



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CLASS
Department	Theatre and Dance
Program Unit	Theatre Arts BA
Reporting for Academic Year	2013-2014
Department Chair	Thomas C. Hird
Date Submitted	5/22/2014

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

Goals are unchanged except for progress reported in B.
--

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

CURRICULUM - Deletion of unused options was completed. Revision of the Directing Option is about to pass out of the APGS office and should be complete next year. We created one more online course and expect others to be proposed next year. Professor Fajlan was enticed to focus on the topic of minority mental health this year. Her students will perform at a professional venue, The Marsh in Berkeley. The revision of the directing option should put more emphasis on her contributions in the department. Professor Kupers continued development of the Inclusive Interdisciplinary Performance program. Students have been developing new work with nationally and internationally known artists in cooperation with his professional companies. Their work was performed in LA and on campus. We delayed review of the Technology and Design Option for another year. SAM chairs are beginning to discuss cooperative curriculum, but next year is the earliest to expect proposals. The department will continue to participate in at least three clusters, to teach at Concord, and to support service courses for KIN, LBST, and PACE. While we can't continue producing in summer, we might look at self-support models. We have a new plan to produce some kind of minimalist script each fall that is family oriented.

STUDENTS - We are able to maintain quality, if a reduced quantity, of production (one major work per quarter, plus two minimalist shows (Fall & Spring)). Students continue to enjoy support of EIRA for participation in college festivals. We continue to succeed with taking some performances off-campus to expand live-audience performance opportunities for majors, but probably not international tours. Students continue to attend our shows and fill about half the seats at performances. We have made no progress on plans to help professionals complete their degree or to attract more international students, but have not given up on these ideas. While we have not formalized any specific relationships with professional companies, Professors Haft and Kupers continue to generate opportunities for students to perform with their professional dance companies; this year the San Francisco International Arts Festival

co-produced a Polish company's performance on campus; the local Douglas Morrison Theatre performed their "James and the Giant Peach," directed by and featuring alumni, in the University Theatre; and, the SAM Director is making contacts. We had over thirty professional guest artists present in classes this year.

FACULTY AND STAFF - Our tenure-track search proposals have not been granted. CLASS continues to support the base level of lecturers that we need, especially in the technology and design area for which we have proposed tenure-track positions. We have formed a diversity committee and expect to discuss a report in the fall. Our .8, 10/12 shop staffer is in place, but staffing continues to limit our ability to produce more shows. Publicity success varies, but has at least stabilized under personnel in the Box Office.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND OTHER - We are doing reasonably well equipment-wise. Sound is improving with the commissioning of a new system. There are several projects that need consideration, especially replacement of the lighting system in the Dance Studio and replacement of the University Theatre stage floor. CLASS is doing an admirable job supporting professional travel. We just have a lot to manage, but hope that our new staffer will have time to help with organizational issues that need to be addressed. We are on the verge of creating another scholarship endowment with the help of Hollywood production designer Scott Chambliss ('85). We have created a committee to reinvigorate our community and professional advisory group.

C. Program Changes and Needs

Generally, these issues are covered in B, but with the following comments.

If the .8, 10/12 staff in the shop can be increased to 1.0, 10/12, our maintenance situation would improve. It is possible that we have been too accepting of audience turnout for our own shows. Audience size for the events with major Hollywood guest Scott Chambliss proved that publicity is probably a more significant shortcoming for the performing arts than we realized.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students who graduate with a B.A. in Theatre Arts will be able to:

- A. communicate in writing, orally, non-verbally, and visually in their area of emphasis;
- B. conduct background research, evaluate scripts, and analyze performance for use in scholarly and performance applications;
- C. employ historical, contemporary, and cultural performance techniques and production technology appropriate to their area of emphasis;
- D. reflect on performance techniques and concepts of other performers and apply high standards of reflection to their own production work;
- E. solve problems of production by creating roles, dancing, designing, managing, building, directing, or choreographing performances that address issues of life in striking and remarkable ways.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

This year Professor Jacobs assessed the following outcomes in the mastery level culmination classes, THEA 4151 – Senior Preproduction and THEA 4152 – Senior Performance:

Theatre and Dance Department SLO 5

Students will solve problems of production by creating roles, dancing, designing, managing, building, directing or choreographing performances that address issues of life in dynamic ways.

California State University East Bay ILO B & D

Students will communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others; Students will work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Our program culminates by offering a variety of students, those in design, dance, choreography, acting, musical theater, and directing, an opportunity to follow a significant production project from concept to stage. Creating a rubric for assessing the mastery level of such a diverse set of specializations proved a challenge. Jacobs' CLASS FACT report contains the rubric he developed with department faculty that was used for a summative assessment to generate a survey assessment. It is interesting to see that both assessments reveal similar weaknesses in preparation for the class, but more significantly how well the culmination classes succeed themselves.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Jacobs' report reveals the following:

A) Students arrive in the class with the ability and mindset to create, to come up with interesting ideas. While they possess many tools and technique needed to perform and design, some lack ability to integrate and synthesize their tools and technique with their creative ideas in a production process. We find ourselves caught between an inability to offer an intermediate course in directing, to find a place for it in the degree requirements, and the students' desire for originality in their work. We also discussed limiting students to proven material in the culmination process.

Closing the Loop A - We decided to put more emphasis on proven material and still allow for original

work if created and developed in existing courses, especially the solo, directing, and dance ensemble courses. Original work should be prepared in classes before or early in the senior year. We also agreed to a long-range plan to consider a new first course in directing and to improve assignments in the culmination courses that promote integration and synthesizing of production tools and concepts learned earlier in the sequence.

B) The assessment reminded Jacobs that he initially thought that some skills were weak. Indeed some students were not as good at visual research or at pursuing research beyond easy Web-based sources. Others appeared to have trouble identifying themes. While we might have thought that these issues should be handled in design and history courses, Jacobs found that by restating his assignments, challenging students, and providing individual guidance, more understood that their existing skills were applicable to production and indeed were sufficient to make good progress on their projects.

Closing the Loop B - We are reviewing introductory and intermediate courses that involve research skills, especially visual, to determine whether new or refined assignments can better prepare students for the culmination sequence. In addition, assignments that help students recognize the value of research in developing a vibrant production concept will be created or implemented earlier in the culmination sequence.

c) The pre- and post-course survey assessment revealed that students overwhelmingly believe the culmination classes help them to progress and improve in their mastery of production.

	College Years				
B. Degrees Awarded	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
1. Undergraduate	14	7	16	12	12
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total	14	7	16	12	12
	Fall Quarter				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	7	7	7	7	7
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	7	7	7	7	7
3b. % Tenure Track	35.0%	58.3%	53.8%	50.0%	58.3%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	2	2	2	2	2
5. Part-Time	11	3	4	5	3
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	13	5	6	7	5
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	65.0%	41.7%	46.2%	50.0%	41.7%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	20	12	13	14	12
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	6.9	6.9	5.7	5.7	5.6
9. Lecturer FTEF	3.3	2.4	2.8	2.4	2.6
10. Total Instructional FTEF	10.2	9.3	8.5	8.2	8.1
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	114.9	113.4	111.6	101.4	76.2
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	63.4%	70.6%	71.9%	71.3%	62.5%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	66.4	47.3	43.6	40.7	45.7
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	36.6%	29.4%	28.1%	28.7%	37.5%
13. Total FTES taught	181.3	160.7	155.2	142.1	121.9
14. Total SCU taught	2720.0	2411.0	2328.0	2132.0	1829.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	16.7	16.5	19.5	17.7	13.7
2. Lecturer	19.9	19.7	15.6	16.8	17.9
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	17.8	17.3	18.2	17.4	15.0
4. Lower Division	18.6	17.3	15.8	16.2	16.3
5. Upper Division	16.6	17.3	20.7	18.7	14.0
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	65.0	58.0	57.0	53.0	49.0
2. Average Section Size	13.4	14.0	14.0	13.3	12.0
3. Average Section Size for LD	13.9	12.9	11.9	11.3	12.4
4. Average Section Size for UD	12.9	15.3	16.3	15.6	11.6
5. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	19	18	17	18	12
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	15	20	19	13	16
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	26	23	24	22	24
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	15	8	9	12	9
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0

D. Student Faculty Ratios	DANC				
1. Tenured/Track	25.4	25.1	33.7	29.2	21.7
2. Lecturer	23.0	21.6	22.1	19.7	21.7
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	24.0	23.8	28.9	25.7	21.7
4. Lower Division	25.6	23.7	24.9	23.8	25.6
5. Upper Division	19.2	24.0	37.1	28.5	16.8
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	15.0	15.0	16.0	17.0	13.0
2. SCU taught	732.0	893.0	812.0	763.0	568.0
3. Average Section Size	21.0	23.9	21.7	17.9	19.7
4. Average Section Size for LD	20.6	21.6	17.3	13.7	19.0
5. Average Section Size for UD	22.0	26.2	32.0	23.8	21.0
6. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	3	4	8	7	3
8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	2	4	3	3	5
9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
10. LD Section taught by Lecturer	16	14	14	14	15
11. UD Section taught by Lecturer	2	2	2	2	0
12. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
D. Student Faculty Ratios	THEA				
1. Tenured/Track	15.5	13.8	16.1	14.5	11.6
2. Lecturer	18.3	18.5	13.1	15.6	16.7
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	16.2	14.9	15.2	14.8	13.2
4. Lower Division	16.1	14.7	12.1	13.0	12.8
5. Upper Division	16.3	15.1	18.0	16.3	13.4
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	50.0	43.0	41.0	36.0	36.0
2. SCU taught	1988.0	1518.0	1516.0	1369.0	1261.0
3. Average Section Size	11.8	11.4	12.1	11.7	10.6
4. Average Section Size for LD	11.9	10.9	9.9	10.2	10.7
5. Average Section Size for UD	11.7	12.1	14.0	13.2	10.5
6. Average Section Size for GD	0	0	0	0	0
7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	16	14	9	11	9
8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	13	16	16	10	11
9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
10. LD Section taught by Lecturer	10	9	10	8	9
11. UD Section taught by Lecturer	13	6	7	10	9
12. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0