DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND FILM
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

The Department of Theatre and Film prepared a self study following program review guidelines. A two-person external review team visited the campus; reviewed the self study; interviewed unit personnel, university administrators, undergraduate and graduate students; and submitted an external report. The Program Review Committee studied all written materials. The Committee liaison for the Department discussed the self study with the department chair and faculty. The Committee discussed its preliminary findings with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. This document reflects the Committee’s findings and recommendations.

SUMMARY OF THE SELF STUDY

Mission, vision. The mission of the Department is “to emerge as a recognized national leader for the study of theater and film through focused degree programs” (undergraduate degrees in theater and film, graduate degrees in theater). The mission statement stresses the relationship of the undergraduate program to liberal education, and the fact that the graduate program seeks to produce “artists/teachers/scholars” by combining the “study of theater with . . . performance studies and pedagogy.”

Core values. The Department has adopted a set of Core Values “. . . that underpin the process of actually engaging in the performing arts:” Creativity, Collaboration, Communication, Commitment, and Community.

Relationship of mission to curriculum. The section describes the relation of the mission to curricular offerings of the Department in four areas—General Education, undergraduate studies, graduate studies, and the production program.

Relationship of Department to college and university mission. The section describes the relationship of the Department to both the College and the University missions. It lists congruencies between the five themes of the Academic Plan and the departmental educational activities.

History. When the last departmental program review occurred in 1998-99, Theatre and Film were separate, Theatre as a department and Film Studies as an interdisciplinary program. In 2004, Film was integrated into Theatre, and the Department changed its name to the Department of Theatre and Film. The National Association of Schools of Theater (NAST) reaccredited the program in 2001-02.

The last program review made 13 recommendations:
1. The PRC recommends that the department reorganize around one or two foci. . .
2. Regarding salaries, the PRC believes that the compensation issue is being addressed institutionally, and the PRC has no separate recommendation.
The remaining recommendations depend on the outcome of recommendation number 1. They should be interpreted in the context of the department’s newly defined focus and vision.

3. The PRC recommends that the department reduce the number and increase the quality of its productions. The PRC recommends a target of 8 during the 2000-01 academic year. We urge the department to evaluate this plan after the coming season with the possibility of reducing the number to six in 2001-02;

4. The PRC supports a replacement position in Performance Studies for Fall 1999. We recommend that the additional requests for two redefined retirement positions be put off by one year and re-evaluated based on the department’s decisions regarding its focus;

5. The PRC agrees that the replacement of the retiring departmental secretary is a high priority. The PRC recommends that Human Resources conduct a position audit as soon as possible. The PRC recommends that two, not three, people be hired. The third position, publicity manager/box office supervisor, should be re-evaluated during the 2001-02 academic year after the needs of the new Student Union are defined;

6. The Horizon Theater program should be carefully assessed after its first session in Summer 1999, and in light of the developing focus and vision of the department. The financial aspects of the Horizon Theater, as well as its impact on faculty and staff resources, should be considered among the tradeoffs that go into structuring the department’s focus;

7. The PRC recommends that the expansion of the contracts of the scene shop supervisor and the costume shop supervisor to 12 months be delayed until the department’s focus has been more sharply defined and the current summer project, Horizon Theater, is evaluated. Depending on the progress in identifying a focus, the 12-month contract discussion can be reopened during the 2000-01 academic year.

8. The PRC requests that the Director of Capital Planning provide the department and the Dean of A&S with a written statement of the scope of the renovations planned for theatre spaces and an approximate timetable for the work. This should be done before the visit on the NAST accreditation team during the 1999-2000 academic year.

9. Changes to the undergraduate curriculum effective in Fall 1999 should be closely supervised. Discussion on the viability of the Performance Studies concentration within the B.A.C. degree and expanded concentrations in Musical Theatre, Arts Management, and Film Studies should be postponed until the department’s focus is more sharply defined. Depending on progress in identifying a focus, discussion of these concentrations can be reopened during the 2000-01 academic year;

10. Any plans to establish an Institute for the Study of Performance, Pedagogy and Culture, as well as formalizing ties to the Centre for Performance Research at the University of Wales, should be delayed until the
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department focus is more sharply defined. Depending on progress in identifying a focus, discussion of the Institute proposal can be reopened during the 2000-01 academic year;

11. The redesign of the M.A. to create a two-track degree program should be delayed until the department focus is more sharply defined. Depending on progress in identifying a focus, discussion of the two-track M.A. program can be reopened during the 2000-01 academic year. The PRC enthusiastically supports the department’s efforts to enforce more rigorous admission standards to its graduate programs;

12. The PRC supports an increase in operating budgets to appropriately address the rising costs of productions;

13. The PRC strongly encourages the department to continue to create the necessary assessment procedures, which will address the quality of their product, both curricular and artistic. It applauds the newest efforts, the Major Event and the Senior Capstone Course, and looks for these to be strengthened with experience. The plans to develop a production assessment program should begin as soon as possible, but no later that Fall 1999.

Description of the unit. The unit is now identified as the Department of Theatre and Film. The incorporation of Film occurred in 2004.

The Department offers programs of study in several areas, as follows:
1. Graduate Degrees:
   a. M.A. with a major in Theatre (requirements described on p. 29)
   b. M.A. with a major in Teaching (requirements described on p. 28-29)
   c. Ph.D. with a major in Theatre (requirements described on pp. 29-31
2. Undergraduate Degrees:
   a. B.A. with a major in Theatre
   b. B.A. in Communication, with a major in Theatre and with specializations in Acting/Directing, Theatre Design and Technology, Performance Studies, Musical Theatre, and Youth Theater/Puppetry;
   c. B.A. with a major in Film, with specializations in Film Studies and Film Production.
3. Minors
   a. Theatre (23 hrs.)
   b. Film (21 hrs.)
   c. Interdisciplinary Minor in Arts Management (24 hrs.)

The Department is also responsible for productions in the Gish Film Theater, the Eva Marie Saint Theatre, and Joe E. Brown Theatre. It supports the Treehouse Troupe, the Huron Playhouse, “Elsewhere Productions” (for undergraduate student productions), and has collaborated in productions with the College of Musical Arts. Finally, it offers a forensics program.
Faculty resources. The Department consists of a total of 22 individuals (21.5 faculty): 15.5 tenured or tenure-track individuals (one individual has a joint appointment with American Cultural Studies), three full-time instructors, and three part-time instructors. Eleven hold the Ph.D., nine the M.F.A., and two the M.A.

Of the nine tenured faculty, two are at the rank of Professor, six at the Associate rank (including the half-time appointment with ACS), and one at the rank of Assistant. All of the tenure-track faculty (seven) are at the rank of Assistant.

Diversity. The self study provides tables showing faculty resources by gender, ethnicity, rank, tenure status, and highest degree. These figures extend from Fall 1998 to Fall 2004. There are differences between the numbers in the self study and the numbers provided by Institutional Research (see below, fourth set of Findings and Recommendations).

Workload assignments and policies. All full-time faculty have a minimum of two instructional assignments per semester (2/2 teaching load). MFA faculty have an additional assignment each semester involving the department’s productions (3/3 load). All faculty receive one assignment per year (0.5 load per semester) for service. The chair, graduate coordinator, and undergraduate coordinator receive load credit for administrative duties. The numbers in the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity have changed from the version distributed to the committee. They are now slightly higher (see below, fourth set of Findings and Recommendations).

Graduate assistant resources. Graduate assistant resources have moved between a low of 17 assistants (1998/99, 2002/03, 2003/04) to a high of 26 (1999/2000) or 24 assistants (2000/01, 2001/02). The assistantship resources are augmented by four assistants from American Cultural Studies, who teach THFM 161.

Staff resources. Prior to Fall 2000 the Department had four staff members; since Fall of 2000 two staff members have been added. These individuals are assigned to the costume shop, scene shop, box office and publicity, and departmental office. The Department needs one additional staff person in film production (equipment manager).

Majors and graduate students. The table on p. 23 shows that the number of undergraduate majors the Department has grown from 95 in Fall 1998 to 202 in Fall 2005. Some of this is a result of absorbing the Film program; the remainder is growth in the theater area. A table also shows ACT test score figures; the percentage of students at the highest level has increased slightly. The table on p. 23 of the self study does not agree with the total number of students in the Headcount Enrollment by Major and Headcount Enrollment by Department tables provided by Institutional Research.

The ACT score distribution table on p. 24 shows a slight increase in the percentage of students in the 26-36 range, a decrease in those in the 21-25 range, and an increase in the 16-20 range. The improvement seems mixed. The GPA data on p. 44 shows improvement in quality of student more clearly.
Graduate students. The number of graduate students has decreased from a high of 41 in Fall 2000 to a 7-year low of 30 in Fall 2004. The number of master’s students has remained relatively constant, while the number of doctoral students has decreased from 26 (Fall 2000) to 17 (Fall 2004).

Student credit hour production. The table on p. 25 shows total SCH figures from 1997-98 to 2003-04. The totals range from a low of 5169 in 1997-98 to a high of 7298 in 2000-01, with an average of 6170. The text explains that unusually high figures in 2000-01 resulted from University enrollment increases, and that the reduced figures thereafter resulted from enrollment caps placed on some classes. There are no figures given here for SCH per tenured/tenure track faculty. Some of the numbers provided by Institutional Research looked very low, and were later emended, resulting in a slight increase the SCH/FTE figures.

Recruitment and retention efforts. The Department uses both regular mail and e-mail as recruiting tools. Regular mail is decreasing in importance. The Department also participates in President’s Day, Music Discovery Day, and Preview Day. Finally, the Department has revised its web site, increased use of e-mail for responses, holds workshops for area high schools, and revised its hard-copy information materials to include film.

Retention efforts include A&S 110 (Arts BG), improved advising, the fall Newcomers Production, 2nd year portfolio review, upper-level assessment activity, and required production participation (THFM 046).

Graduate programs in Theatre (M.A.T., M.A., Ph.D.). Each section is devoted to a single degree, and gives the minimum number of hours required (36, 32, 103), suggested course work, and differences between Plan I and Plan II in the M.A. degree.

Graduate faculty accomplishments. Graduate faculty pursue professional activities in both the research and creative spheres. In general, Ph.D. faculty pursue research, while M.F.A. faculty are involved in creative activities. However, some Ph.D. faculty carry out creative work, and receive release time for that activity, whereas some M.F.A. faculty publish and present. The kinds of activities are dependent on the professional qualifications of the individual faculty members.

Those involved in research serve as editors of Theatre Annual and Theatre Topics, and have published or are contracted to publish monographs with Routledge, Cambridge University Press, University of Mississippi Press, Southern Illinois University Press, Alta Mira Press, and Wayne State University Press. Faculty have also published articles in The Drama Review, Text and Performance Quarterly, Theatre Forum, and other periodicals. (See also p. 7, Publications, selected list.)

Those involved with creative activities work theatrical productions rather than in publications. These involve participation in theatre as designers, performers, directors,
and dramaturges at local, regional, and national sites. The self study summarizes publications and creative work by individual faculty on p. 41, #25, and complete information is given in the individual vitae in Appendix I.

**Graduate degrees in Theater since 2000.** All graduate degree recipients (Ph.D., M.A., and M.A.T.) from 2000-2005 are listed (pp. 31-36). The list includes the advisor, the committee membership, and current employment of the recipient, when known. Since 2000 there have been 25 Ph.D.s, 31 M.A.s, and 5 M.A.T.s conferred. The numbers in the report do not agree with the numbers on the Degree Conferred by Degree Institutional Research table for 2001-04.

**Placement.** The Department records a nearly 90% placement rate of their graduates in higher education. Others have found employment in arts administration and at junior colleges.

**Facilities and equipment.** The report lists the existing facilities used by the Department. These facilities are in serious need of renovation or replacement. However, if the new Arts Center is completed, the renovations will not occur.

Much of the equipment is relatively new (within past five years). This includes equipment for theater production, film production, and the departmental office. The equipment was acquired as a result of various funding sources and the merger of Theatre and Film.

**Information resources and services.** Library resources fully satisfy NAST standards for all the educational programs. The Department also provides funds for videos and slides.

**Financial resources.** Personnel budget (wages and benefits) has risen from $1,192,706 in 1998-99 to $1,576, 502 in 2003-04, a difference of $383,796. The total budget has increased from $1,531,350 to $2,010,075 over the same period, a difference of $478,725. The Department’s funds are augmented by moneys from 1) summer program; 2) box office; 3) funds given when Theatre and Film merged; 4) course lab fees; 5) and equipment fund established in 2005.

**Self Evaluation**

An introductory section describes the growth of the Department since the last program review, and states a need for additional faculty in the areas of theater for youth, puppetry, and arts administration (to service the minor).

**Faculty quality and productivity.** The report distinguishes between Ph. D. faculty, with research expectations (publications and presentations) and service to professional societies and organizations, and the M.F.A. faculty, with expectations of local, regional, national, and international creative activity. However, the record of faculty activities indicates that some do both.
Publications, selected list. The report lists examples of the productivity of 15 of the faculty. The list includes 23 publications, among which are 18 articles and 4 books (one in press). There are 17 examples of creative activity (performances, directorships, scene designs, etc.). Nearly all of these date from the period 2001-05. Appendix I gives individual faculty vitas, which include more complete records of faculty productivity.

Student entry attributes. There has been a general increase in GPA distribution from Fall 1998 to Fall 2004, in that a higher percentage of accepted students are at the higher range of GPA scores. Graduate student entry attributes have also improved, but not by as great a percentage. The numbers given on p. 44 for Degrees Conferred do not agree with Institutional Research data tables (see below, 4th set of Findings and Recommendations).

Quality of curriculum. Both the undergraduate and graduate curricula meet NAST standards. The graduate curriculum was recently revised to integrate theory, history, and literature into core graduate offerings. Also a graduate portfolio requirement was implemented.

Quality of graduate students and their learning experiences. The learning experience of graduate students is based on required courses, electives, creative activities, and support of graduate student research and professional development. The Department also holds weekly seminars for graduate students devoted to announced topics. Staff meetings provide guidance in pedagogy for graduate students.

Administration and funding of graduate program. This section described criteria used in accepting students into the Ph.D. program. Applicants are divided into three priority levels based on GRE scores, undergraduate and masters GPAs, writing sample, and letters of recommendation. Those not satisfying the criteria for a priority level are accepted only conditionally. Bowling Green State University master’s students are not automatically accepted into the Ph.D. program.

Two to four new students are accepted each year. Generally students are not accepted without funding.

Assessment of student learning outcomes. The section describes several undergraduate assessment activities, including the Senior Seminar Course, Major Event (portfolio review, audition experience, workshops), and 2nd-year portfolio review. Graduate assessment is not mentioned in this section.

Enrollments and program quality, general education, values initiative, Arts Village and Arts BG. The undergraduate area is expanding too fast, and the Department will develop an enrollment management plan. The degree programs have expanded to include both Musical Theatre and Film. A B.A.C. concentration has been created in Youth Theatre/Puppetry, and a minor in Arts Administration has been created (see above, section 7). The Department also contributes to General Education, the Values Initiative,
and living/learning communities; it was instrumental in developing the interdisciplinary arts course A&S 110 Arts BG.

**Centrality to the University mission** (See also #5 above). The activities of the Department are related to the University mission in three ways: 1) It provides a meaningful arts experience for all students on campus through its course offerings and productions; 2) it pursues engagement activities that benefit northwest Ohio; and 3) it contributes to the goals and themes of the University.

**Competitive advantage and uniqueness.** The Department is unique in its Performance Studies and Theatre for Youth/Puppetry undergraduate programs, its B.A.C. degree tracks, and the liberal education orientation (rather than professional orientation) of its B.A. degrees. The M.A.T. degree addresses the needs of teachers, and the Ph.D. emphasizes pedagogy and prepares the student for a position in higher education.

**Financial considerations and adequacy of resources.** This section consists of a table showing Personnel and Operating Expenditures per Student Credit Hour, and refers the reader to Appendix H for those budgets.¹

**Facilities and equipment.** Facilities need to be replaced, and the Wolfe Center will satisfy that need. Theater equipment is adequate, but new equipment is needed in film and video production.

**Financial resources and external support.** The Huron Summer Program provides additional support necessary to maintain the program. The Department has raised $196,223 in external funds, detailed in Appendix D, to support the Huron Playhouse.

**Graduate student support.** Current funding is adequate to meet present needs.

**Faculty and staff needs.** The section describes the new faculty and staff needs, as follows: one Ph.D. faculty member in film for Introductory General Education courses; graduate teaching of media courses in ACS; two new instructor/lecturer production faculty; one new staff position for film and video equipment; and staff persons to support the Wolfe Center for the Arts. The Department will also need to replace one faculty member in Theatre for youth/directing, and would like a dual/joint appointment in Musical Theatre with the College of Musical Arts.

**Doctoral program.** The self study does not provide information about its doctoral program in a separate section, as required in the self study outline. Section 16 describes the Ph.D. program requirements, and section 29 describes entering criteria for Ph.D. students. Information on some of the following points is included in earlier sections. These are shown in parentheses.

---

¹ The figures given in this section—Personnel expenditures/SCH; Operating Expenditures/SCH; and Instructional & General Expenditures/SCH—rely on correct SCH figures. But there are conflicts between the figures in the report and the Institutional Research data. The material in Appendix H is not very helpful. There are, for instance, no Personnel Expenditure figures in the Appendix.
• Program Faculty (8, 17, 24, 25)
• Program Graduates (18)
• Program Vitality
• Program Demand
• Program Interactions
• Program Access
• Student Outcomes Assessment (Appendix E contains assessment reports from 1999-2000, 2000-01, and 2004-05. The last of these lists learning outcomes and assessment tools for graduate students. The last pages of this section are out of order, but they are all there.)
• Program Revisions from Previous Reviews

Unit planning (next seven years); The planning process; Goals and strategies.
The Department has four goals for the next review period:
A. Increase faculty, staff, (three new faculty lines, one replacement, two new staff positions), and budget (through student fee structure);
B. Develop a model arts environment (Wolfe Center) and advance faculty and student achievement;
C. Integrate and sustain engagement activities—Theater for Youth activities (Treehouse Troupe, Horizon Theater); Huron Playhouse, including two replacement positions; and
D. Create and integrate courses and activities connecting the study and practice of film and theater.

Timetable and implementation plan. The timetable for implementing these goals is as follows. The letter in parentheses is that of the Unit Planning Goals that the activity seems to satisfy.

1. 2005-06
   a. Revise promotion and tenure documents (A, C)
   b. Complete program statement for Wolfe Center for the Arts (B, C)
   c. Plan for enrollment management in film production (B)
   d. Revise assessment (D)
      1) Link Major Event to junior level courses
      2) Include film majors in 2nd-year portfolio assessment review

2. 2006-07
   a. Approve search for Ph.D. faculty in film studies and instructors in film production (A)
   b. Review Theatre for Youth programs (C)
   c. Break ground for Wolfe Center for the Arts (B)
   d. Submit enrollment management plans to A&S Dean (D)
   e. Create joint appointment for Musical Theatre position (A)
   f. Submit plan for Huron Playhouse to A&S Dean (external funding; endowment) (C)

3. 2007-08
   a. Begin enrollment management in film production (D)
b. Approve search for theater for youth/directing (replacement) (A, C)
c. Construction of Wolfe Center (B)
d. Develop collaborative arts proposal for Wolfe Center and submit it to the A&S Dean (B)
e. Establish committee to organize administrative structures in Wolfe Center (B)
g. Work with Development Office and administration on proposals for future of Huron Playhouse (C)
h. Complete curriculum review (D)

4. 2008-09
   a. Move into new arts center (B)
   b. Prepare for dedication of new arts center (B)
   c. Secure future of Huron Playhouse (C)

5. 2009-10
   a. Produce original works for new arts center (B)
   b. Continue work on future of Huron Playhouse (C)

6. 2010-11
   a. Begin renovations of Huron Playhouse (C)
   b. Write program review self study

7. 2011-12
   a. Complete renovations of Huron Playhouse (C)

Ten of the items in the implementation plan concern the Wolfe Center for the Arts. The Department will have to complete some of these items (1.b; 3.d, e) regardless of the timetable for completion. Other items dealing with breaking ground, construction, and occupancy of the Wolfe Arts Center (2.c; 3.c; 4.a, b; 5.a) are outside the control of the Department. A third set of items (4.b; 5.a) will only need to be satisfied once the building is complete.

A second group of goals concerns the Huron Playhouse (2.f; 3.g, 4.c; 5.b; 6.a; 7). All seem to hinge on the acceptance of the plan by the Dean of A&S.

   Relationship to the Academic Plan. This is addressed in section 5 of the self study.

RESULTS OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS

No section of the report addresses the recommendations made in the previous round of Program Review. The following is a summary of departmental changes that can be related to the 13 concerns given in section 6.

The previous program review recommendations are given above. One of the recommendations was followed (#3): the Department has reduced the number of its productions from 20 to 13.\(^2\) The quality of entering graduate students has improved, the

\(^2\) Figures provided by Steven Boone in dept. meeting, on 1/27/06.
graduate curriculum was revised, and a portfolio requirement implemented. These correspond to two suggestions in the previous report (#11, #13).

Two recommendations concerned salary and budget. The previous report had no separate recommendation on salary (#2), and supported an increase in operating budget (#12).

The first recommendation was that the Department reduce its size and offerings and “reorganize around one or two foci.” Instead, the Department expanded its foci by absorbing Film Studies, something not anticipated in the review. Of the remaining seven recommendations, six recommended filling replacement faculty and staff positions but delaying new hires until the question of focus was resolved (#4, #5, #6, #7). However, the Department has added 15 new positions. Two were replacements of retired faculty; the rest were new lines resulting from an increase in the number of majors, and from the absorption of Film Studies. Another recommendation (#8) asked that Capital Planning provide information on renovations to theater spaces and a timetable for completion. These renovations have now been replaced with the Wolfe Center for the Arts. It was also suggested (#9, #10) that discussions of concentrations in Performance Studies, Musical Theatre, Arts Management, and Film Studies, and the establishment of a Centre for Performance Research at the University of Wales be postponed and reopened in the 2000-01 academic year. The B.A.C. degree now has concentrations in Performance Studies and Musical Theatre; Arts Administration is available as a minor; and Film Studies has become part of the Department. The current report contains no information on collaboration with the University of Wales.

**SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL REPORT**

The external reviewers’ report is organized in three main sections, Program Evaluation, Observations and Suggestions, and Recommendations and Rationale.

**Program Evaluation**

*General education.* The students, faculty, and external reviewers recommend that there be separate sections of the department’s general education courses designated for pre-majors and declared majors. The reviewers seem to be referring to film only.

*Undergraduate education.* Theater students are happy with the undergraduate curriculum. Film students are less satisfied, as growth in film students has outpaced faculty and equipment. The problems cited are: 1) the need for more demanding set of requirements; 2) the lack of a capstone project; 3) the frequency of offerings; and 4) the lack of graduate faculty to direct dissertations. Additional faculty members and equipment are needed.

The reviewers recommended that the Department review its production practicum requirements in the 141 course, and for Film majors. Inexperienced non-majors are

---

3 It should be noted that Film Studies is exclusively an undergraduate program, and so the problem of dissertations will not arise.
having a negative impact on faculty’s and staff’s ability to mount shows. The Department should use experienced student assistants, and the lab requirement for all students should be reduced.

**Graduate studies.** The external reviewers praise the graduate program for its niche, opportunities for practical work, and the opportunities graduate students (M.A. and Ph.D.) have to teach undergraduates. The M.A.T. degree needs to be coordinated with the ‘School of Education’ to improve its efficiency and attractiveness.

**Faculty and leadership.** The reviewers praised the faculty scholarship and creative activities. They noted the record of awards of private and federal grants, and the “compelling and rigorous scholarship and creative work among both tenured and untenured faculty.” Three faculty have authored books, and others have contributed articles to journals and other publications. Faculty are also active in presentations, performances, and service to the profession. The reviewers were pleased that creative activity is recognized along with scholarly work as a criterion for tenure and promotion decisions. The reviewers also praised the collaborations of the Department with other units on campus. Finally, the reviewers noted the increase in size and diversity of the faculty, but were puzzled that there were only two full professors.4

**Facilities.** This is the area of greatest concern for the reviewers. The existing facilities present safety risks and jeopardize accreditation. The reviewers praise the proposed arts center (Wolfe Center), but recognize that it will not be completed until 2008-09, and may be delayed beyond that.5 They recommend a secondary plan that provides renovation of existing theaters.6 They mention that the University of Toledo may implement a mission shift away from the arts and towards biological and life sciences. If this happens, the Department may indeed become the ‘premier arts education institution in the state,’ but this must be accompanied by the new Arts Center with Theatre and Film, the School of Art, and Musical Arts all participating in some way.7

**Observations and Suggestions**

The external reviewers “recommend a reexamination of the general education courses and requirements to ensure that the courses meet the needs and expectations of majors or

---

4 In response, the Department said (1/27/06) that newly hired faculty have not been here long enough to be promoted. Other faculty, because of credentials or research/creativity activity, may be relegated at the associate (or assistant) level.

5 In addition, funding cuts may result in reduction in the quality of the facility.

6 According to the Chair, the presence of the new Arts Center means that no repairs will take place on the existing facilities.

7 Others wish to participate in this space as well: 1) Voice (including choral and voice faculty); 2) Music Technology (including Music Technology studios and recording services); 3) Digital arts and other School of Arts areas (woodworking, sculpture, etc.). This will cause severe space allocation problems unless there is significant strategic planning. (Dance does not anticipate participating in the space, according to Deborah Tell.).
pre-majors in a better, more substantive manner.” In particular, they suggest a reduction in the 10-hour lab requirement for non-majors. They also believe majors and pre-majors should have their own sections of the general education courses, separate from students not intending to major in theater or film.

The external reviewers suggest the introduction of enrollment and quality controls, such as “caps on the number of students who are permitted to pursue the major” or a GPA requirement for students in the major (e.g., 2.5 GPA, grade of C or better in core theater classes, or grade of B or better in core film classes). They believe “there are far too many film majors at present.”

The external reviewers suggest that the Department differentiate lab hour requirements for theater and film majors. They argue that “the production practice required of the film major needs to be tailored to the medium of their art, namely film.” They suggest we consider developing a practicum in film production.

The external reviewers noted faculty and staffing issues. For instance, they suggested adding a full-time equipment manager, especially for film and media equipment. They also argued for a load reduction for faculty supervising graduate assistants in multi-section undergraduate courses and for the appointment of an assistant chair.

The external reviewers found the Department’s collaborations with faculty in music, dance, and education to be “commendable.” However, they noted that the dance program is focusing on modern dance just when other types of dance will be needed for inter-arts collaboration. Also, Musical Theatre majors will need eight semesters of vocal training, something that does not seem to be part of the Department’s long-range planning.

Correcting the deficiencies in the physical plant is the most important single improvement that could be made.

**Recommendations and Rationale**

The evaluators congratulated the Department on its record of growth, hiring, diversity, and productivity over the past six years, and reiterated their praise of the leadership, the level of faculty and student commitment, and the collaboration with other units on campus. They also see the following needs:

1. A new arts center (Wolfe Center);
2. New performance space to replace the “Elsewhere” space (the reviewers recommend the former Lutheran Chapel);
3. New faculty in Film to service the increased number of majors, including personnel (full-time and managerial) to maintain and manage equipment; and
4. Immediate strategic planning for the move to the new arts center.
The Department is to be congratulated on its progress since the last program review. Scholarly and creative productivity of the faculty is very good. The Department has built enrollment, absorbed Film Studies, increased the number of faculty, and continued a long-lived and successful series of productions. The Department has a long-standing and successful process for assessing undergraduate student outcomes.

1. Scholarship of Engagement

*Findings.* The Department has produced high-quality performances in a variety of venues. These activities make an important cultural contribution to the University and surrounding community, and hence qualify as “engagement,” construed broadly.

*Recommendation.* In the next program review, departments will be asked to demonstrate their record in the areas of engagement generally, and more specifically in the scholarship of engagement. The Department is in an excellent position now to make its record clear, and indicators for scholarship of engagement should certainly be highlighted in the next report.

2. Space

*Findings.* The issue of space was a concern during the last program review eight years ago, and nothing has been done since then to improve the situation. The space problems include physical dangers to faculty and students, and this will continue for the foreseeable future unless action is taken.

The Department and the University are relying very heavily on the Wolfe Center to solve many of the space problems. According to the Master Plan, however, the Wolfe Center is the last in a four-step construction process (new space for Student Affairs; razing of Saddlemire Building; construction of new Admissions Office; construction of Wolfe Center), and the date for completion is not at all certain. It is quite possible that the next round of program review will take place before the Wolfe Center is complete. Yet there seem to be no back-up plans, at the departmental, college, or university level, to account for delayed completion, or for cutbacks in the original plan. There is also no plan to carry out renovations on existing facilities.

*Recommendations.* Both short-term and long-term plans are needed.

1. The Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Chair should maintain close contact with the Assistant Vice President for Capital Planning for information on planning and on reasonable projections for completion. The Chair, Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost need more detailed and accurate information about the scope and funding of the Wolfe Center. There is far too much speculation and rumor at present to allow any accurate projections.
2. Because the Wolfe Center will not be completed for at least three years, short-term plans and renovations to address safety issues in theaters currently in use are absolutely essential.

3. The Elsewhere Theater should be moved to the Lutheran Chapel, as recommended in the external reviewers’ report.

3. **Enrollment Management**

   **Findings.** The Department is to be applauded for its efforts to date at enrollment management in film, and especially the goal for 2006-07 to “submit enrollment management plans to the Dean of Arts and Sciences for approval.” We endorse this and offer the following as cautionary recommendations.

   **Recommendations.** The Chair and the Dean should develop an enrollment management plan that balances enrollment (Chair) with realistic faculty and staff projections (Dean). The Department has enjoyed growth in resources so far, but such growth is not likely to continue at recent levels. Planning for space and equipment should be based, for the time being, on current resources.

4. **Institutional Data Problems**

   **Findings:** The SCH/FTE figures for the Department looked oddly low, and reliance on graduate assistants seemed heavy. Investigating these peculiarities uncovered several problems, both in the Department and in the area of Institutional Research. When the Chair was asked about the low numbers, he noted that the Department stopped adding students to credit-earning practicum sections, and began to enroll all majors into a zero-credit production class. Another change that impacts these numbers is that in the past faculty were listed as instructors of record for several general education courses to reflect the mass lecture format. Currently, however, both THFM 161 and THFM 141 list individual recitation instructors, most of whom are graduate students, as instructor of record. This practice artificially reduces the SCH/FTE for faculty. Nevertheless each of these heavily enrolled courses has a faculty member who creates the syllabus, exam questions, and has staff meetings weekly throughout the semester.

   It was also difficult to confirm the SCH/FTE figures with Institutional Research. Some SCHs the Department received should have been credited to other departments; while other SCHs, credited to other departments, should have been credited to the Department. It was even difficult to determine how many faculty and graduate assistants were teaching in the Department. When these figures were corrected, the SCH/FTE for the Department increased slightly. However, the Committee is still not certain that the figures are correct. This is a larger problem, especially relevant to this particular department because of the low numbers, but applicable to the University as a whole.
Recommendations. Although the responsibility for these discrepancies and uncertainties is not all at the department level, nonetheless there are actions that departments can and should take to ensure the accuracy of data collection and reporting.

1. The Department and College should consider reinstating credit for the practicum course. The students should be registered before the 14th day, so that the Department may receive credit for the course.

2. The Chair and Dean should decide whether the current practice of attributing SCH to faculty and graduate students is appropriate for large-lecture classes.

3. As a general rule, all chairs should work closely with Institutional Research to ensure that the data about their department are accurate. Institutional decisions are made on the basis of these data, so it is important that they be as accurate as possible.

5. Incomplete Report

Findings. The section on doctoral programs did not follow the outline specified in the Academic Program Review report guidelines. Some of the information (Program Faculty, Program Graduates, Assessment) could be found in other areas of the report, but other points (Program Vitality, Program Demand, Program Interactions, Program Access) were not addressed at all. However, the Program Review Committee needs this information in order to adequately understand and evaluate the Department. Furthermore, the Graduate College needs this information, and in this format, to present to RACGS as part of the Guidelines for the Review of State University Doctoral Programs (Section D).

More generally, the self-study report emphasized factual reporting at the expense of self evaluation. In taking this approach, the Department missed an opportunity to use the program review process in the spirit of constructive reflection and continuous improvement. The lack of self evaluation in the report reduces the utility of the effort spent on program review.

The Department of Theatre and Film is multifaceted in its mission and programs. The decision to support a multifaceted program has important resource implications for space, facilities, equipment, operating budget, and personnel. In the previous program review (1998-99), the Program Review Committee recommended limiting the number of activities. Later the Department and College decided on a different path. However, no explanation of the differences between the recommendations and what actually happened was given in the self study.

Recommendations. The Department should rewrite the section of its report on doctoral programs in the form specified and submit it to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs, with copies to the Graduate Dean and the Dean of Arts and Sciences, by May 15, 2006. The report on the doctoral program should include appropriate self evaluation.

The Committee feels that the breadth of academic programming should be part of the Department’s regular strategic planning. We encourage the Department to include the number of different programmatic commitments as a consideration, and report on that element of their strategy in annual planning exercises and in future program reviews.
6. Curriculum and Assessment

Findings: Although the undergraduate assessment program has been very effective, no evidence is presented on assessment of graduate programs. The external reviewers had several suggestions that could be helpful to the Department.

Recommendation: The Department should continue to institute additional methods of student outcomes assessment for both undergraduate and graduate programs. During the 2006-07 academic year, the Department should set a goal of implementing an assessment procedure for graduate programs. Progress on these efforts should be reported annually in the Department’s report to the Student Achievement Assessment Committee. Future revisions to the curriculum should be informed by the results of assessment of student outcomes.

The Department of Theatre and Film should report annually to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.