

## Theatre Arts Department 2012 Annual Assessment Update

Prepared by John Blondell and Mitchell Thomas

### I. Mission Statement, Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map, and Multi-Year Assessment Plan

- A. [http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre\\_arts/missionstatement.html](http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre_arts/missionstatement.html) Mission statement has not changed.
- B. [http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre\\_arts/ProgramLearningOutcomes.html](http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre_arts/ProgramLearningOutcomes.html) The PLOs were changed during the 2011-2012 academic year. Please see section II for further information on the changes.
- C. [http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre\\_arts/Alignmentlink.html](http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre_arts/Alignmentlink.html) The curriculum map was changed to utilize the updated institutional template.
- D. [http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre\\_arts/Multi-YearAssessmentChart.html](http://www.westmont.edu/academics/departments/theatre_arts/Multi-YearAssessmentChart.html) The multi-year assessment chart was updated to reflect the pilot program that TA is participating in with a multi-year self-study and the development of an action plan with input from external reviewer, PRC, Dean of EE, and Provost.

### II. Follow up on Action Items identified in previous reports

Please see **Appendix A** for a copy of last year's PRC response to the Theatre Arts 2011 Assessment update.

A1. *Focus on specific tasks related to the data-gathering and rubric modification for evaluating student writing-effectiveness. John Blondell.*

A2. Gathered data, and assessed student success in effective Written Communication, relative to the application of discipline-specific research methodologies in crafting effective writing about theatrical practice. (This department SLO maps onto the college's PLO for written effectiveness for the 2011-12 school year.)

A3. The department is consulting with the lead Writing Assessment Coordinator for input on appropriate data samples and storage, as well as developing strategies to encourage stronger, earlier writing from students.

B1. *Further revision related to the Design and Technology portion of the Theater Arts curriculum. Bob Hamel.*

B2. TA 136 (Design for the Theatre) has been changed to TA 036 to create an introductory course in design and the visual arts accessible to our majors and the GE population. The course has been submitted to the GE committee (though late) and is currently in a revision process.

B3. The Theatre Arts department is still trying to strengthen this area of the department. Though some strides have been taken in the physical plant and departmental structures, we have yet to see consistent enrollment increases or significantly greater student participation and/or satisfaction in these areas.

*C1. Development of specific Program Learning Outcomes which are then linked to the curriculum map and multi-year assessment plan. You currently have listed Student Learning Outcomes and Student Goals. The PRC strongly recommends you merge them to create a set of measurable Program Learning Outcomes. Mitchell Thomas.*

C2. In consultation with the Dean of Educational Effectiveness and the Theatre Arts faculty, the department has created Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) that are linked to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). These PLOs are measurable and meaningful.

C3. The department is getting better at differentiating between the areas of annual assessment, program review, and ongoing individual and departmental growth. (e.g. what is measurable, and what is not)

*D1. Placement of the Program Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map and Multi-Year Assessment plan on the departmental website. Mitchell Thomas.*

D2. This has been accomplished.

D3. As we begin the pilot process for the new 6-year program review cycle, the department anticipates making some changes to our multi-year assessment plan in the near future.

*E1. Discuss, and adopt as appropriate, new rubric for Senior Projects that will be used consistently by full-time and adjunct faculty.*

E2. This project was originally assigned to be lead by Bob Hamel with input from TA faculty. However, during the year it was decided it was more appropriate for Professor Hamel (in his 2<sup>nd</sup> year at Westmont) to focus on his teaching and scholarship in anticipation of his intermediate tenure review.

E3. The department is discussing with the Dean of Educational Effectiveness whether to take this on for 12-13 or wait until the self-study report process is complete.

### III. 2011-2012 Focus

The Theatre Arts Department engaged in the following assessment tasks for 2011-2012:

- 1) Gathered data for the Core Knowledge Outcome, and evaluated the success of the new benchmark.
- 2) Gathered data, and assessed student success in effective Written Communication, relative to the application of discipline-specific research methodologies in crafting effective writing about theatrical practice. (This department SLO maps onto the college's PLO for written effectiveness for the 2011-12 school year.)

#### A. Core Knowledge

1. During the 2011-2012 school year, the Theatre Arts Department continued work on its outcome relative to Core Knowledge and Disciplinary Literacy in Theatre and Drama. The data set consisted of 13 Theatre Arts Majors.
2. The departmental benchmark is Program Learning Outcome #2, which reads:
  - Students demonstrate Core Knowledge in major literature, history, and theory of western theatre practice.
    - Student Learning Outcome 1  
Students will score 80% or higher on the core knowledge exam administered in Theatre History sequence. Actually, the benchmark should read as follows: *80% of Theatre Arts majors will score 80% or higher on the core knowledge component of Theatre Arts coursework.*
3. Please find **Appendix E** for the curriculum that constitutes “Core Knowledge” for Westmont Theatre Arts majors, and **Appendix F** for the instruments used to assess Core Knowledge in Theatre Arts 121, taught by John Blondell during the spring of 2012.
4. Data can be accessed on the department's shared drive at [smb://myfiles.westmont.edu/program\\_review/Theatre\\_Arts/Assessment Data](smb://myfiles.westmont.edu/program_review/Theatre_Arts/Assessment Data)

#### B. Interpret the Results

1. Focused work on this outcome continued from 2010-2011, when adjunct instructor Elizabeth Hess taught Core Knowledge-related courses, and obtained data that was inconsistent with that of previous years. Hence, the department decided to focus on this area for one more year, in order to collect more data, and answer several questions related to this outcome. Theatre Arts Core Knowledge consists of 100 terms, theatrical figures, and aesthetic movements integral to a deep and broad understanding of western theatrical practice.  
In the beginning of 2011, the department adopted the following benchmark: *80% of Theatre Arts majors will score 80% or higher on the core knowledge component of Theatre Arts coursework.*  
During the spring of 2012, Core Knowledge was assessed in midterm and

final examinations in TA 121 Theatre History II. Scores of Theatre Arts majors are as follows:

Student 1 – 97.25  
Student 2 – 96  
Student 3 – 92.5  
Student 4 – 90  
Student 5 – 86.75  
Student 6 – 85.25  
Student 7 – 85.5  
Student 8 – 85.25  
Student 9 – 82.25  
Student 10 – 75.75  
Student 11 – 75  
Student 12 – 67.75  
Student 13 – 53.5

Thus:

- 2 out of 13 majors scored 95% or higher
- 4 out of 13 majors scored 90% or higher
- 6 out of 13 majors scored 85% or higher
- 9 out of 13 majors scored 80% or higher
- 11 out of 13 majors scored 75% or higher

Though students did not reach the benchmark, the results are nevertheless encouraging: assessment instruments appear to assess effectively disciplinary knowledge in theatre and drama; several students display significant achievement (95% or higher), and though the benchmark was not reached, it was close! In addition, a staffing anomaly in the spring of 2012 probably had some impact on grading. During that spring, Professor John Blondell was out of the country for the Final Exam, which was administered and graded by adjunct instructor Elizabeth Hess. Taking into account differences in grading, and Professor Hess's own account that she grades "terms really, really hard" and takes off points for fairly minor errors, it appears that the benchmark is achievable in the future.

C. Close the Loop

Indeed, several questions considered by the department over the last number of years seem to have been answered. First, the 100-term curriculum adopted by the department several years ago *does* assess a certain depth and breadth of disciplinary knowledge. Second, the assessment instruments are appropriate to gather and assess the outcome. Third, the departmental benchmark is appropriate for this outcome. Though the benchmark was not achieved this time, the department believes that it will. In 2012, Core Knowledge will be taught by John Blondell in Theatre Arts 120 – Theatre History I. This course develops literacy in ancient Greek and Roman Theatre, Medieval Theatre, and Renaissance Theatre in Spain, Italy, and England.

**A. Written Communication**

1. In addition to its work on Core Knowledge and Disciplinary Literacy, the Theatre Arts Department focused its assessment activities on Written Communication during the 2012-2013 school year. The data set consisted of 12 students, all of whom were Theatre Arts majors.
2. The department's program outcome relative to writing reads:
  - Students apply discipline-specific research methodologies in crafting effective writing about theatrical practice.
    - Student Learning Outcome 1  
Students will develop a precise thesis and fully developed arguments in their writing.
    - Student Learning Outcome 2  
Students will be able to produce accurate discipline-specific research in their writing.
3. Please find the prompt in **Appendix G** and the rubric and the key to the rubric, used to assess student writing, in **Appendix H**.
4. As noted above, the department is trying to ascertain the appropriate data to store for archival purposes, and will post this data in our next round of collection in Fall 2012.

**B. Interpret the Results**

1. The above outcomes were assessed in TA 121, Theatre History II. This is the first time the department has focused on writing for one of its assessment activities, and the practice turned out to be useful and informative. The assignment was created in order to develop effective writing about theatrical practice, and to develop research methodologies appropriate to the field. Though there were several writing assignments in the course, the assignment used to assess this outcome was a research paper in which students research and write about the methods, styles, and features of a significant 19<sup>th</sup> century actor. Though the rubric includes such writing categories as Structure & Organization, Argument & Analysis, Use of Evidence, Bibliographic Format & Sources, and Style & Mechanics, for the purposes of this outcome special attention is paid to Structure & Organization, especially in regards to the development of an effective thesis; the development of that thesis through the essay's use of Argument & Analysis; and proper Bibliographic Format & Use of Sources.  
Theatre History II is a Writing Intensive course, and as such there is a substantial amount of revision and rewriting required for writing assignments. John Blondell, using the rubric created during the 2010-2011 school year, assessed student essays. In addition, Professor Blondell provided a significant amount of written feedback to the student regarding the strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement for the essay. Students received their essays with margin comments, a highlighted rubric indicating Professor Blondell's assessment of student writing relative to their first draft, as well as written comments. In addition, on several occasions, Professor Blondell provided oral

feedback to students' writing. Students then took the feedback from these sources (marginalia, rubric, and written and/or responses) and crafted a revision of the essay. All students were required to revise their essays at least once.

The following data was collected from use of the rubric:

- 11 of 12 first drafts received a "C" or lower in "Structure & Organization," the category of the rubric that most clearly addresses the development of a thesis, and the argument(s) that intend to develop that thesis. Please see the appendix for features that characterize a "C" in this area.
- 11 of 12 first drafts received a "B" or better in "Bibliographic Format & Sources." Please see the appendix for features that characterize a "B" in this area.

Students showed substantive improvements in subsequent drafts.

- 11 of 12 subsequent drafts received a "B-" or higher in Structure & Organization."

#### C. Close the Loop

The following observations and questions emerge from using this rubric for the first time:

- The rubric and its key seem to be effective tools in improving student writing. They create clear expectations for students, and are useful for professor and student alike.
- The rubric's categories are appropriate, covering a range of criteria, including Structure, Argument, Evidence, Sources, and Style.
- It is baffling, however, that students write essays with inferior, or nonexistent thesis statements. Here is but one example of a professor's response to a student, which was repeated many times for this assignment: "You have a good sense of Stanislavski and some of his major contributions. However, we have some large problems to address here. First of all, there is no clear thesis here. The essay is little more than an extended laundry list of some of the major Stanislavskian principles (several of which were developed in class), rather than a precise, incisive exploration of some aspect of his acting work." Why is this? During the upcoming year, the department seeks to address this area, in order to help students to write better earlier in the process.

The Theatre Arts Department will continue work on effective written communication for the 2012-2013 school year. Assessment activities will occur in TA 120: Theatre History I and will involve a research essay on a topic of

Shakespearean practice. During the course of the semester, the department will do the following:

- Create a short survey that questions the rubric's effectiveness. The survey will question student perception regarding the helpfulness of the rubric, as well as the assignment used to collect data relative to written communication.
- Develop methods that encourage the development of clear, concise thesis statements earlier in the process of writing, so that students can communicate more effectively, and enjoy more success, earlier in the writing process. Professor John Blondell will confer with Sarah Skripsky about strategies and methods in this area.

#### **IV. Next Steps**

##### **A. Action Items:**

- 1) Create a short survey that questions the writing rubric's effectiveness.
  - a. Timeline: Fall 2012
  - b. Lead: John Blondell
- 2) Confer with Sarah Skripsky about strategies and methods for encouraging clear, concise thesis statements early in writing process as well as appropriate data samples for archival use.
  - a. Timeline: Fall 2012
  - b. Lead: John Blondell
- 3) Further revision related to the Design and Technology portion of the Theater Arts curriculum, including GE acceptance (PIA) of TA 036 and the development of a design and technology manual for students working in production.
  - a. Timeline: Fall 2012
  - b. Lead: Bob Hamel
- 4) Completion of multi-year self study
  - a. Timeline: To be completed by Sept. 15, 2013
  - b. Lead: Mitchell Thomas

#### **V. Appendices**

- A. 2011 response from the PRC
- B. Departmental response to PRC response
- C. Multi-year assessment chart
- D. Curriculum Map
- E. Core Knowledge Prompt
- F. Core Knowledge Prompt 2
- G. Written Communication Prompt
- H. Written Communication Rubric and Key to the Rubric

## APPENDIX A



# WESTMONT

### *Program Review Committee* **MEMORANDUM**

Date: November 22, 2011  
To: Mitchell Thomas, Chair, Department of Theatre Arts  
Re: Annual Assessment Update Report  
Prepared by: Program Review Committee/Edd Noell

Thank you for your timely submission of your 2011 Annual Assessment Update Report.

The Program Review Committee (PRC) commends your department for following up on the actions items listed below:

1. Adopting a new Mission Statement
2. Adopting new Student Learning Outcomes
3. Mapping the new SLOs more carefully to the Institutional Learning Outcomes, particularly those outcomes related to effective written communication.
4. Creating a rubric for SLOs related to effective written communication.
5. Initiating revisions in both major curriculum and particular courses in design and production.
6. Adding a new dramatic literature course “Gender and Ethnicity on the American Stage” that will satisfy the General Education requirements for Performing and Interpreting the Arts.

#### **Mission Statement:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In place | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aligned with college mission statement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Posted on department website           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concise  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Link provided in the report            |

#### **PLOs:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent with college/program mission                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessable        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Realistic  | <input type="checkbox"/> Posted on department website |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Few in number  | <input type="checkbox"/> Link provided in the report  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Used by faculty/staff to set priorities and make data-guided decisions |   |

#### **Curriculum Map:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In place  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required courses identified (for 2012) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear   | <input type="checkbox"/> Posted on department website                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Curriculum is aligned with PLOs   | <input type="checkbox"/> Link provided in the report                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment conducted in or after courses in which the outcomes are mastered |  |

#### **Multi-Year Assessment Plan:**

In place

Complete

Realistic

Aligned with institutional schedule

Sufficiently specific about closing the loop

Posted on department website

Link provided in the report

**Follow Up Items:** The department has identified several items that need to be addressed. These include further a) curriculum revision, particularly in regards to creating a lower-division Stage Design course; b) resolving several questions regarding assessment of the “Core Knowledge” of Theatre Arts majors, including the appropriate assessment instrument and appropriate departmental benchmark.

**Current Year Focus:** The department has identified two learning outcomes for its assessment focus for 2011-12: 1) applying theatre arts-specific research methodologies in crafting effective writing about theatrical practice; 2) closing the loop with respect to assessing the Core Knowledge of Theatre Arts majors.

**Next Steps:** The department is encouraged to continue to gather data related to assessing the Core Knowledge SLO and continue its discussion of the new assessment benchmark. Its also encouraged to develop new rubrics with respect to Senior Projects and writing research papers.

**Feedback for use in 6-Year Report:** Several of the potential action items named by the annual assessment report update need to be re-examined. With regards to item 1, the department needs to distinguish carefully between what it can do to replenish the Global Series funds and the portion of this task that is the Provost’s responsibility. For item 2, the department’s discussion of its aim to add an additional faculty person of color by 2014 needs to be supported by the appropriate data. Then a case can be made to the Provost. The same is true for the Action Item of re-hiring an Arts Coordinator by the end of this academic year. The specifics of how this person will improve student performance need to be clearly identified. It will be helpful to name what educational and/or administrative functions which aren’t currently covered are envisioned to be covered by the Arts Coordinator.

**Conclusion:** Again the PRC commends the department for its progress in closing the loop in its curriculum by gathering data, discussing rubric formation, and developing new curriculum, including a new course related to diversity issues.

The items that merit specific attention for next year are:

1. Focus on specific tasks related to the data-gathering and rubric modification for evaluating student writing-effectiveness.
2. Further revision related to the Design and Technology portion of the Theater Arts curriculum.
3. Development of specific Program Learning Outcomes which are then inked to the curriculum map and multi-year assessment plan. You currently have listed Student Learning Outcomes and Student Goals. The PRC strongly recommends you merge them to create a set of measurable Program Learning Outcomes.
4. Placement of the Program Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map and Multi-Year Assessment plan on the departmental website.

## APPENDIX B

### Program Review – Theatre Arts

#### One page response to 2011 PRC response to department update

#### Feedback for use in 6-year report

*“Feedback for use in 6-Year Report: Several of the potential action items named by the annual assessment report update need to be re-examined. With regards to item 1, the department needs to distinguish carefully between what it can do to replenish the Global Series funds and the portion of this task that is the Provost’s responsibility. For item 2, the department’s discussion of its aim to add an additional faculty person of color by 2014 needs to be supported by the appropriate data. Then a case can be made to the Provost. The same is true for the Action Item of re-hiring an Arts Coordinator by the end of this academic year. The specifics of how this person will improve student performance need to be clearly identified. It will be helpful to name what educational and/or administrative functions which aren’t currently covered are envisioned to be covered by the Arts Coordinator.”*

- 1) The Globe Series was funded by the Lovelace Foundation in 2003 with a grant of \$45,000 that created the international series at Westmont. Those funds have now been depleted. The department continues to make requests to the Provost and outside foundations to renew this fund. The department is also cultivating donors to create a Westmont Center for International Theatre Performance under the Global plank of the college vision and mission, which would include working capital for the Globe Series.
- 2) Items 1 and 2 are connected as the department envisions an endowed Chair as part of the Center being created, which would allow for an additional faculty person being hired. The department is confused, however, by the request to support with appropriate data how diversity would enhance the department? Surely this is self-evident, and is supported by college-wide goals, research, vision, and biblical rationale.
- 3) The Arts coordinator position was a fully funded and implemented position that was cut during the downturn in the economy. The Arts coordinator position was fully implemented for two years prior to the elimination of the position. Key roles that the AC played was interfacing with the public, donor and board relations, and the creation of new programs (outreach, etc.). The AC position is NOT related to student performance but the interaction between the college programs and the world. The functions of this position have already been identified, articulated, and supported by the Provost and President.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mitchell Thomas  
Chair, Theatre Arts

**APPENDIX C**

**Theatre Arts Multi-Year Assessment Plan**

<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>201 1- 201 2</b>	<b>201 2- 201 3</b>	<b>201 3- 201 4</b>	<b>201 4- 201 5</b>	<b>201 5- 201 6</b>	<b>201 6- 201 7</b>	<b>Means of Assessment, Benchmark</b>	<b>Who is in charge?</b>	<b>How the loop will be closed /has been closed?</b>
1. Skill in Development of Theatrical Performances				<b>X</b>			Senior Project/Rubric	Thomas	Developed new outcome, refine rubric that is five years old
2. Core Knowledge	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>		Test/80% of Theatre majors will score 80% or higher in Core Knowledge	Blondel 1	Developed new outcome. Gathered data for one more round in order to answer questions regarding this outcome, the assessment instrument, and the benchmark.
3. Discipline-specific research and writing	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>	Research Papers/Rubric	Blondel 1	Developed new outcome/rubric. Final round of data collection and analysis in Fall 2012.
4.									
5.									
<b>GE Projects</b>									
6.									
7.									
8.									

Note: The department will be completing a multi-year self-study report in 2012-2013, and completing the 6-year cycle with an external reviewer, PRC response, and action plan development with Dean of Educational Effectiveness and Provost in 2013-2014.

**APPENDIX D**

**Theatre Arts Major Curriculum Alignment Chart**

List all courses offered in your curriculum. Identify whether each course is required or elective.

Identify program-learning outcome/s taught in each course and at what level.

**Theatre Arts Major**

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Core or Elective</b>	<b>Program Learning Outcome #1 Skill/Theatrical Performance</b>	<b>PLO #2 Core Knowledge</b>	<b>PLO #3 Discipline Specific Writing / Research</b>	<b>PLO #4 [List]</b>	<b>PLO #5 [List]</b>
001	Core		I/D	I/D		
009	Elective	I				
010	Core	I/D	I			
011/111	Elective	D				
015	Core	I				
016	Core	I				
017	Core	I				
031/131	Elective	D				
050/150	Core	D				
071/171	Elective	I/D				
072/172	Elective	I/D				
073/173	Elective	I/D				
075/175	Elective	I/D				
120	Core		M	M		
121	Core		M	M		
124	Elective		M	M		
125	Core	D				
126	Elective	D				
127	Elective	D				
136	Core	D				
137	Elective	D				
186	Elective		D	D		
187	Elective		D	D		
190	Elective					
193	Core	M				
195	Elective					

I = Introduced, D = Developed, M/A = Mastered/Assessed

**Appendix E – Core Knowledge Prompt**

**Core Knowledge Curriculum  
Theatre Arts Department**

GREEK AND ROMAN THEATRE

City Dionysia  
Dithyramb  
Tetralogy  
“goat song”  
Anagnorisis  
Peripetia  
Stichomythia  
Parados  
Skene  
Thymele  
Agon  
Theatron  
Orchestra  
Thyromata  
Proskenion  
Episkenion  
Hesiod  
Ludi  
Cavea  
Pulpitum  
Vomitoria  
Scaenae Frons  
Old Comedy  
New Comedy  
Komos  
Plautus

MEDIEVAL, ELIZABETHAN, AND SPANISH GOLDEN AGE

Morality Play  
Corpus Christi Plays  
Mansion-and-Platea Staging  
Medieval Theory of Vertical Time  
*Quem Quaeritis* trope  
Pageant Wagon  
Great Chain of Being  
“Humours” Theory of Personality  
Yard  
Inner Above  
The Heavens  
Tiring House

London City Limits  
Sharer  
Blackfriars  
City Comedy  
Masque  
Inigo Jones  
*Auto Sacramentales*  
*Carros*  
*Comedia*  
*Capa y Espada*  
*Mosqueteros*  
*Corrales*  
*Cazuela*

### RISE OF THE PROFESSIONAL THEATRE

Neoclassicism  
Comedy of Manners  
Sentimental Comedy  
Heroic Tragedy  
Adaptations of Shakespeare  
Drame  
Moliere  
Edwin Forrest  
Denis Diderot  
Lewis and William Hallam  
Edmund Kean  
Romanticism  
Comedie Francaise  
Johann Wolfgang von Goethe  
Melodrama  
Gotthold Lessing  
Scenic Stage  
Preface to *Cromwell*  
Stage Licensing Act of 1737  
*Le Cid* Controversy

### THE MODERN STAGE

Constantin Stanislavsky  
Bertolt Brecht  
Emile Zola  
Edward Gordon Craig  
Georg, Duke of Saxe Meinengen  
Robert Wilson  
Provincetown Players  
Deterministic Triad  
Group Theatre

Federal Theatre Project  
Antonin Artaud  
Gesamkunstwerk  
Verfremdungseffekt  
Richard Wagner  
Vsevelod Meyerhold  
Theatrical Device  
Adolphe Appia  
Andre Antoine  
Moscow Art Theatre  
Gestus

**Appendix F – Core Knowledge Prompt**

TA 121 History of Theatre II  
Midterm Exam  
February 15, 2012

I. Significant Terms. Please indicate the period and country to which this term, person, or concept most accurately applies, and then write a sentence or two that defines, and describes the significance of it, him, or her.

Neoclassicism

Moliere

Lewis and William Hallam

Romanticism

Comedie Francaise

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

Gotthold Lessing

Preface to *Cromwell*

Stage Licensing Act of 1737

*Le Cid* Controversy

1. In five succinct sentences, please describe the significant contributions and innovations of the 1671 Drury Lane Theatre, using the following terms: Thomas Killigrew, Scenic Stage, Vista Stage, Stage Doors, Frontispiece, Marriage of Italianate and Raised Platform Methods of Playing, Wing and Border, Painted Perspective Scenery.
2. In five sentences, please describe the tension between technical and emotional/intuitive approaches to acting, using five of the nine actors or theorists (and their contributions) to write your answer: Denis Diderot, *The Paradox of the Actor*, Edmund Kean, William Charles MacReady, Edwin Forrest, David Garrick, Sarah Bernhardt, Sarah Siddons, John Phillip Kemble.
3. In five sentences, please describe some notable characteristics of five of the following eight examples of dramatic form: comedy of manners, heroic tragedy, drame, sentimental comedy, bourgeois or domestic tragedy, melodrama, or Adaptations of Shakespeare.

**Appendix F, continued – Core Knowledge**

**TA 121 Theatre History II  
Final Examination, May 2, 2012**

- I. **Develop a 4-5 sentence description of artistic Modernism. Then, for each of the remaining terms in this section, develop a 2-3 sentence statement that describes, defines, or explains the term in question, and displays its significance to theatrical modernism.**

Modernism  
(15 pts)

Realism  
Naturalism  
Poetic Theatre  
Expressionism  
Epic Theatre  
(25 Pts., 5 pts per term)

- II. **People, Theatres, Ideas of the Modern Theatre. Please write a short description/definition of the following people, theatres, or concepts. Please include the following information: the theatrical movement to which the term is most clearly associated, and a statement that suggests how the individual, theatre, etc. had a formative influence on the modern theatre. 60 pts. 3 pts. per term**

Constantin Stanislavsky  
Bertolt Brecht  
Emile Zola  
Edward Gordon Craig  
Robert Wilson  
Provincetown Players  
Group Theatre  
Antonin Artaud  
Gesamkunstwerk  
Verfremdungseffekt  
Richard Wagner  
Jerzy Grotowski  
Adolphe Appia  
Andre Antoine  
Moscow Art Theatre  
Gestus  
Harold Clurman  
Peter Brook  
Moscow Art Theatre  
Berliner Ensemble

## Appendix G – Written Communication Prompt

TA 121  
Theatre History II

For your next essay, you will write a 6-page essay about a significant 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, or 19<sup>th</sup> century actor. Rather than focusing on biographical material, find material that deals with their attitude to acting, acting process or method, relationship to Romantic or Classical norms, famous performances and roles, and so on. I am principally looking for you to write about what *distinguishes* their acting from other actors of the period, and am looking for descriptions of their work, or their own opinions or attitudes to their work, from primary source material. Consequently, you can use our *Actors on Acting* text, its bibliography, and other sources from which you can obtain primary material. You may also use secondary source material, wherein contemporary scholars or historians interpret or analyze the actors in question. You may use online source material, as well. Please use no less than 5 sources for your essay.

Due Date: March 21

Here are some possibilities.

Nell Gwynn  
Thomas Betterton  
Moliere  
David Garrick  
Edmund Kean  
Sarah Siddons  
William Charles MacReady  
Henry Irving  
Ellen Terry  
Edwin Forrest  
Edwin Booth  
John Philip Kemble  
Sarah Bernhardt  
Francois Joseph Talma  
Eduard Devrient  
Frederich Schroder  
Charlotte Cushman  
James O'Neill

**Appendix H – Written Communication Rubric and Key to the Rubrickl**

<b>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>ARGUMENT &amp; ANALYSIS</b>	<b>USE OF EVIDENCE</b>	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHIC FORMAT &amp; SOURCES</b>	<b>STYLE &amp; MECHANICS</b>
<p>Essay has a compelling purpose. Introduction contextualizes issue and engages reader; thesis is precise, original, and sophisticated; transitions clarify relationships of ideas; paragraphs cohere and build substantively on one another; conclusion demonstrates substantive reflection.</p>	<p>Response to topic is insightful and original, and fully addresses the prompt. Essay offers a compelling and fully developed argument, clearly laid out. No gaps in logic are present. Analysis is excellent. Answers “so what?” question.</p>	<p>Essay provides compelling and accurate evidence that convinces the reader to accept the main argument. Significant and persuasive examples illustrate all points. Quotation and paraphrase are relevant, incorporated skillfully, and analyzed explicitly.</p>	<p>Impeccable MLA citation style throughout. Correct parenthetical citation of all sources; sources used appear correctly in list of works cited. Minimum source requirements exceeded. All sources are reliable and discipline-specific.</p>	<p>The writing is polished and distinctive, and rivets the attention of the audience. Diction is vivid and precise. Consistent use of standard grammar, punctuation, and spelling.</p>
<p>Essay has a clear purpose; digressions from purpose are rare. Introduction is informative; thesis is interesting and makes an argumentative claim; transitions are generally smooth; paragraphs cohere and sequence is logical; conclusion goes beyond summary.</p>	<p>Response to topic is thoughtful and purposeful, and addresses the prompt. Ideas are developed. Essay offers an argument that unfolds logically; few, if any mental leaps are required. Analysis is steady. Considers “so what?”</p>	<p>Essay provides necessary evidence to convince the reader of most points of the main argument. Effective examples illustrate most points. Quotation and paraphrase are generally relevant, incorporated grammatically, and at least partially contextualized.</p>	<p>Very few errors in MLA citation style. Largely correct parenthetical citation of sources; all sources appear in list of works cited, with some style errors. All minimum source requirements met. Most sources are reliable and discipline-specific.</p>	<p>The writing is concise and fluent, and typically holds the attention of the audience. Diction is concrete, fitting, and solid. Few deviations from standard grammar, punctuation, and spelling.</p>
<p>Essay’s central purpose is not consistently clear; reasoning wanders. Introduction is pedestrian; thesis is present but vague, self-evident, or unoriginal; transitions are lacking; paragraphs have lapses in coherence and/or do not build upon one another in logical progression; conclusion is merely a summary, or lacks reflection on implications.</p>	<p>Response to topic is appropriate but needs more sustained thinking; the scope of the prompt is only partially addressed. Points are left undeveloped. Reader must construct an argument from the text and/or supply needed analysis. Analysis is often superficial. “So what?” gets short shrift.</p>	<p>Essay provides some evidence to support an argument, but evidence is incomplete or oversimplified. Ineffective examples are employed in illustrating points. Quotation and paraphrase are present, but lack relevance, are awkwardly or ungrammatically incorporated, and/or lack analysis to connect them with the author’s claims.</p>	<p>Errors in MLA citation style. Some missing parenthetical citations; all sources appear in list of works cited, but with partial or incorrect documentation. Most source requirements met. Some sources taken from questionable or general, rather than discipline-specific, references.</p>	<p>The writing is bland or stilted, only sometimes engaging the attention of the audience. Diction is generally clear and fitting with occasional vague, clichéd, or incorrect wording. Occasional comma splices, fragments, misspellings, or other errors.</p>

*Theatre Arts Department 2012 Annual Assessment Update*

<p>Essay's central purpose is generally unclear; little thought is evident in either topic selection or execution. Introduction is absent or fails to demonstrate topic's significance; thesis is missing, difficult to identify, or aimless; organization is haphazard, ideas fail to make sense together; some paragraphs are repetitive or irrelevant; conclusion is missing, or fails to offer any meaningful comment.</p>	<p>Response to topic is inadequate. The prompt's aims are addressed insufficiently. Little or no attempt is made to articulate an argument. Reader must generate all substantive analysis. Subject is not comprehended; analysis breaks down. "So what?" is unconsidered.</p>	<p>Essay provides little evidence or misrepresents ideas. Examples are often missing, or are overly generalized, ramble, or lack supporting details. Quotation and paraphrase are insufficient, excessive, or inaccurate, or presented without contextualization.</p>	<p>Serious or pervasive errors in MLA style. Complete parenthetical citation often missing; some sources do not appear in list of works cited. Failure to alphabetize works cited list. Source requirements not met. Discipline-specific references not consulted. Use of Wikipedia or other highly inappropriate sources.</p>	<p>The writing is awkward and generally unable to hold the attention of the audience. Diction is frequently clichéd, repetitive, vague, or incorrect. Repeated comma splices, fragments, or other serious deviations.</p>
<p>Essay has no central purpose or is of an unacceptable length. Paragraphs thoroughly fail to comprehend subject. Internal structure generates no momentum.</p>	<p>Response to topic is wholly deficient. The prompt is disregarded. Intent is aimless. Little thought is evident.</p>	<p>Essay makes factual errors. Examples are absent or irrelevant. Quotation and paraphrase are inappropriate, inaccurate or absent.</p>	<p>MLA citations omitted. No parenthetical documentation. List of works cited absent. Plagiarism.</p>	<p>The writing is clumsy and fails to engage the audience. Diction confounds comprehension. Pervasive grammatical errors.</p>

Key to Rubric for Theatre Research Essays

	Standards for Mastery
Structure & organization	Purpose of essay is readily apparent to the reader. Essay is focused, unified, and logical throughout, with elegant use of transitional devices to articulate relationships between ideas. Paragraphs are unified and cohesive, and build substantively upon one another in ways that effectively serve the progress of the argument. The reader can follow the line of reasoning.
Introduction	Succinctly contextualizes issue and establishes its significance in lively, engaging prose.
Thesis statement	Precise, carefully considered, and original, making a clear, specific, sophisticated, and plausible argumentative claim.
Conclusion	Goes beyond summary to show serious reflection; demonstrates the implications of argument for reader. Resolves the importance of the argument for the reader.
Use of evidence	Essay provides compelling and accurate evidence that convinces the reader to accept the main argument. Examples are used to support all points. The importance and relevance of all pieces of evidence is clearly stated. Essay offers fresh readings of critical sources, clearly and accurately summarizing their contributions and limitations, and linking them together in a convincing framework. Alternate or conflicting interpretations of evidence are thoughtfully considered and responded to in ways that ultimately buttress the author's main argument.
Quotation & paraphrase	Text is properly quoted and paraphrased, and is skillfully, gracefully, and grammatically integrated into the argument. Each quotation is explicitly analyzed to show how the passage serves as evidence for the argument.
Analysis & argument	Essay contains a compelling and original argument that is clearly laid out for the reader. Analysis is insightful, offering a fresh and illuminating take on the evidence. There are no gaps in reasoning; the reader does not need to assume anything or do additional research to accept the main argument. "So What?" question is answered consistently.
Style	The writing is compelling, polished, and distinctive. It hooks the reader and sustains interest throughout. Sentences are skillfully constructed and distinctive, varied in length and structure, and flow smoothly from one to another.
Diction	Masterful use of language. Diction is vivid, vigorous, fresh, and precise. No words are misused.
Grammar & mechanics	Consistent use of standard grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Fragments, comma splices, and run-on sentences are scrupulously avoided, dependent clause markers are used appropriately, words are spelled properly, and punctuation marks are used correctly.
Bibliographic format	Proper MLA citation style throughout. All quotations and paraphrases include complete and accurate parenthetical citation

	in the text. All entries in the List of Works Cited are accurate, complete, alphabetized, and referenced in the text, and include all the necessary information in the correct order, properly punctuated. No authors are misidentified and no entries feature misspellings.
Sources	Minimum source requirements: more than 1 primary source, or more than 4 secondary sources used. All secondary sources published since 1985, most sources from scholarly books or peer-reviewed journals. Mixed use of both book and journal sources.



