Mission / Purpose
The mission of the dance program at The University of Southern Mississippi is to integrate theoretical and practical aspects of dance in a way that is meaningful to our students’ lives. By providing a myriad of diverse perspectives to the study of contemporary and traditional forms of dance, and by engaging the students in holistic and comprehensive approaches to the study of dance, USM’s programs-its faculty, courses and opportunities-prepare the students for successful participation in the field of dance.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Perform exit competencies in dance technique
Students are able to perform 400 level (advanced level) exit competencies in dance technique. A minimum of two semesters of both DAN 402 and DAN 401 are required.

Related Measures:

M 1: Performance exam
400-level students complete semesterly juried assessment. Juries assess technical and artistic skills, and disposition and professionalism on a standardized 5 point rubric. The jury is the full dance faculty. The overall highest score possible is 5.0.

Target:
75% earn minimum score of 3.5 out of 5.0.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
FA12: (performance juries only occur in the Fall semester) Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) completed performance jury and received score of at least 3.5 (out of 5). Average score was 4.6 (out of 5).

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Performance Exam
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Student scores in annual juried assessments did not meet targets.

M 2: Self-evaluation
As a part of DAN 401, students complete informed, written self-evaluation on their technical progress in relation to given objectives and established criteria for excellence and competency. These competencies include alignment/placement, range of motion/flexibility, strength and control, rhythmic skills/sequencing, coordination/connectivity, focus, musicality and phrasing, qualitative range combined with individual course objectives. Self-evaluations display synthesis of objectives and personal growth.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target:**
90% of students successfully earn grade of at least 75 (out of 100) for informed written self-evaluation on technical progress in relation to given objectives and established criteria for excellence and competency.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) earned grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 91.
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 94.
Overall, target met with 100% of students (7 of 7) earning grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 92.5.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**DAN 401 self evaluations**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Students in DAN 401 complete summative self evaluations that are directed, yet personalized and reflective. The range of methods...

**M 3:DAN 401 Performance Exam**
As a part of DAN 401, students complete instructor-determined performance exams based on given objectives and established criteria for excellence and competency. These competencies include alignment/placement, range of motion/flexibility, strength and control, rhythmic skills/sequencing, coordination/connectivity, focus, musicality and phrasing, qualitative range combined with individual course objectives. Exams are midterm and/or final performance exams. In these exams, skills are both applied and exactly demonstrated/identified.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% of students in DAN 401 earn score of 75 or higher (out of 100) on instructor-determined performance exams based on instructor and program approved competencies.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 90 (out of 100).
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (7 of 7) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 89 (out of 100).
Overall, target met. 100% of students (10 of 10) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 89.5 (out of 100).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Performance exams in DAN 401 and assessing them**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
The process of aggregating the data suggests a variance in how students are being assessed in performance exams in individual ...

M 4: DAN 402 Variation performances
In DAN 402, students perform a variety of instructor-selected ballet variations that intentionally range in style from classic to contemporary. These performances allow students to demonstrate and apply technical skills as well as develop artistry.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of students perform variations that demonstrate technical and artistic skills and competence and earn at least 37.5 out of 50.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 44 (out of 50).
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 41 (out of 50).
Overall, target met. 100% of students (6 of 6) earned at least 75 (out of 50) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 42.5 (out of 50).

M 5: Growth grade in DAN 402
In DAN 402, student technical and artistic growth is quantified in a growth grade that is based on defined ballet exit competencies and includes technical, artistic and performance skills and knowledge. These skills and knowledge are articulated in detail as well as aggregated into a single score for the student.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of students earn a score of 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402. Average score was 91 (out of 100).
SP13: Target not met. 33% of students (1 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402. Average score was 73 (out of 100).
Overall, target not met. 66% of students (4 of 6) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402. Average score was 82 (out of 100).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**DAN 402 growth grade for DED majors**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
Target not met in 2012-2013. Target will not be changed, but monitored in future reporting cycles. At present, we maintain the s...

M 6: Alumni Survey- Dance Technique
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. 90% of respondents rank technical preparedness at 3/5 out of 5 or higher.

**Target:**
80% of respondents to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. 80% of respondents rank technical preparedness at 4 or higher (out of 5).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 reporting cycle. Data is reported separately for alumni and graduates from 2012-2013.
Alumni findings: Target met. 92% of responders (12 of 13) to alumni survey indicated they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. Average score was 4.4 out of 5 with 12 of 13 respondents "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness.
2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of responders (5 of 5) to graduate survey indicated they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. Average score was 4.8 out of 5 with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness.
Overall, target met for graduate and alumni with 17 of 18 responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness. Overall average score was 4.6 (out of 5).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Administer exit survey to alumni**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

**SLO 2: Comprehensive knowledge of dance**
Students display an integrated and comprehensive knowledge of the dance field -- historical, cultural, theoretical, and aesthetic, practical, and pedagogic.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Capstone final Presentation**
Students complete final project in Capstone course, DAN 491, that integrates field of dance education to other areas of scholarship. Final oral presentation involves thesis statement, review of literature, annotated bibliography, explanation of main points and is delivered with accompanying power point presentation.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
80% of all projects will earn mimimum score of 2.8 out of 4.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) earned a score of at least 2.8 (out of 4) on final research presentation in Capstone course. Average score was 3.2. (Capstone is only offered in Fall semesters.)
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Capstone course final presentation**  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Because this is a culminating project, it is expected that it’s quality be high and that the stakes be correspondingly high.

**M 8: Final Projects**
Students complete final projects in individual dance theory courses (DAN 131, DAN 240, DAN 351, DAN 431, DED 360, DAN 340, DED 260, DED 361)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of all projects will earn minimum score of 75 out of 100.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

**FA12:**
- DAN 131: Target met. 100% of students (9 of 9) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 94.
- DAN 240: Target not met. 75% of students (3 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 83.
- DAN 431: Target met. 86% of students (6 of 7) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 90.
- DED 360: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 93.
- DED 361: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project (autonomous lesson). Average score was 85.

**SP13:**
- DAN 340: Target met. 93% of students (4 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 94.
- DED 260: Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 90.

Overall, target met. 94% of students (34 of 36) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final projects. Average score was 90.

**M 9: Exit Interview**
Seniors complete exit interview with faculty sub-committee where they discuss their progression through the program, their benchmarks of major growths, their growth, and their cognitive
discoveries/understandings. Exit interview incorporates student response to standard questionnaire that addresses the above issues in addition to career/artistic goals.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
80% of students pass exit interview with faculty subcommittee (program director, academic advisor and another selected faculty member). Interview is preceded with written submission of initial survey/questionnaire. Interview is assessed in terms of professionalism, quality of answers to subcommittee questions, and clarity in statement of career objectives and strategies for attaining them. A score of at least 2.5 out of 4 is passing.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) passed exit interview with faculty subcommittee with a score of at least 2.5 (out of 4). Average score was 3.7. (Exit interviews are only conducted in Spring semesters).

**M 10:Portfolio- DED 460/461 Student Teaching**
Dance education students present two portfolios (that adhere to University and state licensure guidelines) of student teaching experience. These portfolios are compilations of both mentor and supervising teacher assessments of the skills, knowledge and disposition they display during their teaching placement as well as all required written work in a diversity of supporting pedagogical areas. Examples include weekly lesson and unit plans, reflective journals, student assessment studies, and classroom management profiles and plans to name a few.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
90% of students earned at least 910 points out of 1138 on OEFE/SPA portfolio.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 910 points (out of 1138) on OEFE/SPA portfolio. Average score was 901.
(Student teaching only happens in the Spring semester).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Teaching Portfolio target**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
This is the first reporting cycle for this measure, so even though it was not met we will not change the target for at least one...

**SLO 3:Prepared to participate in various fields of dance**
Graduates are prepared to successfully participate in the dance field as performers, choreographers, licensed dance educators, graduate students, and/or scholars.

**Related Measures:**

**M 11:Participation in the Repertory Dance Company**
Students gain adequate experience in dance repertory, public performance, and professional rehearsal situations through successfully completing a minimum of two semesters in DAN 420. Students are given Process and Product grades by the choreographers with whom they work. The Process Grade includes: Professionalism/Approach & Attitude; Commitment to the Choreographic Process; Consistency in Work Ethic; Ability to Receive & Apply Feedback, Coachability; Investment in the Development/Evolution of the Dance; Spirit of Exploration; Personal Improvement in Artistry; Commitment to Fellow Cast Members & Choreographer.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
At least 100% of students earn at least 54 (out of 60) on Process Grade for Repertory Dance Company.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
FA12: Target not met. 66% of students (6 of 9) earned targeted score. Average score was 55.
SP13: Target not met. 63% of students (5 of 8) earned targeted score. Average score was 52.
Overall, target not met. 65% of students (11 of 17) earned targeted score. Average score was 54.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**RDC target**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
An updated RDC rubric requires an updated target. The new rubric does not have a "process" portion. 2012-2013 finding are likely...

**M 13:External Evaluations**
Students work with guest artists while participating in DAN 420/Repertory Dance Company. Guest artists set new works and offer evaluations of students to the RDC director. The 100 point Dancer Evaluation rubric addresses disposition/professionalism, clarity of choreographic detail and quality, and performance in the creative process and product. Rubric is developed from similar instrument used in DAN 220 and DAN 420. If no guest artist is available faculty will evaluate students in RDC performance on "Evaluation of the Dancer" rubric.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Target:**
50% of dancers earn 80 points or higher (out of 100) on the Dancer Evaluation rubric for their work with guest artists.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (1 of 1) earned at least 80 (out of 100) in evaluation from guest artist. Score was 89 is a combination of Adrienne Clancy and faculty rehearsal director.
(Guest artist residency only took place in Spring semester).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Substitute for external evaluations of RDC members**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

No data was reported this cycle because our guest artists residencies did not include setting a work (and thus evaluating) our R…

**M 15: Licensure**

Dance education graduates with licensure who try to achieve employment will have a job in the field.

**Target:**

75% of dance education graduates with licensure who seek employment in the field achieve it.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. 75% of graduates who attempted to find work as licensed dance educators (3 of 4) achieved employment.

**M 16: Praxis II exam**

Students will take and pass the Praxis II state teacher’s examination. This exam correlates to University and state measures of effective teaching and professional readiness.

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**

90% of students will pass Praxis II exam.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. 100% of students who took the Praxis II exam (5 of 5) passed it.

**M 17: Teacher Candidate Evaluations**

Teacher candidates are evaluated by supervising teachers using standardized instrument from the Office of Educational Field Experiences. In-class (TIAI) and final-summative evaluations are used. Scores from second placement are used in annual assessment reporting. The TIAI assesses student skills, knowledge and professional dispositions in dance and educational practices/pedagogy. It concentrates on class planning, instruction, student diagnosis and assessment, and classroom management. The summative rubric is used by the cooperating teacher only and it focuses primarily on the evaluation of the student teacher’s professional and personal dispositions in terms of being an effective, ethical and quality professional educator.

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**

90% of students earn at least 468 points (out of 586) on supervising teacher’s in-class (TIAI) and final evaluations in second placement.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 468 points (out of 586) on final
evaluation in second placement. Average score was 534. (Student teaching occurs in the spring semester only).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**mentor/supervisor evaluations and targets**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Target language needs to be updated to read "388 points (out of 454)" for mentor teacher evaluations and "778 points (out of 972)...

**M 18: Program alumni as mentor teachers**
Dance program alumni become mentor teachers in their schools, K-12. Becoming a mentor teacher requires 5 years of service at a school as well as proven excellence as an arts educator.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  

**Target:**  
50% of eligible K-12 dance education graduates become mentor teachers after 3 years of service. "Eligible" refers to graduates who are in-state and/or within reasonable distance so that no courtesy fee is required.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
We had no program graduates who were eligible to become mentor teachers in this reporting cycle. We did add two new mentor teachers to the ranks, but they are not dance department graduates.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**mentor teacher recruitment**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Once we have graduates who have been in a school for 3 years, they will be strongly recruited for mentor teachership. This is ...

**M 19: Alumni Survey - Career Preparedness**
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate that their course of study was integrated and comprehensive and prepared them to enter the field of dance.

**Target:**  
80% of respondents rate dance program curriculum at 4 or higher (out of 5).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 along with survey of 2012-2013 graduates. Findings are presented independently and combined.
Alumni findings: Target met. 100% of alumni responders (12 of 13) rated the comprehensiveness of the dance program and their preparedness to enter the profession at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.3 (out of 5) with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum.
2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of graduating students (5 of 5) rated the comprehensiveness of the dance program and their preparedness to enter the profession
at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.8 (out of 5) with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum. Overall, target met with 17 of 18 alumni and 2012-2013 graduates "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum. Average score was 4.55.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Administer exit survey to alumni**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

**SLO 4: Articulate dance theoretically and aesthetically**
Students are able to articulate the dance experience and situate their pedagogical practices and experiences in the larger field of dance both theoretically and aesthetically.

**Related Measures:**

**M 20: Teacher Candidates presenting concerts**
Dance education majors choreograph in their second K-12 teacher candidate placement and/or produce dance concerts in the public schools where they student teach. This project includes working on a group of dancers in developmentally appropriate ways while maintaining a commitment to the fundamental principles of quality dance-making. Final work is evaluated by the supervising teacher and through a self-evaluation by the participants. Project also includes a final reflective paper that details the learning process and product, a log of all rehearsals and progress made in each as well as a comparison of the student's junior choreographic work to their dance made in the schools.

**Source of Evidence:** Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students earn at least 90 points out of 100 in creating and presenting dance in the public schools where they student teach.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Student teaching happens only in the Spring semester. SP13: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 90 (out of 100) in creating and presenting dance in the schools in which they student taught. Average score was 97 (out of 100).

**M 21: Alumni Survey-Theoretical/aesthetic understanding**
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were able to participate in the field of dance with a clear sense of theoretical and/or aesthetic placement and/or understanding.

**Target:**
80% of responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were able to participate in the field of dance with a clear sense of theoretical and/or aesthetic placement and/or understanding.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 along with survey of 2012-2013 graduates. Findings are presented independently and combined.
Alumni findings: Target met. 81% of alumni responders (21 of 26) rated their sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4 (out of 5).

2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of graduating students (5 of 5) rated their sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.8 (out of 5).

Overall, target met with 83% (26 of 31) of alumni and 2012-2013 graduates rating their sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.4.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Administer exit survey to alumni**
*Established in Cycle:* 2008-2009
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

**SLO 5: Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making**
Students apply broad knowledges and experiences to dance-making and demonstrate a developed sense of what constitutes a serious work of dance with coherent and embodied goals and ideas.

**Related Measures:**

**M 22: Festival Adjudication**
Student dancers and choreographers annually and successfully adjudicate work at American College Dance Festival. ACDFA is a conference for college and university dance programs. Students perform formally, informally, and take master classes. Formal performances are evaluated by a panel of three respected figures in the field.

**Target:**
Continuous and multi-part target:
- a) Student choreographers annually adjudicate work at American College Dance Festival.
- b) At least every other year, student dancers and/or choreographers are selected for Gala Concert and/or national festival.
- c) Compiled anecdotal feedback is positive.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
- a) Target met. Student work "worlds in conflict" was adjudicated at American College Dance Festival.
- b) There was no Gala concert offered at the festival for this reporting cycle (for the first time ever). USM work was selected in previous reporting cycle, so we will report on target being met in 2013-2014 reporting cycle.
- c) Target met. Compiled anecdotal feedback was constructive and positive for the student work.

**M 23: Oral and written presentation**
Students track and articulate their individual choreographic and aesthetic preferences and technical growth. This is evidenced in oral and written research presented in DAN 212, DAN 310, and DAN 312. Journals, project proposals and final papers are the written documents required. They are evaluated with a rubric and put into student files.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
a. 90% of students earn at least 3 points (out of 4) on project proposal in DAN 310, 312. b. 90% of students earn at least 3 points (out of 4) on final paper in DAN 212, 310, 312. c. 90% of students earn at least 4 points (out of 4) on journal in DAN 212, 310, 312.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

a. Project proposal

SP13: DAN 312. Target not met. 50% of students (1 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on project proposal. Average score was 2.7 (out of 4).

b. Final paper

FA12: DAN 212. Target not met. 50% of students (2 of 4) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.1 (out of 4).

SP13: DAN 310. Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.3 (out of 4).

SP13: DAN 312. Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.9 (out of 4).

Overall for final paper, target not met. 78% of students (29 of 35) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.4 (out of 4).

c. Journal

FA12: DAN 212. Target not met. 33% of students (1 of 3) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 2.5 (out of 4).

SP13: DAN 310. Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 3.6 (out of 4).

SP13: DAN 312. Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 4 (out of 4).

Overall for journal, target not met. 75% of students (6 of 8) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 3.4 (out of 4).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Written and oral presentations**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Targets were not all met and will be considered by appropriate faculty for update. Procedures for scoring press blurbs needs to...
**DAN 212, 310, 312 targets**
*Established in Cycle*: 2012-2013
Target have not been met over successive reporting cycles. Scope of target may be too broad (should 212 and 310 be included?)

**M 24: Alumni Survey- Apply and Demonstrate Knowledge**
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they are able to apply and demonstrate their broad experiences of dance-making in post-baccalaureate creative work.

**Target:**
80% of responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they are able to apply and demonstrate their broad experiences of dance-making in post-baccalaureate creative work.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 along with survey of 2012-2013 graduates. Findings are presented independently and combined.
Alumni findings: Target met. 85% of alumni responders (11 of 13) rated their ability to apply and demonstrate knowledge of dance-making at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.2 (out of 5).
2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of alumni responders (5 of 5) rated their ability to apply and demonstrate knowledge of dance-making at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.4 (out of 5).
Overall, target met with 89% (16 of 18) of alumni and 2012-2013 graduates combined rating their ability to apply and demonstrate knowledge of dance-making at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.5 (out of 5).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Administer exit survey to alumni**
*Established in Cycle*: 2008-2009
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Administer exit survey to alumni**
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

*Established in Cycle*: 2008-2009
*Implementation Status*: Finished
*Priority*: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure**: Alumni Survey- Apply and Demonstrate Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making
- **Measure**: Alumni Survey- Career Preparedness | **Outcome/Objective**: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance
- **Measure**: Alumni Survey- Dance Technique | **Outcome/Objective**: Perform exit competencies in dance technique
- **Measure**: Alumni Survey-Theoretical/aesthetic understanding | **Outcome/Objective**: Articulate
dance theoretically and aesthetically

Implementation Description: Su 2011: Professor Meredith Early has taken over this project. The majority of all alumni contacts are updated. The survey is being reviewed and will be posted to Survey Monkey (or another survey source) and we hope to administer the survey Fall 2012.
Responsible Person/Group: Meredith and Stacy

Written and oral presentations
Targets were not all met and will be considered by appropriate faculty for update. Procedures for scoring press blurbs needs to be formalized across sections of DAN 312 and DAN 410.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Oral and written presentation | Outcome/Objective: Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making

Implementation Description: Summer 2011: The dance composition and choreography faculty had a summit where we reconsidered and revisited all assessment instruments and materials in these courses. Scoring is now updated and consistent across courses. We are piloting our new system to see if it is successful. Press blurb scoring is now included in "choreographer responsibility" portion of assessment instrument.
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy, Meredith, Kelly, Elizabeth

Capstone course final presentation
Because this is a culminating project, it is expected that it’s quality be high and that the stakes be correspondingly high. The full faculty (upon review of this report) will discuss if the target should be changed. Data for this reporting cycle reflects a weakness of one student.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone final Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive knowledge of dance

Implementation Description: Fall 2011 faculty discussion: We will change the target to 80% and see how this works after gathering 2 years of data. Hopefully, this will better address intellectual disparity.
Projected Completion Date: 08/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy and full faculty

DAN 401 self evaluations
Students in DAN 401 complete summative self evaluations that are directed, yet personalized and reflective. The range of methods through which professors of this course (there are between 2 to 4 per academic year) meet this objective is widely varied. The self evaluations need to be addressed as a faculty as a whole (including some new instructors for this course) so that we can assure that the divergent methods we use to assess this outcome are still targeted to the same end. Because this
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Self-evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

Implementation Description: Fall 2011: The dance faculty decided to utilize a "reflective paper" rubric to assess all student written work in DAN 401. The rubric allows for consistency in assessment, with the appropriate amount of flexibility for individual instructor assignments. This was first used Fall, 2011. This change will apply to all majors.
Projected Completion Date: 10/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy with dance faculty
Additional Resources Requested: allocated dance faculty meeting

**mentor teacher recruitment**
Once we have graduates who have been in a school for 3 years, they will be strongly recruited for mentor teachership. This is actually part of the long term planning for the dance education program. We simply didn't have anyone "come up" this year, but we will next year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Program alumni as mentor teachers | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

Projected Completion Date: 10/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy, Julie, Elizabeth

**mentor/supervisor evaluations and targets**
Target language needs to be updated to read "388 points (out of 454)" for mentor teacher evaluations and "778 points (out of 972)" for supervising teacher evaluation. Also, update this to be a two-part target.

The actual target may need to also be updated to reflect more accurately what we expect from our students in relation to what the university and/or mentor teachers expect.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teacher Candidate Evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance
Implementation Description:  FA11: The faculty met and decided to update this target for the 11-12 Plan. The mentor teacher's scores will not be used as they are often inflated. We are lowering the target after 2 yrs of data and with knowing that it is not possible for teacher candidates to be excellent at everything; the portfolio is too diverse. A significant amount of growth will still be needed to meet the target.

Projected Completion Date:  10/30/2011

Responsible Person/Group:  Stacy, Julie, Elizabeth

**Performance exams in DAN 401 and assessing them**

The process of aggregating the data suggests a variance in how students are being assessed in performance exams in individual sections of DAN 401. DAN 401 faculty should meet as a whole to determine their assessment methods and which are shared and which are unique. The content of the performance exams is not the issue, but how each individual instructor determines if they are being met or not perhaps is. Each student encounters up to 4 different instructors and assessment processes per year in DAN 401, so this action is certainly relevant to assuring course continuity in terms of the experience of the students who take it repeatedly.

Established in Cycle:  2010-2011
Implementation Status:  Finished
Priority:  High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: DAN 401 Performance Exam | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

Implementation Description:  Fall 2011: The dance faculty met to review this measure and target. We decided to NOT change the target, but to work harder to impart and share the relevance of the final performance assessments with our students. Specifically, these activities prepare students for high stakes performing, which they will encounter in the profession. Additionally, these activities reflect the rigor and high expectations within our program. Also these performances are just a component of the final grade.

Projected Completion Date:  10/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group:  Stacy, Meredith, Kelly, Elizabeth

**Student Teaching Portfolio target**

This is the first reporting cycle for this measure, so even though it was not met we will not change the target for at least one more reporting cycle.

Established in Cycle:  2010-2011
Implementation Status:  Finished
Priority:  High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Portfolio- DED 460/461 Student Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive knowledge of dance

Implementation Description:  Target was modified to students earning 715 out of 894 points.

Projected Completion Date:  08/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group:  Stacy

**Substitute for external evaluations of RDC members**
No data was reported this cycle because our guest artists residencies did not include setting a work (and thus evaluating) our RDC dancers. Residencies instead included master classes and lectures. For the upcoming year, we will have at least one guest artist who can do this evaluation. However, is there an alternative in case the opportunity doesn't exist for an external judgement such as this? Should faculty evaluate RDC members not in their own works? And should we do so with a slightly different perspective, one that is maybe more akin to what exists in the professional world of dance? Dance faculty to brainstorm the idea with the objective being: how can we satisfy this measure when we do not have a guest artist set a work?

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** External Evaluations  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

**Implementation Description:** If no guest artist is available, faculty will evaluate students in RDC performance on "Evaluation of the Dancer" rubric. Evaluation will be done outside the scope of faculty and students working together in faculty choreographic projects.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/30/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy and full dance faculty

**212/210/312/410 targets change**  
In both emphasis areas, all targets for this measure were mainly not met. There has been some revision to the written work required in these courses (project proposal, final paper, journal), but targets were also not met last year. The targets should be REVISED as clearly program expectations are not in line with student achievement. At the same time, the accompanying and observable work of student in their choreography IS meeting expectations, so while our targets are high, lowering them should not sacrifice the quality of student creative work.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Faculty discussion FA12. Faculty decided to modify targets.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy

**Applying broad experiences of dance making**  
Target was not met, but due the the sample size, there is little concern in this area. Target will remain.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy

**Performance Exam**  
Student scores in annual juried assessments did not meet targets.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Performance exam
- **Outcome/Objective:** Perform exit competencies in dance technique

**Implementation Description:** Analyze findings with full faculty to determine if expectations are reasonable.
**Responsible Person/Group:** dance faculty
**Additional Resources Requested:** dedicated faculty meeting

**Repertory Dance Company Process Score target**
Target was not met by either Dance Education or Dance Performance/Choreography students. This was the first year we have used this measure, so we will wait to see if it is met or not next year. 12-13 reporting cycle was not met either. Full attention needs to be given to this in terms of the instrument used and the expectations in relation to the program SLO. Knowing the average RDC Process Score will, in a larger view, assist the dance department in determining where student weakness are in the RDC experience.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Wait for another cycle of data reporting to gain fuller understanding of student achievement in relation to this measure and target.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy and dance faculty

**Student Teaching Portfolio scores**
Target was almost met. Target was newly revised, so it will be kept for another year to see if student achievement meets target in 12/13.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Target modified to students earning 715 out of 894 points.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy and dance education faculty

**Summer/winter study off campus**
Students are not participating in off campus training during summer and winter breaks. The faculty greatly supports this effort and we have taken steps towards making it a reality for our majors. The results do not yet show that it is working. Is this target needed? Or should the measure be changed to measure the results of students who DO study/train off campus? It could be that our current measure only measures who (financially) is able to pursue this.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** faculty discussion in FA12.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy plus dance faculty

**Teacher candidate evaluation target not met.**
This measure and target were both updated for the 11-12 reporting cycle, so we will keep it for an additional year without changing it to see the results of capturing 2 years of data.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Discussion with dance education faculty in FA12. Target was met in 12-13 reporting cycle.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy, Julie, Elizabeth

**DAN 212, 310, 312 targets**  
Target have not been met over successive reporting cycles. Scope of target may be too broad (should 212 and 310 be included?) Are assessment instruments consistent? Are expectations too high? What is the relation between Quality of Work score and scores in these areas (project proposal, final paper, journal)?

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Oral and written presentation | Outcome/Objective: Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making

**Responsible Person/Group:** SRF plus composition/choreography faculty

**DAN 402 growth grade for DED majors**  
Target not met in 2012-2013. Target will not be changed, but monitored in future reporting cycles. At present, we maintain the same standards and expectations for Licensure and performance/choreography emphasis area majors. Typically, student achievement is consistent across both areas, but this will be monitored.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Growth grade in DAN 402 | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

**Responsible Person/Group:** SRF and DED faculty.

**RDC target**  
An updated RDC rubric requires an updated target. The new rubric does not have a "process" portion. 2012-2013 finding are likely skewed for this reason.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** Participation in the Repertory Dance Company | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

**Responsible Person/Group:** SRF and dance faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

You will notice overlap in this section and the following in the Licensure emphasis and the Performance/Choreography emphasis area assessment reports. This is intentional and reflects that our majors, regardless of emphasis area, are in the same courses and are held to the same expectations. When measures are specific to one area, they are only addressed in the corresponding report.

Reviewing the findings in this report reveal that we are primarily meeting targets for all SLOs. SLO#2 and #4 were met by all measures. This indicates that students are meeting our expectations for displaying an integrated and comprehensive knowledge of dance and for being able to articulate dance theoretically and aesthetically. In particular, SLO#2 utilizes 4 measures (capstone presentation, final projects in eight DAN/DED courses, exit interview, Student Teaching portfolio) to assess student achievement. The portfolio measure has been inconsistent in previous reporting cycles, so we look forward to future reporting cycles to support this year's findings.

Meeting 5 of 6 measure targets for SLO#1 indicates that we are doing well in developing the technical skills of our majors. Four SLO #1 measures vary from performance to written work, so we are assured that our majors are proficient in their skill acquisition on both physical and cognitive levels. That SLO #1 and #2 are mainly met affirms our department value for majors being skilled and further able to integrate their skills to "non-dance" coursework.

Part of training artists in any field is preparing them for the realities of the "real world" when they graduate. SLO#3 is directly concerned with this. The Licensure area measures this outcome through assessing student work in RDC, their ability to gain employment in the field, evaluations of their work in student teaching, development of alumni to mentor teacher status and results from an alumni/graduate survey. We are most satisfied with the student teacher evaluation measure being met as we have grappled with the most appropriate and effective way to include it in our WEAVE reports. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the summative evaluation from the supervising teacher in the second experience appears to be our best indicator of actual student performance in this area. We look forward to future reporting cycles to affirm this.

SLO#3 was met except for the measure regarding student work in the Repertory Dance Company which is under review. (Student achievement is not the issue, but how our unit measures it is.) It is worth highlighting that one measure for this SLO, as in others, is the results of an alumni survey. That alumni view themselves as prepared for the field is perhaps the most valuable indicator of this outcome.

SLO#5 was met in 2 of 3 measures. That we expect Licensure majors to demonstrate an ability to apply knowledge of dance making reflects that the degree in a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree and that all our dance educators need to be able to engage in the craft of dance making as proficiently as they do their pedagogical practices.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

While each program SLO was met through more than one measure, there are still areas for improvement. They are:

1. It appears that guest artists evaluate our student dancers from a less rigorous perspective than the regular dance faculty do. This was immediately apparent in the data received and for this reason, we have modified the measure/target to reflect a score that is partially the guest artist and partially the RDC director or faculty rehearsal director.

2. We are still not satisfied with how we are assessing/reporting on student written work in composition/choreography courses. Our measure (meas. #23) regarding journals, final papers and project proposals in DAN 212, 310, 312 and 410 needs attention. In the past 3 years we created and implemented a consistent assignment across these courses, but it appears that there is not yet consistency in how they are evaluated (by the instructors, who rotate) and/or in how "featured" or attended to they are in each course (specifically the journal).

3. Assessment of student work in RDC needs attention. The measure (meas. #11) was changed for the 12-13 reporting cycle, but mid-cycle the assessment instrument was changed as well. The data in this report does not completely capture what we wish for-which is student work in the rehearsal process (not the process and product combined). What we ultimately care about knowing is how prepared out students are for the "real world" (SLO #3).

4. An area for attention is related to Measure 5 (DAN 402 Growth Grade). This measure was not met in the cycle and reflects an issue that emerges periodically. This measure was met by performance/choreography emphasis area majors and we have the same expectations and standards for performance and growth in DAN 402 (Advanced ballet) for majors from both emphasis areas. When Licensure majors underachieve (yes, the sample size was small: 3) we need to be assured that this is not because we are advancing our licensure students too early in their technical training. Every semester as the faculty discussed technique level placement, we encounter this issue. Findings this year brings it to light, again.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The following events were unique to the 2012-2013 year. This section is the same for both BFA emphasis areas.

- We expanded our faculty to seven with the addition of an Instructor. Rebecca McArthur instructed 10 courses and contributed to the artistic community. Students benefitted from her perspectives on technical training and faculty benefitted from a new (non-USM) perspective.

- Due to asbestos abatement, our primarily performance venue, the Mannoni Performing Arts Center (PAC) was not available to us. We had anticipated this for the Fall semester, but the February 2013 tornado rendered it unusable for our Spring production. We compensated (and met accreditation standards for performance and choreographic opportunities for our majors) through producing a
series of site-specific works in the Hattiesburg area in fall and in reconfiguring our Spring PAC concert into a series of smaller concerts in the convertible dance studio theatre. It was not ideal, but we managed. The site-specific works were wildly successful in terms of audience attendance, creating visibility for the department and in generating buzz.

· On July 1, 2013, we officially became a stand-alone department at USM. We split from the Theatre department and now govern ourselves autonomously within the institution. This is the result of several years of work and planning and has been a point of pride and celebration all year long.

· Faculty were prolific in their creative research, Prof. White published in the Journal of Dance Education, and faculty made off campus research and creative presentations. White was awarded the CoAL Teacher of the Year and Reischman Fletcher was honored with the Dance Teacher magazine 2013 Award in Higher Education. Faculty are serving on national board and hold leadership positions in service organizations. Lester chaired the UAC and Reischman Fletcher the Academic Council.

· Surprisingly, there was no Gala concert at the American College Dance Festival in March 2013. Our department made a very good showing, especially with the faculty works, but we missed the opportunity to show our work more than once in the regional setting.

· 2012-2013 saw the advent of departmental strategic planning, which includes curricular revisions and possible degree expansion. The process is inclusive, focused and will generate a 5 year plan for the department. This is in part a result of the Spring 2012 reaccrediation visit.

· The department (White and Lester) adminsitered a grant-funded guest artist residency with ClancyWorks, a company from Washington D.C.. The residency had a large education component and integrated our licensure program in a way not typical.

We are continuing to attract a larger number and more talented incoming class. The ramifications of a more skilled incoming class should be manifest in the level of student achievement in areas such as those presented in this report. Will targets need to be adjusted in the future to account for this? Will their technical growth be paralleled by "academic" growth? Accepting students who are pre-prepared for our program and who have gone through the audition-acceptance process also appears to be contributing to a higher retention rate (although in 2012 we started deliberately addressing retention through student engagement and faculty contact). Because contemporary dance is more mainstream than it was even 5 years ago is aiding us in attracting students, assuaging parent fears about majoring in the arts and in guaranteeing that our incoming majors have exposure to the field in relevant ways.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

1. Administering the alumni survey was a large scale departmental initiative and encompassed and addressed more than one SLO. The electronic survey was administered to about 40 USM dance program alums. This survey polled respondents on each of the SLOs in this WEAVE report. The responses are reported in this annual report and the department is using them for further department planning and decision making (curricular, artistic and programmatic). The alumni survey is being utilized in establishing the Dance Advisory Board, which will start work in summer, 2013. Generally, survey results are positive and reflect that our graduates are using their degrees and are satisfied with their USM dance education.

2. In 2012-2013 we continued with administering the Chicago Dance Artist Series (CDAS). This program brings a variety of working artists from Chicago to USM to work with students in classes, rehearsals,
performances, lec-dems and informal discussion. We had always intended for this program to be a way to expose our majors to dance outside of the immediate geographic region. Literally, we have brought the Chicago dance scene to our majors (and the public who participate). Our original intentions have been magnified and we now have proof that exposure to the larger dance world is essential to the training and development of our students (and will be addressed in our strategic plan). We have seen immediate success and already have a 2012 graduate performing professionally in Chicago. We intend to continue the CDAS model with dance artists from other cities and to see how we can mine the idea to augment our students’ educational and artistic experiences at USM. CDAS is not included in this report as a measure because its intent (and rewards) transcend more than one program objective.

3. We are using assessment results to help us make decisions about curricular progression across series of courses. For instance, Capstone final presentations, which are used as a key indicator of student achievement in their final year of study have been (yet again) revised in terms of the scope and expectations for the assignment. 2012-2013 saw modified targets and they were met for both emphasis areas. The curricular links between Capstone and the subsequent course in thesis writing are clearer now and we are better able to see how they work together to develop student skills. The next step is configuring how the pre-Capstone writing/speaking intensive course (DED 360) and the post-Capstone student teaching experience can likewise be beneficial and benefited within the existing curricular structure.

4. We are revising our juried performance assessment instrument (and perhaps processes). The present one has been in use for many years. We are using new(er) faculty to contribute an outside/objective eye to our processes. We are concerned with remaining relevant and being efficient in our juried assessments.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking

1. For the licensure emphasis area, effort spent determining what evaluation tools are most appropriate (summative), from whom (supervising teacher) and in which experience (second) are paying off and we are now generating useful data that tells us what we want to know and data that we can use for program improvements. We remain flexible with the sometimes "moving target" that is the Office of Educational Field Experience and of how certain assignments change in terms of how many points they are worth, etc. We look forward to continuing to learn about our licensure program/students through several cycles of reporting and analyzing data that emerges from the measures and targets included in this (and future) reports.

2. In addition to developing mentor teachers from the pools of our program graduates in the K-12 sector, we are developing mentor teachers who come from other disciplines. This ultimately aids us in assuring consistency and a high quality of student teaching experience for our licensure majors. Plus, having more qualified mentor teachers creates more placement opportunities for our students. While this doesn't capture the successes of our students and graduates, it does reflect a growing need and ever-increasing partnership we have with the regional K-12 sector.

3. Some departmental processes (for both emphasis areas) are now working effectively and efficiently and reflect past time spent as a result of annual assessment reporting and follow through. They include: assessing student work in ballet and modern technique courses with rigor and consistency;
evaluating written work in modern technique courses in a way that is standard, yet flexible for the
range of professors who instruct these courses; administering the exit interview and using it as a way
to capture student self perceptions on their achievement at the point of graduation (literally, these
happen the week of graduation).
All of the above have been under review/revision for several reporting cycles and now we see the
rewards of their implementation.