

Performing Arts Department  
Program Learning Outcomes Evaluation – Spring 2023

**Course: DRAMA 318 (Playwriting)**

PLO #1: Identify, explain, and/or perform key concepts and/or techniques in their major field of study (i.e. dance, music, drama).

Artifact: Play Pitches

For their midterm, students were asked to:

1. write a 10-minute play;
2. “pitch” their play, as if to potential producer(s);
3. cast & lead a table reading of their play;
4. participate in a verbal critique of their play by the class.

Steps 2, 3 and 4 were all done on the same day.

The video submitted shows their “pitch” to get the audience interested. (Note: Presentations were recorded using Zoom, which filters out extraneous noise like cheers, laughter and applause. If presenters giggle, it is in reaction to audience response.)

Methodology: Two readers from the department evaluated the student videos using the rubric below. Data is embedded in the rubric.

Scoring: 3= exceeds expectations, 2 = meets expectations, 1 = does not meet expectations

Name/Title		Presentation is succinct (2 minutes or less) and engaging.	Shares information relevant to plot, character, theme, tone, spectacle, or technical requirements.	Arouses the listener’s interest in hearing the full play.	TOTAL SCORE  excellent= 8-9 good= 5-7 fair= 4 poor= 3 or less	comments
Kapuamae’ole	R1	2	3	3	8	clear and emotive
	R2	2	2	2	7	Presenter talked about elements of the play using Hawaiian terms that were not “translated” (i.e. the instruments used to create sound effects) may be confusing for many listeners.
	avg	2.00	2.50	2.50	7.5	
Three Wise Men	R1	2	2	3	7	
	R2	1	2	1	4	The pitch did not give a compelling reason to produce this play – no “why this piece”. Presenter did not state the title of the play.

	avg	1.50	2.00	2.00	5.50	
Date	R1	3	3	3	9	
	R2	3	3	3	9	
	avg	3.00	3.00	3.00	9.00	Excellent pitch! Used the guidelines to the letter and made the pitch entertaining, giving a real feel for the play.
Hurricane Season	R1	2	3	3	8	
	R2	2	3	3	8	
	avg	2.00	3.00	3.00	8.00	
An Easy Climb	R1	2	3	3	8	
	R2	3	3	3	9	Excellent pitch– lots of energy, and leaves the listener ready to see the full play! Used guidelines fully to create pitch.
	avg	2.50	3.00	3.00	8.50	
Jane and Duck are on the Case	R1	2	3	2	7	
	R2	2	3	2	7	Good pitch – it was a little hard to follow the character description because presenter was speaking so quickly. Guidelines were followed.
	avg	2.00	3.00	2.00	7.00	
Invisible Disability	R1	1	2	2	5	Needed more detail
	R2	1	1	1	3	Unfortunately the only real information about the play is theme- I don't have a sense of what it would take to produce: characters, setting, tone, tech info....
	avg	1.00	1.50	1.50	4.00	
Advocatus Luciferi: Lucifer's Lawyer	R1	2	2	2	6	
	R2	2	2	2	6	Pitch gave significant information about theme, location and character. Also very good that the content warning is stated in the pitch – pitch low energy, even for a very serious subject.
	avg	2.00	2.00	2.00	6.00	
11 A.M.	R1	1	2	1	4	Not clear what this is about.
	R2	1	2	1	4	Pitch gave plot/theme and location information, but not specific enough - number of characters was a big question mark. Did not explicitly state the title of the play. No specific

						statement that would prompt a producer to produce the piece. Constant plying with hair was a significant distraction to 1.00the presentation
	avg	1.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	
Sunflowers	R1	3	3	3	9	
	R2	2	2	1	5	Good presentation. Contained many of elements from the guidelines. Lacked in enticement and compelling reason to produce. – I feel this could have been fleshed out a bit.
	avg	2.50	2.50	2.00	7.00	
Mia is Missing	R1	1	2	1	4	does not seem prepared
	R2	1	1	1	3	No title given, characters named, and theme touched upon. This pitch could have been expanded –nothing grabbed me, and held my attention!
	avg	1.00	1.50	1.00	3.50	
Promise	R1	2	3	2	7	
	R2	2	3	2	7	Good pitch gave the listener a sense full of the play, while squelching fears that a “Zombie Army” would be necessary! I would want to see the play.
	avg	2.00	3.00	2.00	7.00	
After the Match	R1	2	3	3	8	
	R2	3	2	2	7	Very brief yet engaging. The theme is intriguing, I would ask to hear more. Could have had a bit more information about the setting, but the pitch was dynamic enough that I would pursue.
	avg	2.50	2.50	2.50	7.50	
You Can’t Hurt Me, Can You?	R1	2	3	3	8	I want to see this play!
	R2	1	2	1	4	Pitch was very succinct characters presented, but setting? From the description play is set in the past – ‘swords’ so is it a period piece or a fantasy piece? The title of the play was not stated. Not a compelling reason given for a producer to purchase the play. Guideline were not taken into consideration
	avg	1.50	2.50	2.00	6.00	
Haunted Hangout	R1	2	3	2	7	

	R2	2	2	2	6	Good pitch – characters listed, setting suggested. From the theme I would expect there are some special effects- but nothing was mentioned either way, pitch guidelines were followed – I would want to see the play.
	avg	2.00	2.50	2.00	6.50	

<i>n</i> = 16	AVERAGE	1.90	2.43	2.10	6.46
		R1: 1.93 R2: 1.86	R1: 2.66 R2: 2.20	R1: 2.40 R2: 1.80	
Interrater agreement		62%	50%	43%	

Observations and recommendations: Each reader offered feedback for the play pitches; the comments should prove valuable as direct feedback to students. The teacher of the course noted that Reader 2 provided excellent insight about each student.

In terms of the assessment, this represents an excellent start for the program and the feedback given is often what assessment should provide for students and faculty. However, the rubric does not give descriptors for the categories for each level of skill (3= exceeds expectations, 2 = meets expectations, 1 = does not meet expectations), and this may be the reason why the third column, “Arouses the listener’s interest in hearing the full play,” proved challenging in calibrating scores. Three pitches reflect major disagreement among the readers as scores were more than 1-point apart, rendering the data unreliable. Thus while the overall average is 2.10 for this category, this does not mean that the majority of students can be considered having exhibited competency in this area due to the lack of agreement. The recommendation here is to consider either (1) drafting performance descriptors for each category, and/or (2) have readers review disagreements in scores and rectify scoring to within one-point.

[TEACHER RESPONSE TO DATA]

The instructor of this course wrote the following in response to the above recommendations:

Descriptors for each level of skill in the three categories for the above stated rubric have been drafted:

Presentation is succinct (2 minutes or less) and engaging.

3 exceeds: Clear, thorough, entertaining and/or emotive, follows all assignment guidelines, 2 minutes or less.

2 meets: entertaining and/or emotive, follows most assignment guidelines, 2 minutes or less.

1 does not: either does not engage the audience or does not meet the time constraint.

Shares information relevant to plot, character, theme, tone, spectacle, or technical requirements.

3 exceeds: Discusses two or more of the listed elements in relation to their play.

2 meets: Discusses at least one of the listed elements in relation to their play.

1 does not: audience does not gain a clear understanding of any element that makes this play unique.

Arouses the listener’s interest in hearing the full play.

3 exceeds: Listener is intrigued and excited about hearing the full play, based on information shared by the presenter.

2 meets: Listener is mildly interested in hearing the full play, based on information shared by the presenter.

1 does not: Based on information shared by the presenter, listener has no interest in hearing more about it.

The Department will ask reviewers to revisit scoring if readers' scores do not line up within one point. This should allow for better calibration of the data.