General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title ___TA 127 Contemporary Theatre_______ GE Area __V__________________________

Results reported for AY ____2017-18____ # of sections ____1______ # of instructors ____1_______

Course Coordinator: __Kathleen Normington__________ E-mail: __Kathleen.Normington@sjsu.edu__

Department Chair: __Elisha Miranda ________________College: __Humanities and the Arts____________

Instructions: Each year, the department will prepare a brief (two page maximum) report that documents the assessment of the course during the year. This report will be electronically submitted to <curriculum@sjsu.edu>, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by October 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

(1) What GLO’S were assessed for the course during the AY?

GELO 1: Recognize the physiological, social/cultural, and psychological influences on their well-being.

(2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?

The course described how theater culture in both the U.S and globally changed in response to social, political, and economic pressures in the decades following the 1960s. Students saw numerous video lectures and video clips, including video examples of the work of Grotowski, Butoh, Philippe Genty, Tadeusz Kantor, Cirque du Soleil, Theatre Royal de Luxe, Pina Bausch, Carmelo Bene, and many other foreign performers and playwrights. Each week, students turned in a blog assignment in which they were asked to respond to questions about particular texts or themes discussed in the video lectures. Some blog assignments explicitly asked students to identify relations between social-political conditions and manifestations of contemporary theater outside the U.S. In responding to blog prompts, students were required to include images and links to support their statements. Most students were able to grasp how, globally and in relation to particular countries like Japan, Germany, France, Poland, Canada, and China, theater had evolved since the 1970s toward modes of performance that were “international,” insofar as they stressed communication with diverse, global audiences through means that were “beyond language” (bodily expressivity, integration of technology, voices that are not “understandable”). Blog entries were each worth nine points, but students lost points for not including images or links. About two thirds of students were able to successfully answer questions about how foreign theater changed in response to internal and external pressures. Most students received seven or eight points in relation to these blog prompts, which followed an elaborate grading criteria rubric, although some students either failed to submit the blog entries or failed to include links or images. Students also did two collaborative video projects in which they explored more deeply a theme or artist introduced in the course. In this respect, students tended overwhelmingly to favor themes related to American theater culture, and it was difficult indeed to persuade them to
explore further any of the foreign theater cultures introduced in the course, although the video projects were on the whole quite successful in achieving other goals of the course and in stressing the preoccupation of students themselves in the non-textual aspects of theatrical experience.

(3) What modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming year? (If no modifications are planned, the course coordinator should indicate this.)

The blogs and video projects have worked well to assess student learning. But the course does need to amplify the global perspective on theater. Students need to be much more open to foreign “influences” on theater, much more curious about it, than they demonstrated at the end of the course. This may mean requiring students in their video projects to apply explicitly ideas about theater that they have learned from foreign artists or sources.

Part 2:

To be completed by the department chair (with input from course coordinator as appropriate):

(4) Are all sections of the course still aligned with the area Goals, Student Learning Objectives (GELOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned? Yes.

(5) If this course is in a GE Area with a stated enrollment limit (Areas A1, A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z), please indicate how oral presentations will be evaluated with larger sections (Area A1), or how practice and revisions in writing will be addressed with larger sections, particularly how students are receiving thorough feedback on the writing which accounts for the minimum word count in this GE category (Areas A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z) and, for the writing intensive courses (A2, A3, and Z), documentation that the students are meeting the GE GELOs for writing.

Yes, all sections of the course are still aligned with the benchmarks listed above. However, we are diversifying the curriculum to include plays like Bandidos by Luis Valdes and Ruined by Lynn Knottage that speak to the diverse needs of our first generation to attend college, mainly immigrant students. These plays have been used this semester as well and student have engaged with the material and were inspired to create their own “enacto’s” ten minute plays that they will present in a public space to their peers through THE DREAMER PROJECT.