



COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| College | CLASS |
| Department | Theatre and Dance |
| Program Unit | Theatre Arts BA |
| Reporting for Academic Year | 2015-2016 |
| Department Chair | Thomas C. Hird |
| Date Submitted | 6/10/2016 |

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

The goals for our 43 Action items can be summarized as follows:

(Legend: ~~Done or abandoned.~~ Still in progress. Continuous efforts.)

- ~~1. Reconsider low-enrolled options.~~
- 2. Revise the Technology and Design Option.**
- ~~3. Develop cooperative degree within School of Arts and Media.~~
4. Continue participation in GE and service courses.
- 5. Develop online teaching and large enrollment course opportunities.**
- 6. Review summer theatre program(s).**
- 7. Create recruiting committee and program.**
- 8. Improve assessment and advising programs.**
- 9. Create a modular schedule that avoids conflicts in teaching major courses.**
10. Increase student performance opportunities.
- ~~11. Review opportunities for increasing international student enrollment.~~
- 12. Formalize career advising and reporting.**
- 13. Determine minimum need and priorities for lecturers.**
- 14. Address production workload issues.**
15. Contribute to developing campus diversity.
- ~~16. Secure a regular scenery technician, a regular costume technician, and separate box office manager.~~
- ~~17. Secure travel for professional and mandatory travel.~~
- 18. Develop support of alumni and community groups, including a fundraising plan.**
19. Continue developing Theatre facilities and equipment.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

We made progress on the following in the past year: (5)Online Teaching: Professor Jones joined Professor Kaufman in online teaching. Others are now interested to begin with semesters. (6)See below. (7)Recruiting: We increased students and schools attending our shows by invitation. The Musical Theatre program initiated an annual invitational workshop for high school and community college students. We still have no written plan, but we continue to discuss opportunities and to implement ad hoc activities. (8)Assessment/Advising: All the TT faculty have now participated on the CLASS FACT Team at least once. We've reported six assessments with the FACT system and learned enough to develop what should be an even more effective semester plan. Four faculty now use the online advising site. We have detailed advising forms for all concentrations that all faculty are now using. (10)Increase performance opportunities: Dance, acting, and musical theatre ensemble classes now hold quarterly recitals with invited audiences. (12)Career Advising: Students continue to produce a career plan in a culmination class where 5 to 10 professionals come to speak to students. (17)Travel: CLASS continues to provide adequate support for professional travel. Mandatory Travel funding was included in our S&S allocation this year and proved sufficient. (18)Alumni and community outreach: Our alumni page continues to inform former students. We have alumni on Broadway, in Hollywood, serving major professional fellowships, in grad school, performing onstage and backstage in Bay Area professional and semi-professional theatres. One continues to donate \$3000 annually to fund a scholarship. (19)Equipment funding continues to be sufficient, but we have a continuing concern about the larger issues in section C.

C. Program Changes and Needs

NEW ISSUES

-Our focus this year was Q2S conversion. As mentioned last year, we started over from mission statement, guiding principles, and outcomes, then created a curriculum with embedded assessment. Our program proposal was rejected due to a disagreement about cost related to production and performance, but we can require the additional student units and remain within semester constraints.

- The EIRA process is delayed more and more each year. We just learned what funding to expect next year. The EIRA funding cut is a blow to production. The current system is dysfunctional. We are asked to justify everything annually to a committee that is reformulated annually, often leading to conflicting judgments from year to year. Our program has operated under essentially the same arrangements for more than 50 years, often adjusting to budget freezes and frequently returning unspent allocation. We've responded to all questions by the college and CAPR about our operations, but the committee makes cuts without even asking questions. This year we essentially spent our entire allocation and all revenue. So it won't be easy to adapt to an 11.5% cut.

CURRENT ISSUES RELATED TO EXISTING GOALS

-Given summer cutbacks, we have abandoned the Highlands Summer Theatre. However, we might discuss implementing a service learning Youth Summer Arts program. (6)

-The semester GE program eliminates Area F in favor of a "creative component" requirement in Area C3. This change will have at best unknown and more likely difficult consequences for major curriculum, developing non-major cultural capital, faculty workload, and SFR. (4)

-We will continue to advocate for tenure-track Technology and Design positions. The recent production staff allocation continues to make a huge difference in the quality of our tech area. Lecturer funding was seriously reduced this year, which could have put a severe crimp in dance technique and service course offerings. The department's priority is production lecturers, dance

technique, and then service courses. Donations and special funding helped in Spring, 2016. (13,14,16)

-While we've made progress in communicating with alumni. Few appear to be able to contribute financially. The next step will be finding potential alumni leaders from each decade to help us focus on small gifts to larger scholarship funds, possibly with the October Alumni Association events. We continue to work with Friends of the Arts and hope for School of Arts & Media to share the workload of fundraising. This is not a plan, but a direction for achieving a plan. (18)

-Our three major facility and equipment issues remain unresolved: 1)The video monitoring system in the Theatre is on life support. 2)Lighting in the Dance Studio had asbestos insulation and it was all removed several years ago. The dance faculty has a new vision that still needs to be drafted and estimated. The new lighting should be LED to save energy and avoid the need to run new power to the room that lacks sufficient power for incandescent stage lighting. 3)The backstage dressing rooms still need accessible showers. We'd recommend that the two single showers be turned into a common shower with two heads.

-We face several minor issues related to facility and equipment for which planning and funding remain unresolved: 1)Wooden shelving in the prop room and a wood frame cage around the lighting maintenance shop should be replaced with metal materials. 2)The Theatre stage floor protective layer should be replaced. 3)The Costume Shop needs a proper dye vat. 4)With our new staff person we are finally able to follow the kind of metal framing practices found in professional shops. Now we need the tools and for them to be installed.

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

Theatre and Dance Department PLO B

Students will be able conduct background research, evaluate scripts, and analyze performance for use in scholarly and performance applications.

PLO B aligns with CSUEB ILO 1 – Students will be able to demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

For the academic year 2015-2016 Prof. Kaufman served on the CLASS FACT committee and conducted our annual assessment report. She interviewed department faculty about their use of research assignments, reviewed department course syllabi, gathered sample student papers and exams, created a rubric, evaluated samples, and offered suggestions on how to enhance student experience with research and the application of research to performance. She reported to the faculty at a meeting May 13th. Professor Kupers will serve next year to evaluate PLO A.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

- Faculty must direct students on how to use more specific assignment-focused research in preparing for performance and design, in writing analytic papers and in answering exam questions. For example, cast members can research and write character analyses. Designers, who normally do visual research, can write a reflection about why the images of their choice best fit the production concept.
- More students must experience a library sponsored learning tutorial on how to do research. Faculty will arrange classroom tutorials where research is directly focused on the goals of the course. Example introductory courses: DANC 1201 & 1202, THEA 1013 & 1016; developing: THEA 2035-7, 2055, 2072-8, 2310, 3056-7, 3061, 3070-5 ; mastery: DANC 3251 & THEA 3252 & THEA 3257 & 4152.

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

APR attached.

4. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- 1) Concerns about facilities and equipment mentioned above represent significant issues. They suggest topics that CAPR could address such as allocations for planning a project in advance. The Facilities office has improved their ability to respond to requests for project estimates, but it remains unclear how to request such estimates.
- 2) Our ensembles (Acting, Dance, Musical Theatre, or Technology/Design) still have not met the objective of regularly enrolling 14-18 students in option courses. Background: While we have begun to attract applicants from across the state. Of 109 applicants accepted for 2016-7, the largest pool from one school was three. However, conversion rate is likely to be less than 5%. Practice: While we have ideas for recruiting and some faculty experiment sporadically, the faculty have plenty to do without making extra efforts. Thus, we will focus efforts on trying to invite more students to campus for regular classes and shows, improving publicity for our successes, developing social media resources, and developing materials for the campus recruiters. The goal is still for a written plan for sharing the work needed to reach our objectives.
- 3) Successes in the past year: Five of seven tenure-track faculty and all four regular lecturers directed or performed in professional projects this year and have engagements for next year. The Dance alumni held their first annual concert to benefit the dance program. Theatre alumni continue to work in the business, including one who will direct a show for the Oregon Shakespeare Festival next season.
- 4) Please notice the “new issues” concerning EIRA/ECL and facilities.

California State University, East Bay

APR Summary Data

Fall 2011 - 2015

| Theatre Arts & Dance | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Fall Quarter | | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| A. Students Headcount | | | | | |
| 1. Undergraduate | 58 | 61 | 61 | 57 | 60 |
| 2. Postbaccalaureate | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Graduate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Total Number of Majors | 60 | 62 | 62 | 57 | 60 |
| College Years | | | | | |
| | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 |
| B. Degrees Awarded | | | | | |
| 1. Undergraduate | 16 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 9 |
| 2. Graduate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Total | 16 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 9 |
| Fall Quarter | | | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| 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 | 53.8% | 50.0% | 58.3% | 53.8% | 53.8% |
| Lecturer Headcount | | | | | |
| 4. Full-Time | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 5. Part-Time | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 6a. Total Non-Tenure Track | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| 6b. % Non-Tenure Track | 46.2% | 50.0% | 41.7% | 46.2% | 46.2% |
| 7. Grand Total All Faculty | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF) | | | | | |
| 8. Tenured/Track FTEF | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 4.2 |
| 9. Lecturer FTEF | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 3.6 |
| 10. Total Instructional FTEF | 8.5 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.7 |
| Lecturer Teaching | | | | | |
| 11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track | 111.6 | 101.4 | 76.2 | 72.7 | 69.8 |
| 11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track | 71.9% | 71.3% | 62.5% | 60.7% | 51.8% |
| 12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer | 43.6 | 40.7 | 45.7 | 47.1 | 65.0 |
| 12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer | 28.1% | 28.7% | 37.5% | 39.3% | 48.2% |
| 13. Total FTES taught | 155.2 | 142.1 | 121.9 | 119.8 | 134.8 |
| 14. Total SCU taught | 2328.0 | 2132.0 | 1829.0 | 1797.0 | 2022.0 |
| D. Student Faculty Ratios | | | | | |
| 1. Tenured/Track | 19.5 | 17.7 | 13.7 | 14.1 | 16.8 |
| 2. Lecturer | 15.6 | 16.8 | 17.9 | 18.0 | 18.3 |
| 3. SFR By Level (All Faculty) | 18.2 | 17.4 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 17.5 |
| 4. Lower Division | 15.8 | 16.2 | 16.3 | 17.1 | 18.1 |
| 5. Upper Division | 20.7 | 18.7 | 14.0 | 13.2 | 16.7 |
| 6. Graduate | . | . | . | . | . |
| E. Section Size | | | | | |
| 1. Number of Sections Offered | 57.0 | 53.0 | 49.0 | 43.0 | 41.0 |
| 2. Average Section Size | 14.0 | 13.3 | 12.0 | 12.6 | 17.6 |
| 3. Average Section Size for LD | 11.9 | 11.3 | 12.4 | 13.8 | 16.5 |
| 4. Average Section Size for UD | 16.3 | 15.6 | 11.6 | 10.7 | 19.3 |
| 5. Average Section Size for GD | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track | 17 | 18 | 12 | 14 | 11 |
| 7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track | 19 | 13 | 16 | 12 | 8 |
| 8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. LD Section taught by Lecturer | 24 | 22 | 24 | 21 | 23 |
| 10. UD Section taught by Lecturer | 9 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| 11. GD Section taught by Lecturer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| D. Student Faculty Ratios | | DANC | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Tenured/Track | | 33.7 | 29.2 | 21.7 | 15.2 | 15.2 |
| 2. Lecturer | | 22.1 | 19.7 | 21.7 | 22.2 | 22.8 |
| 3. SFR By Level (All Faculty) | | 28.9 | 25.7 | 21.7 | 18.3 | 18.3 |
| 4. Lower Division | | 24.9 | 23.8 | 25.6 | 22.3 | 20.3 |
| 5. Upper Division | | 37.1 | 28.5 | 16.8 | 8.1 | 14.3 |
| 6. Graduate | | . | . | . | . | . |
| E. Section Size | | | | | | |
| 1. Number of Sections Offered | | 16.0 | 17.0 | 13.0 | 11.0 | 18.0 |
| 2. SCU taught | | 812.0 | 763.0 | 568.0 | 367.0 | 718.0 |
| 3. Average Section Size | | 21.7 | 17.9 | 19.7 | 12.2 | 18.1 |
| 4. Average Section Size for LD | | 17.3 | 13.7 | 19.0 | 13.6 | 16.4 |
| 5. Average Section Size for UD | | 32.0 | 23.8 | 21.0 | 5.0 | 21.5 |
| 6. Average Section Size for GD | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track | | 8 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track | | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. LD Section taught by Lecturer | | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
| 11. UD Section taught by Lecturer | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 12. GD Section taught by Lecturer | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| D. Student Faculty Ratios | | THEA | | | | |
| 1. Tenured/Track | | 23.6 | 25.2 | 48.3 | 61.3 | 63.3 |
| 2. Lecturer | | 42.1 | 42.9 | 45.3 | 43.6 | 43.3 |
| 3. SFR By Level (All Faculty) | | 38.4 | 39.3 | 46.5 | 48.8 | 46.4 |
| 4. Lower Division | | 45.4 | 44.4 | 92.9 | 85.7 | 63.3 |
| 5. Upper Division | | 37.1 | 38.3 | 38.0 | 42.4 | 43.3 |
| 6. Graduate | | . | . | . | . | . |
| E. Section Size | | | | | | |
| 1. Number of Sections Offered | | 41.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 32.0 | 23.0 |
| 2. SCU taught | | 1516.0 | 1369.0 | 1261.0 | 1430.0 | 1304.0 |
| 3. Average Section Size | | 12.1 | 11.7 | 10.6 | 12.7 | 17.3 |
| 4. Average Section Size for LD | | 9.9 | 10.2 | 10.7 | 13.8 | 16.6 |
| 5. Average Section Size for UD | | 14.0 | 13.2 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 18.3 |
| 6. Average Section Size for GD | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track | | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 5 |
| 8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track | | 16 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 5 |
| 9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. LD Section taught by Lecturer | | 10 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 |
| 11. UD Section taught by Lecturer | | 7 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| 12. GD Section taught by Lecturer | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |