




7-1-2012

Grand Tactical Assessment of Effectiveness

Andrew Vorder Bruegge

Winthrop University, vorderbruegg@winthrop.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.winthrop.edu/cvpa_facpub

 Part of the [Art Education Commons](#), and the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

Publisher Citation

Vorder Bruegge, Andrew. "Grand Tactical Assessment of Effectiveness." Assessment in the Arts Conference. July 2012. Available at: http://works.bepress.com/andrew_vorder_bruegge/21

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Visual and Performing Arts at Digital Commons @ Winthrop University. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Visual and Performing Arts Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Winthrop University. For more information, please contact bramed@winthrop.edu.

Proposal Submission

Assessment in the Arts Conference 2012

Submission by:

Andrew Vorder Bruegge, Ph.D.
Professor of Theatre and Dance
College of Visual and Performing Arts Assessment Committee Chair
Winthrop University
803-323-4850
vorderbruegge@winthrop.edu

Proposal for a Paper Presentation

Technology Needed: Computer/Laptop with Access to the Internet

Proposal Abstract

Title: Grand Tactical Assessment of Effectiveness

The institution's recent reaffirmation process with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) brought many upgrades in assessment practices. This paper focuses on the mandate for every academic department to create a plan to review the effectiveness of all its assessment tools/instruments. To meet this mandate the Department of Theatre and Dance created a roster of all its assessment instruments and established review cycles ranging from two to ten years for all of them. In any given year, therefore, the faculty evaluates the effectiveness of six to ten instruments. When evaluating each instrument, we ask these questions: Is this instrument generating the intended results? Are the results useful in any way (reliability/validity)? Are we using the results to make improvements in our programs (closing the loop)? What adjustments do we need to make to this instrument in order to get a "yes" answer to the above questions? 2011-12 is the first year of implementation for this cyclical review of all our assessment instruments. This paper will include a few examples of faculty actions: eliminating instruments, changing an instrument intention, expanding data collection power of an instrument, or narrowing the focus of the data collection of an instrument.