.

Student assessments of all degree paths undertaken during this assessment cycle went very smoothly; this was due in large part to the fact that our three-person committee met *before* scoring to look at examples of undergraduate and graduate work and discuss where we believe the work falls on the competency rubric. This fruitful discussion served to prime our thinking about critical thinking in general and better calibrate our scores; I plan to repeat this practice during the next cycle.

7. Please provide an update on actions regarding your MOU if appropriate and attach the update to this report if necessary.

N/A
MOU in process

Please send the completed report to your College Dean and appropriate Associate Dean, Vice Provost Jody Cormack, and the Director for Program Review and Assessment Sharlene Sayegh. Please save a copy for your files. If you have any questions, please contact Sharlene at Sharlene.Sayegh@csulb.edu.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC — DANCE — UNDERGRAD**Definition**

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Learning Objectives	Advanced competency performance indicators	General competency performance indicators	Low competency performance indicators
Explanation of Issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, and boundaries undetermined.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.

POINT SCALE:

3 points

2 points

1 point

**UNDERGRAD - BFA
Critical Thinking
Competency - Spring 2019
Dance 442 -
Appropriation Paper**

	DEGREE PATH	CRITICAL THINKING COMPETENCY				STUDENT AVERAGE
		Explanation of issues	Evidence	Influence context/assumptions	Student's position	
Student 1	BFA	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.88
Student 2	BFA	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.25
Student 3	BFA	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.88
Student 4	BFA	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.50
Student 5	BFA	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.88
Student 6	BFA	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.75
Student 7	BFA	2.0	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.00
Student 8	BFA	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.63
Student 9	BFA	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.75
Student 10	BFA	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.75
Student 11	BFA	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.25
Student 12	BFA	2.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.13
AVERAGES		2.5	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.39