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The Department offers three B.A. degrees, three minor studies and a M.A. program. They are:

B.A. in Radio, Television, Film
B.A. in Theatre Arts
B. A. in Theater Arts, Preparation for Teaching
Minor in Musical Theatre
Minor in Radio, Television, Film
Minor in Theatre Arts
M.A. in Theatre Arts

The Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre (TRFT) Department evolved from a drama department model in the 1960s. In 1975, Drama became Theatre Arts. In 2000, the name was changed to TRFT to reflect the programs the department offers since the majority (80%) of students are in the BA Radio-TV-Film program.

The Program Planning Committee commends the Department of TRFT on a thoughtful, well-documented and comprehensive self-study. The committee also commends the Department’s effort to meet the standards of National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) in 1997, 2003 and 2009 and its commitment to continuing program and curriculum improvement (seen from the department response to NAST report). The NAST accreditation team commended the department for its strength in faculty commitment and in development community partnership.

The Program Planning committee is aware that the RTVF and Theatre BA programs made large changes to their curricula. It isn’t clear that assessment of student learning was used in formulating the changes, nor that recommendations of the external reviewers were incorporated.

The B.A. Theatre program has made a good start in assessing its program. The Program Planning Committee congratulates the program for changing the pedagogy in the history of theatre course in response to a perceived student need. We would like to remind the faculty that course grades are not sufficient for assessment. Because this course includes both history and performance, an overall course grade does not reflect students’ understanding of history. Keeping records for the percentage of students not meeting the goal, just meeting, and excelling at the goal is also essential to assessment. The next step to best improve assessment in the program is to develop a rubric and standards for poor, good, and excellent performance on the historical understanding portion of the course. The final exam (or another exam) already in use probably can serve this purpose. The assessment facilitator for your college gets release time to help program faculty better understand assessment and to help design plans that do not increase work load. Please contact Scot Guenter, Elna Green, Ron Rogers, or Jackie Snell for consultation about these or other assessment issues.
The Program Planning committee congratulates MA program faculty for regularly collecting evidence of student ability and making changes to pedagogy to improve candidates’ research proficiency. We recommend that the next step to improve assessment is organizing the data in a manner that shows the effect of changes on student learning.

The final step in the program planning process is a meeting with Provost Selter (or his designee), AVP of Undergraduate Studies Jaehne, AVP of Graduate Studies and Research Stacks, Dean Karl Toepfer, and Department Chair Ann Fontain. The Chair may invite directors of programs within the department. The department should contact the Office of Undergraduate Studies to schedule the final meeting. The following topics for discussion are summarized from the reports:

- Future tenure track faculty recruitment, when hiring becomes possible, in the context of student demand across degrees
- Why curriculum changes were not in line with changes recommended by both external reviewers.
- Joining with Advancement to enhance fundraising

If the Department wants to propose other issues for the meeting, please discuss the appropriateness of the topics with Dean Toepfer. Sutee Sujitparapitaya will help to provide a FTES data with separate degree/program information to prepare to meet with the Provost.

The Program Planning Committee recommends acceptance of the self-study. The self-study provided a good examination of the issues for subsequent reviewers. The next program plan will be due to the College Dean in spring 2013 following the completion of the Theatre accreditation review.
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Summary of Self Report, AY 2007

Program and Curricula

The mission of the TRFT department is to prepare students for successful careers in live performance, narrative film and the traditional broadcast media of radio and television. The Department is committed to the development of artists, educators, and scholars of the highest possible caliber. This mission promotes the liberal arts emphasis of both the University and the College of Humanities and the Arts. All seek to give students skills in particular disciplines while at the same time preparing students to be critical thinkers and ethical individuals who will serve the community in which they live.

The Department curriculum follows a liberal arts model of critical thinking, problem solving, production, communication and collaboration. The degree programs comprise a core of common introductory and advanced classes, required classes in the areas of performance, technical production and history, criticism, and analysis as well as upper division electives which allow students to create specialization according to their interests. Focus in the graduate level program is on interdisciplinary thinking about performing arts history and aesthetics.

The Department is aware of its challenges and problems in improving program curriculum. Ideas, solutions and strategies proposed include:

1) Increase GE profile in a variety of ways;
2) Change titles for some GE classes;
3) Have students take GE within the department;
4) Develop MUSE class to recruit students;
5) A possible new BFA in Acting for Stage and Screen has been discussed, as it reflects the unique strengths of the Department.

The Department offers several courses which fulfill GE requirements. These courses serve to broaden student knowledge of humanities and the arts and offer opportunity for both theoretical and practical experiences.

Students and Enrollment

FTES number should be break up based on programs. Sute will provide information to separate program FTES.

Students in both Theatre Arts and RTVF majors have grown in the past five years. As of Fall 2007, the Department has FTES 470 with a total of 420 students in majors and 96 minors. The majority of students in the department are in the 20-24 year-old range from diverse ethnic backgrounds with no clear ethnic majority, though with the largest number identifying themselves as White, Hispanic, Black, and Asian, in that order. Women outnumber men in Theatre Arts at both the undergraduate and graduate levels while men dramatically outnumber women in the RTVF programs.

Faculty

There are ten full professors, two associate professors, and one assistant professor (tenure-track) in the department. Three full professors were in the FERP program, as of the document writing,
while two more faculty were expected to enter FERP/retirements within the year. Thirty part

time instructors were hired to meet student demand. The department indicates that faculty

time retirement is its greatest challenge.

Assessment

The department has created models of assessment for its programs to evaluate progress made in

required and elective courses. To the date of the Self Report, the assessment has been completed

in seventeen classes. The assessment results indicate “the majors are overwhelmingly meeting

SLO requirements (Self Report, P12)”. In the department student exit survey (2007), a majority

of students indicated “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the program instruction, faculty and

their experience.

Resources

There is never enough money to adequately support programs. When the college uses a

“formula” to calculate the allocation, it is difficult to obtain funding for support and technical

staff needed for equipment operation, management of laboratory and safety. Ideally there should

be a television engineer, a radio station manager, a scene shop technician, a costume shop

technician, an accountant, and a lighting technician.

The department equipment and lab facilities were built in the 1950’s and 60’s. Over the years,

they became inadequate and inoperable.

Summary of National Association of Schools of Theatre Accreditation

Report, 2009

A. The program objectives are stated and appear consonant with those of the college and university

B. The Theatre program appears to satisfy all the criteria established by NAST concerning size and

scope.

C. The theatre program, along with the university, has been through several years of financial

pressure. The program has adjusted to maintain the integrity of its offerings, and the finances,

although stretched, appear to be sufficient to sustain the program.

D. Leadership within the program and the department is in a state of transition. Institution policies

are clear; communication is good between the unit and the administration.

E. Faculty and staff are experienced and highly effective in teaching; additional teaching/production

staff are needed.

F. The visitors are pleased to report the Department’s recent upgrades and their facilities. Faculty

offices, classrooms, and labs, and production areas appear to meet NAST standards. The

equipment in all production areas are adequately maintained and appear to be professionally

supervised. Faculty leadership in the costume area are impressive.

G. Library and learning resources appear to be more than adequate to support the programs.

H. Enrollment appears adequate; record keeping and advisement appear to be satisfactory
Overview, Summary Assessment, and Recommendations for the Program

Strengths

- A major strength of this program is the dedicated faculty and staff
- Recent upgrades to the library and some areas within the theater facilities should be considered major strengths.
- Diverse and talented students
- The potential for a uniquely integrated program that links theatre and media
- Exciting and vital links to the community and the professional worlds of theatre and film
- Strong support from the university administration

Short-term and long-term improvement

- The need to secure at least one full-tenure track faculty in Technical theatre/design
- The need to engage in long term planning to address areas of stress within the program, particularly issues of resources and emphasis within the production program which may fail to integrate film students with theatre students in productive and mutually supportive and respectfully ways, issues of faculty workload and respectful evaluation, and budget allocation, fundraising, and student recruitment.
- Develop a plan to replace retired and retiring faculty

Summary of External Reviewer’s Report for the Radio-Television-Film Program, 2008

1. Identify curricular focus of Program to reflect the program mission
2. Reassess and retool RTVF curriculum so that relates coherently to program mission. Build production courses hierarchically and insure that media studies courses are relevant to film and visual literacy.
3. Revise catalogue descriptions and course numbers to reflect revised curriculum and the reality of the courses as taught.
4. Create green sheets for all courses, and course content templates to insure consistency of curriculum from semester-to-semester.
5. Abolish the minor requirement.
6. Give the RTVF emphasis more authority. If possible, require students to declare an emphasis and to take specified courses. Create online PDF advising forms for each emphasis.
7. Identify realistic ways to integrate the TA and RTVF programs.
8. Invest time and resources in short film production.
9. Insure continuation of Spartan Films project.
10. Work to balance gender ratio.
11. Establish more proactive approach to alumni relations.
12. Adjust student goals regarding screenplays, short films, and participation in Spartan Films and to be more realistic.
13. Careful vetting of part-time faculty
14. Strive for parity in RTVF/TA faculty ratio to reflect student enrollment ratios of Program
15. Urgent need for at least one production hire to cover cinematography and film/digital production.
16. Make the case for increased staff support on the basis of unique requirements of Program.
17. Serialize and fully fund the Director of Theatre and Film Production position.
18. Protect unique production design component in Program by supporting Shop Foreman position.
19. Strive to improve the Checkout facility by optimizing current space, employing a scheduling board, implementing a computerized scheduling system, and expanding storage space into other areas.
20. Establish an equipment priority list – a “wish List” – for future purchase opportunities.
21. Continue the expansion of the HD field camera in inventory. Favor low cost camcorders often found “on set” in the industry such as Panasonic HVX/HPX series.
22. Consider the acquisition of used 16mm cameras converted to super-16
23. Upgrade television studio within budget constraints to accommodate intermediate television production.
24. Examine student fee structure in terms of real maintenance needs and student enrolment numbers in production classes.
25. Explore student-initiated production funding strategies such as corporate donation matching.
26. Nurture ongoing relationships with area companies and corporations whose activities intersect with the production mission of RTVF. Identify people from such companies who might serve on an RTVF Advisory Board.
27. Maintain support of KSJS as a valuable community outreach and public relations tool.
28. Build student film festival into a major RTVF event to showcase high—quality short films.
29. Consider integrating production activity into the Masters program, offering parallel thesis options, one emphasizing scholarship and the other production.
30. More careful vetting of MA candidates: Consider the minimum GPA and GRD scores, a writing sample from prospective scholars, and a portfolio from prospective artists (assuming this plan is adopted).
31. Expand general education course enrollments be employing MA students as graduate assistants.

Summary of College Committee Report, 2009

The committee concurs with the major recommendations of the external reviewers for the Department of Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre and the ongoing initiatives of the Department. It commended the Department for its accomplishments and contributions.

Dean's Report

Interim Associate Dean, Mike Adams signed the College report, signifying concurrence.
May 5, 2009

To: Ethel Walker, Interim Chair
   Department of Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre

From: Mike Adams, Interim Associate Dean
      College of Humanities and the Arts

Subject: College Curriculum Committee Report on the Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre Program Review

Per Section V (A) of University Policy S96-10 the Curriculum Committee for the College of Humanities and the Arts provisionally accepts the plan with suggestions for improvement outlined in the following report.

The Curriculum Committee of the College of Humanities and the Arts would like to commend the Television, Radio, Film, and Theater Department for the thorough and thoughtful self-evaluation of the Radio Television and Film program. The report grapples with difficult issues familiar across the university (faculty replacement and funding) as well as issues particular to the RTVF program (flat enrollment and the need for a staff person to coordinate the production season). Likewise, Prof. Gregory Durbin’s exhaustive external review offers a detailed evaluation of the current RTVF program and a thoroughgoing slate of suggestions for shaping the RTVF program into a major that will be more in line with the program’s de facto focus on TV and film production. He also advocated streamlining and organizing the major requirements and courses for students and advisors to follow more easily. Of Prof. Durbin’s list of 31 suggestions (see Report Summary, pg. 28-29), our Committee’s response will focus on those that we feel are the most relevant and useful to SJSU’s RTVF program.

Our primary concern as a committee centers on Prof. Durbin’s suggestions for improving the program’s curriculum. We support all efforts in this regard, especially making the major requirements comprehensible to students and streamlined for advisers, following a logical progression from course to course, and with clear rationales within the major why students are taking a given course sequence or how a particular course fits into their education in the major. RTVF should ensure that its course offerings align with the production focus of the program, by eliminating old courses that are no longer offered and changing course titles and descriptions to match the
actual content of the courses taught. In sum, hierarchizing and rationalizing the major’s courses can serve to make it more attractive to students and more clearly delineate for them what exactly the goals of their RTVF education are.

RTVF’s current G.E. requirements are not only adequate, but strong draws for students around campus, and a great part of the College’s overall participation in the G.E. program. Both the self-review and the external review suggested expanding G.E. course offerings as a way to attract more majors to RTVF, and Prof. Durbin even suggested using M.A. students as T.A.s in larger sections. However, such a move might draw valuable resources from the department unnecessarily. Although G.E. is our primary tool for bringing students and funding to our departments, in this case, expanding the program’s G.E. offerings may not best serve the needs of the faculty and majors in RTVF. We suggest seeking more effective ways to attract new RTVF majors at SJSU, such as outreach programs to local high schools, etc.

In concert with the self-study and Prof. Durbin’s recommendation, we endorse hiring in cinematography and film/digital production to round out the faculty and bring it into alignment with the program’s direction (while of course acknowledging funds may be limited or tight at this time). We also concur with Prof. Durbin’s suggestion to highlight and strengthen short film production. It seems to this committee that a robust short film requirement for majors or at least the opportunity for more students to produce short films and then show them at various festivals is an ideal way for RTVF to raise its program’s visibility and attract high caliber majors.

The Curriculum Committee is aware that the RTVF program has already adopted several of the program review’s suggestions and has already taken action. We understand that the minor requirement has already been jettisoned; that the ORTU has already been funded; and that a college-paid director has already been appointed. Most importantly for this committee, we understand that the faculty of RTVF have already begun the process of reforming their curriculum to streamline, rationalize, and focus it on production per the program goals. Again we commend the TRFT department and the RTVF faculty for having already taken up these tasks, strengthening and updating their program.

MA/fk

CC: Karl Toepfer, Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts
Bob Cooper, AVP, Undergraduate Studies
Xiaolu Hu, University Program Planning Committee Liaison
I can envision a 2-track MA program that would accommodate production-oriented thesis projects as well as research-oriented thesis projects; but I would reiterate my caveat about judiciously vetting candidates for either track. Such a dual-configuration would call for twin thesis templates, one for production-oriented projects (such as what is described above), and one that is organized along the lines of the research/scholarship template that TA now uses. I am aware that this suggestion is likely to provoke controversy, and that a good deal of adjustment would be called for; but I think such a reconfiguration would contribute substantially to departmental strength and unification. Clearly it would require much more in-depth analysis than is within the purview of this report. One enormous opportunity it might afford is the employment of Masters students from TA as Graduate Assistants in the RTVF General Education courses. This, in turn, could lead to greater FTES, and of course, more FTES means more university support.

REPORT SUMMARY

1. Identify curricular focus of Program (narrative filmmaking). Let this be reflected in Program mission statement.
2. Reassess and retool RTVF curriculum so that it relates coherently to program mission. Build production courses hierarchically and insure that media studies courses are relevant to film and visual literacy.
3. Revise catalogue descriptions and course numbers to reflect revised curriculum and the reality of the courses as taught.
4. Create green sheets for all courses, and course content templates to insure consistency of curriculum from semester-to-semester.
5. Abolish the minor requirement.
6. Give the RTVF emphases more authority. If possible, require students to declare an emphasis and to take specified courses. Create online PDF advising forms for each emphasis.
7. Identify realistic ways to integrate the TA and RTVF Programs.
8. Invest time and resources in short film production.
9. Insure continuation of Spartan Films project.
10. Work to balance gender ratio.
11. Establish more proactive approach to alumni relations.
12. Adjust student goals regarding screenplays, short films, and participation in Spartan Films and to be more realistic.
13. Careful vetting of part-time faculty.
14. Strive for parity in RTVF/TA faculty ratio to reflect student enrollment ratios in the two programs.
15. Urgent need for at least one production hire to cover cinematography and film/digital production.
16. Make the case for increased staff support on the basis of unique requirements of Program.
17. Serialize and fully fund the Director of Theatre and Film Production position.
18. Protect unique production design component in Program by supporting Shop Foreman position.
19. Strive to improve the Checkout facility by optimizing current space, employing a scheduling board, implementing a computerized scheduling system, and expanding storage space into other areas.

20. Establish an equipment priority list – a “wish list” – for future purchase opportunities.

21. Continue the expansion of the HD filed camera inventory. Favor low cost camcorders often found “on set” in the industry such as Panasonic HVX/HPX series.

22. Consider the acquisition of used 16mm cameras converted to super-16 (ex: Bolex, CP-16)

23. Upgrade television studio within budget constraints to accommodate intermediate television production.

24. Examine student fee structure in terms of real maintenance needs and student enrollment numbers in production classes.

25. Explore student-initiated production funding strategies such as corporate donation matching.

26. Nurture ongoing relationships with area companies and corporations whose activities intersect with the production mission of RTVF. Identify people from such companies who might serve on an RTVF Advisory Board.

27. Maintain support of KSJS as a valuable community outreach and public relations tool.

28. Build student film festival into a major RTVF event to showcase high-quality short films.

29. Consider integrating production activity into the Masters program, offering parallel thesis options, one emphasizing scholarship and the other, production.

30. More careful vetting of MA candidates: Consider the minimum GPA and GRE scores, a writing sample from prospective scholars, and a portfolio from prospective artists (assuming this plan is adopted).

31. Expand general education course enrollments by employing MA students as graduate assistants.
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM PLANNING SELF-STUDY
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February 1, 2008

The enclosed self-study report has been reviewed by the faculty in the instructional unit and is now submitted for external review.

[Signature]
Département Chair

3-5-08

[Signature]
College Dean

3/17/08

Draft has been read and deemed ready for external review by:
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TELEVISION, RADIO, FILM, AND THEATRE SELF STUDY  
November, 2007

INTRODUCTION

San Jose State University policy mandates that all programs are evaluated every five years, and all nationally accredited programs are evaluated every ten years. Radio, Television, and Film submitted its last University Self Study in 1999; Theatre Arts submitted its last University Self Study in 2002 and its Self Study for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) in 2002. The BA degrees of Radio, Television, and Film (RTVF), and BA Theatre Arts (TA) have sought to integrate the diverse disciplines within the unit; this Self Study contains an analysis of both the RTVF and TA areas including both undergraduate and graduate programs.

When the term “program” is used here, it refers to the entire department of Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre (called TRFT), including these degree programs: BA RTVF, BA Theatre Arts, MA Theatre Arts. While the SJSU program planning process looks at specific degree programs, we have asked for and received approval to generate a single document to be used for RTVF program planning and the NAST (National Association of Schools of Theatre) program accreditation. The site visits and the overall outside review of all programs have been scheduled to happen concurrently in April 2008.

HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT

The Department of Television, Radio, Film and Theatre (TRFT) evolved out of a drama department model common to radio and television programs in the 1960s. The Department traces its beginnings to 1927 when a new Department of Speech and Stagecraft was formed at what was then San Jose State College. In 1928 it became the Speech Arts Department, and in 1942 was renamed the Department of Speech and Drama. In 1963, Speech and Drama split into two departments; Speech became Communication Studies. In 1975, Drama became Theatre Arts. In 2000, the name was again changed to Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre to better reflect our major numbers, 80% of whom are BA Radio-TV-Film.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT AND ITS PROGRAMS

The Department of Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre offers a BA degree in radio-TV-Film, RTVF, and a BA in Theatre Arts, TA. A BA in Theatre Arts, Preparation for Teaching, is listed in the catalogue, but the faculty have been discussing the discontinuation of this option due to the low enrollment in the Program (The State of
California does not offer certification in Theatre Arts or Radio, Television and Film; therefore students who wish to be certified must do so through the English Department. Apparently the English department is no longer interested in supporting the degree. The Department offers a minor in Musical Theatre, RTVF, and TA, and an MA degree in Theatre Arts (we plan to seek a rename of the MA). There are 302 RTVF majors, 81 TA majors, 49 RTVF minors, 47 TA minors, and 37 graduate students. The Department’s FTEF is 10.8; In fall 2007 the FTES was 470. The Department graduated 102 BA RTVF and 17 BA Theatre Arts in 2007 and 5 (est.) MA Theatre Arts in 2007.

1.2 SYNOPSIS OF THE PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEW

RECOMMENDATIONS

A review of the 1999 RTVF Program Self Study and the 2002 Theatre Arts Program Self Study identifies several similar recommendations (Appendix F). Among those are: (a) the need for more tenure track faculty. The retirement or early retirement of Professors Stanley Baran, Robert Jenkins, Randy Earle, Elizabeth POindexter, and Yen Le Wong, has left a void in our Department. We have replaced only one of these positions; Dr. Alison Mc Kee was hired in the RTVF area to teach and lead in Film Studies (a growing area), and to serve on the Graduate Committee, a major recommendation of Theatre Arts external reviewer, Professor Thomas Cooke.

(b) Upgrades and repairs to the facilities were reported in both Self Studies. Suggestions were made to convert Hal Todd Studio Theatre (HGH 103) into a television/film studio. At the present time the university has allocated financial resources to begin a minor upgrade of the space to begin summer 2008.

(c) Professor Cooke also recommended additional support resources for faculty development. Minimal Department resources are available for faculty, especially junior faculty, to travel to conferences and other professional venues. The limited availability of Lottery Grants has proved helpful to the Department as we received monies to ensure our students attended professional conferences, festivals, and CSU Summer Arts; however, the faculty have not benefited sufficiently from this source of finances. Recently much of this funding had disappeared.

(d) The Theatre Arts external reviewer emphasized the need for support for production and fundraising that “could be met with the Director of Production position.” Cooke explained the need for a full time faculty or staff position to concentrate on securing additional funding for productions through more box office revenue and gifts. The present situation of having the Artistic Director of the Theatre as a part time position and including a teaching assignment for this person, cannot provide adequate time for acquiring sufficient revenue.
(e) The major recommendation from the RTVF Self Study was a name change for the Department, then called Theatre Arts. TA major numbers did not reflect the inclusiveness of our department of Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre.

(f) The final recommendation from Cooke was addressed: the problem of communication with the undergraduates and a perceived lack of success with the integration of the areas within the Department. In the 2002 Department Review, Cooke found “many students either had the wrong expectations when they entered the program or were holding on to territorial attitudes that the faculty and staff gave up long ago.” The recommendation was to dialogue more with the students to eliminate negative perceptions, especially by Theatre Arts students, by involving students in the curriculum and production planning. As more integration of the performance and technical areas has occurred, students may become more accepting of the integration theory as conceived by the Department, but enrollments in both majors have not increased significantly.

1.3 SUMMARY OF PRESENT PROGRAM REVIEW

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following document raises issues in three areas: One is faculty replacement. Theatre technical faculty Randy Earle (lighting) will retire, and Elizabeth Pointecker (makeup and costume) is in her third year of the Faculty Early Retirement Program, called FERP. Beginning Fall 2008, Chair Mike Adams will also retire and enter the FERP program. The University has approved the hire of a Chair and a tenure-track faculty in cinematography in Television, Video, Film Production. Since our Department is production oriented, we are still left without sufficient technical faculty to effectively recruit, teach, mentor, advise, and service the production mission of the Department.

Second is curriculum: Enrollments are flat with the exception of General Education classes, notably Introduction to Acting and World Cinema. Later in this document we will suggest several new classes in General Education and the renaming of others to continue to attract new students into the department. In the Fall semester 2008 we will begin offering RTVF 10, The Art of Film, and we will propose a new course in the GE letters category, a theatre comedy text class. Other suggestions are the elimination of the minor requirement in the RTVF BA, this in order to allow RTVF majors to take more classes in film/theatre performance and technical.

Third, resources: In addition to new instructional faculty, our greatest need is for a staff position to coordinate the large and growing theatre and film production season. This was identified as our major need in the 2002 study and it remains a need now. Note that several budget lines are no longer available: Lottery, equipment money, and now continuing education monies are used for salaries. Fund raising for theatre and film will be important but how to accomplish this is a challenge to all in higher
education. And even though our building is aging, we are about to renovate a portion of our black box theatre, a facility used for plays, instruction and film making.

2. CONTEXT AND SCOPE

The mission of the TRFT Department is "to prepare students for successful careers in live performance, narrative film and the traditional broadcast media of radio and television. We see this as indistinguishable from our parallel mission: to nurture ethical thinking and compassionate human beings. To this end, and given our location in the heart of Silicon Valley, the Department is committed to the development of artists, educators and scholars of the highest possible caliber. This mission promotes the liberal arts emphasis of both the University and the College of Humanities and the Arts. All seek to give students skills in particular disciplines while at the same time preparing students to be critical thinkers and ethical individuals who serve the community in which they live.

In order to fulfill this mission the TRFT Department provides courses in performance, creative writing, directing, and production that prepare students for contemporary careers in the entertainment field, one of the most economically viable arenas in California. Acting and voice classes teach students to perform for television, film, broadcasting, and stage; the screenwriting and playwriting courses educate students in different mediums while providing them an opportunity to see their literary creation come to fruition through productions. Opportunities are also present for students to make films, host radio programs, and direct stage productions. Students in the technical areas work on stage, film and music video productions alongside professional designers and cinematographers.

Majors also have an opportunity to work with current technology to engage in Internet and multimedia productions. Our history, literature, and criticism courses provide opportunities for students to connect the past with the present as they make connections with successes and failures in various disciplines. Courses in media theory and research, film history, theatre history, theatre appreciation, television criticism, broadcast communication, and contemporary theatre represent classes that are required for majors in their selected degree area. Not only are students expected to engage in critical thinking but they are required to demonstrate research and scholarship skills. The Graduate Program allows students to select a particular focus of research within the Department and ultimately engage in rigorous research leading to the writing of a thesis. The Graduate Program encourages students to seek publication for their work and prepares them to continue their education in a Ph.D. program. All of the courses in the Department provide students with practical and theoretical experience that prepare them for their chosen careers.

Finally, we have a student and faculty exchange in place with the respected Shanghai Theatre Academy and its School of Television Arts. This new international program allows TRFT faculty to teach in China while students from both campuses work on production projects and design theatre spaces and direct in both countries.
3 CURRICULUM – INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

3.1.1 CURRICULUM

The Department curriculum follows a liberal arts model of critical thinking, problem solving, production, communication and collaboration (Appendix A). It is designed to offer generalist degrees comprised of a core of common introductory and advanced classes, required classes in the areas of performance, technical production, and history, criticism, and analysis as well as upper division electives that allow students to create specialization according to their interests. The following is a synopsis of the degree programs in the Department:

a. Current Curriculum for Each Degree Program:

The B.A. in Radio-Television-Film is a 45 unit major emphasizing media scholarship and criticism, screenwriting, and film and digital video, and its practical application in the production of narrative film and television. Of the 45 units, 33 are major requirements including TA 100W, and 12 are electives. Majors are also required to have a minor. Students are required to meet all University course requirements. Students are required to take an Internship course that provides practical experience in a related off-campus environment.

The B.A. in Theatre Arts is a 57 unit Program that includes training in performance, technical theatre, and history and dramatic literature. Of the 45 unit BA, 30 units are core requirements, and 15 units are electives. There are 12 units of General Education courses in support of the major. All majors must take the Directing class and utilize their ability to analyze and produce a script. This project requires students to demonstrate a complete approach to theatre arts.

The B.A. in Theatre Arts, Preparation for Teaching is a 72 unit Program; 45 units are taken in Theatre Arts and 27 in English. This does not include the fifth year educational program. The Theatre Arts courses provide a liberal background in the art that will support the middle or high school teachers. Six of the 45 units are General Education courses. Students are required to fulfill all University course requirements. Students in this Program have an advisor in the English and TRFT Departments. The number of requirements dissuade many students from selecting this Program, elimination of this program is under discussion.

The minor in Musical Theatre is a 17-23 unit Program depending on the number of units taken in the areas of Music, Dance, and Theatre Arts. Although the Program is offered through the TRFT Department, all of the advising for the Program is by Professor Janie Scott of the School of Music and Dance.
The minor in Radio-Television-Film is 18 units, which includes production and theory courses. 15 units are required, and 3 units are elective.

Theatre Arts minors must take 21 units; 6 are required and 15 are elective. Students may choose from the areas of Performance, Directing, Design, or Dramatic Writing.

The Theatre Arts MA is a 30 unit program which combines research in both electronic media and traditional theatre. At least 15 graduate level units are required of all graduate students. These include: TA 200 (Research Methods in the Performing Arts, 3 units); TA 201 (Theoretical Perspectives in the Performing Arts, 3 units); TA 260 (Graduate Problems in the Performing Arts, 2 units); two Theatre Arts Seminars (3 units each); and TA 299 (Master’s Thesis, 1-4 units).

Focus in all graduate level courses is on interdisciplinary thinking about performing arts history and aesthetics. TA 200 develops skills needed to do publishable scholarship: bibliographic search, critical assessment of research related to a problem, argument construction, selection of analytical method, identifying methodological relations between different areas of the performing arts, selection of appropriate devices for the dissemination of research findings. TA 201 develops analytical skills; this course gives students the theoretical basis, the rhetoric and systematizing conventions needed to pursue interdisciplinary objectives in the performing arts. TA 260 focuses on preparation of the thesis proposal for approval by the department Graduate Committee. The two seminars concentrate on solving major problems related to specific aspects of the performing arts (Seminar in Performance Cultures, Seminar in Performance History, Seminar in Film and Television, Seminar in Twentieth Century Dance History). But each seminar remains interdisciplinary as far as research projects, class texts and theoretical perspectives, with the concept of performance analysis consistently stressed.

b. Changes to the Curriculum Since the Last Review: The Curriculum Committee is in discussion about the elimination the B.A. in Theatre Preparation for Teaching; however, the change has not been finalized or sent to the College Curriculum Committee. The Department believes there are not enough students who want to get an English Credential in order to prepare for a career teaching Theatre (most will teach more English than Theatre) in the secondary schools. The number of units required by English for the Credential poses enormous problems for students who often struggle to get through the Theatre requirements in a timely manner. Therefore, the Department does not feel it is utilizing faculty resources adequately for such a limited number of students (4 within the last 7 years) who are in the Program.

c. Uniqueness of the Program: The TRFT Department is unique among similar CSU campuses in that it integrates Radio, Television, and Film with Theatre
Arts. Most universities still isolate RTVF from Theatre and majors in both areas have limited contact. The advantage for our majors is that they are prepared to enter various careers in performance and production. Our theatre majors also work with the radio station, make films and music videos, take acting and directing for stage and the screen, and study screenwriting. The RTVF majors are encouraged and often required to take courses in the Theatre Arts curriculum. This multidisciplinary approach allows students to train under talented artists and scholars across the different mediums.

d. Problems with the Curriculum: Concurrently with this Self Study, the faculty has held several sessions to discuss revisions to the current curriculum. One of the major changes for RTVF is the need to eliminate the minor requirement. The interdisciplinary nature of our Department allows RTVF students to cross areas in their elective choices, and thus, the need for a minor is unnecessary. More importantly, this adds time to the student’s stay at San Jose State since most minors require 18-21 units and involve prerequisites that often interfere with the Department’s productions requirements. The BA Theatre Arts faculty will be examining the performance curriculum to make it more competitive with other Programs in Acting and Directing. In the BA RTVF and BA Theatre Arts there are at least a dozen classes that are always under enrolled and this needs to be studied.

Specifically, there are the following recommendations: We may increase our GE (General Education) profile in a variety of ways: 1) A new Theatre Arts lower division GE class in C 2 Letters, an area in which we are currently not represented. 2) Titles are very important in GE classes; the title for the proposed C 2 Letters class is “The Great Comedies.” Some of our other GE offerings might attract more students with catchier names; “Beyond Words” could become “Stage Moves,” and “Theatre Appreciation” might become “Seeing Theatre Now.” 3) We can steer our advisees toward keeping GE enrollments within TRFT. For example, TA 127 Contemporary Theatre in Area V upper division GE should be recommended by RTVF advisors with our 300 RTVF majors. 4) MUSE (Metropolitan University Scholar Experience) classes, designed for incoming freshmen, represent significant potential enrollments and faculty must be encouraged to create GE MUSE classes. However, GE classes are no substitute for new enrollments, and for that we might need to repackage what we offer. 5) A possible new BFA in Acting for Stage and Screen has been discussed, as it reflects the unique strengths of our department and would give us a “brand” to sell outside the University that could make us a “destination” program. The dance program recently added a BFA and could advise us on the process.

e. Interdisciplinary: See above description of the department
3.2 GENERAL EDUCATION AND SERVICE COURSES

a. The Department offers several courses that fulfill the General Education (GE) requirement. These courses serve to broaden the student's knowledge of humanities and the arts and offer opportunity for both theoretical and practical experience. Our General Education course require students to meet the University's student learning objectives and writing requirements, and exposes them to a broad diversity of art and communication. The Department serves over 516 students per semester in core and advanced GE. TRFT General Education courses include TA 100W, Writing Workshop, RTVF 110, Electronic Media and Culture, RTVF 188, Alternative Cinema, TA 5, Acting, TA 10, Theatre Appreciation, and TA 127, Contemporary Theatre. Students are encouraged to become involved in all Department productions and scholarly events. Courses in Oral Interpretation, Storytelling, Web performance, and Children's Theatre attract additional students and are integral courses within Creative Arts, Social Science, and Liberal Studies majors. Major-oriented courses in playwriting and in theatre history are cross-listed with English and always attract a number of students from that department. Technical theatre and design courses appeal to students majoring in Art, Music, and Engineering.

3.3 ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

a. The Department has created models of assessment for both RTVF and Theatre Arts majors to evaluate progress made in required and elective courses for various disciplines. (Appendix B) The models are used to assess theoretical, analytical, oral communication, writing, performance, and technical knowledge and skills. The nature of our Department requires students not only be able to demonstrate practical artistic skills, but also be able to articulate both orally and in written form the aesthetic, historical, and theoretical concepts of the art form. To date, assessment has been completed in the following classes: TA 200, TA 242, TA 201 (all graduate courses), TA 120, TA 10, TA 51A, TA 51C, TA 17, RTVF 91, RTVF 172, RTVF 173, RTVF 110, TA 112, TA 116, TA 153, TA 127, and RTVF 175. Our students are also assessed for their production work including the stage and film projects. Journals are collected and oral critique sessions are held following performances, and students have an opportunity to evaluate their work as well as be evaluated by faculty and guest artists.

See link: http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment/forms/

The assessment models were created under the supervision of the University. The main problem is that very little is actually measured. According to University directive, the instructor only needs to measure proficiency of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) by using one question from a test, or one project that address an SLO. This form of measurement does not account for
other questions on the test or other projects that might be helpful in
determining how well the student is learning the skills or the theoretical
concepts for the class. The method of recording assessment is “easy,” but one
can question the effectiveness of the assessment. It is even more difficult to
obtain an accurate measurement if there are a small number of majors in a
class; this can easily happen in a General Education class or a specialized
major requirement where small numbers are desirable.

b. Overall, the assessment results indicate that the majors are overwhelmingy
meeting SLO requirements. More than three-fourth of our majors are
receiving grades of “B” or above, and only negligible numbers are failing.
This, however, may well correspond to the number of students who receive
high grades in our laboratory classes (RTVF 192, RTVF 190, RTVF 198, TA
117, TA 190, TA 191).

3.4 GOALS AND PLANS

Assessment data is reviewed regularly by instructors from the various assessed areas;
TA 51A and 51C instructors discuss results and curricular changes in the technical
areas; TA 10 and TA 120 instructors discuss results and changes for the literature
and analysis courses, RTVF 172 will discuss assessment data for the film/video
production area. More importantly, this Departmental Review will lead to an
evaluation of courses and SLOs for major subjects and attempts to strengthen
problems that are evident. Certainly the most visible problems in the literature
courses are the writing quality of the students, and faculty must find new methods of
addressing the problems. When Graduate Coordinator, David Kahn returns from
sabbatical in the Spring, the Graduate Studies Faculty will evaluate alternative
methodology for improving overall performance of the graduate students to help them
gt through the entire process more efficiently and to guide those who cannot meet
the high academic standards out of the Program.

The RTVF area completed assessment of all SLOs in the fall of 2007, and discussion
of results will take place in spring 2008. Theatre Arts will continue to assess SLO 4
in the spring of 2008 with TA 113, TA 128, and TA 151. The results will be
evaluated at the end of the semester and discussion of results will take place in fall,
2008. This will conclude assessment of all SLOs for Theatre Arts.

4. STUDENTS

4.1 ANALYSIS OF STUDENT DATA

a. We asked the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to provide us with
student information for the past five years (i.e., 2002-2005). Those data are
placed in Appendix C. Included are numbers of students that applied to, were
admitted to, and enrolled in each major, as well as statistics reflecting gender,
age, ethnicity, place of residence, and rates of graduation. Also included is a
graph that summarizes the history of FTES in the Television-Radio-Film-Theatre Department (sorted by Theatre Arts and Radio-Television-Film degree programs).

The greatest number of students who enroll in our department are in the 20-24 year-old range, from diverse ethnic backgrounds with no clear consistent ethnic majority, though with the largest number identifying themselves as White, Hispanic, Black, and Asian, in that order. Women outnumber men in Theatre Arts at both the undergraduate and graduate levels by approximately one-third, while men dramatically outnumber women in the RTVF program, by as much as 2 to 1.

From the data provided by OIR we are able to conclude that student demand for both the Theatre Arts and RTVF majors has grown in the past five years. In Fall 2002 Theatre Arts majors were at their five-year low of 78 (52 undergraduates, 26 graduates); however, that number has increased each semester (with the exception of Fall 2005, when there was a low of 79 TA undergraduate and graduate majors) until the present: in Spring 2007 the TA program was at its five-year high of 106 students (72 undergraduates, 34 graduate students). Similarly, the number of RTVF majors has risen from a low of 264 majors in Spring 2005 to a high of 287 majors in Spring 2007. As of Fall 2007 the Department of Television-Radio-Film-Theatre had a total of 420 majors (RTVF: 309; TA 118) and 96 minors (RTVF 49, TA 47).

The final census for Fall 2007 shows department-wide FTES at 470, the highest in our history. Enrollments are clearly going up, and while our classes are primarily major-driven, we do offer five General Education courses: TA 5 (Acting), TA 10 (Theatre Appreciation), TA 127 (World Theatre), RTVF 110 (Electronic Media and Society, and RTVF 188 (Alternative Cinema). Among those, TA 5, RTVF 110, and RTVF 188 supply the largest portion of FTES, in addition to RTVF 82, which is a course required for the RTVF major but not a GE course. A new core GE course, RTVF 10 (The Art of Film) has received General Education approval. This course is designed to meet increasing student demand for film studies courses and to continue to build the strengths of the RTVF program’s scholarly offerings.

Other indicators of student demand in the past five years are mixed. While the number of Full Time Equivalent Students (a student taking 15 units is classified as a full time equivalent student), called FTES, in Spring 2005 was 350, and in Spring 2007 it increased to 416, the number of actual majors has remained flat. Of the majors, 309 are RTVF majors, 74 are Theatre Arts undergraduate majors, and 33 are Theatre Arts graduate students. (The MA, while titled “Theatre Arts,” serves a number of film, television and radio students). Our department also services 49 RTVF minors and 47 TA minors. If the admitted and enrolled trends are a moderately reliable indicator, the
numbers of RTVF and TA majors may increase, but not significantly given overall campus enrollment growth trends.

b. Students take jobs in the film, television, radio and theatre industries in production, performance, management and education. We are able to track students careers informally through our Department’s interactive website, and alumni newsletter. (See www.TVRadioFilmTheatre.com)

4.2.1 STUDENT EXPERIENCES

a. All tenure-track and tenured TRFT faculty assume advising duties for TRFT majors, and there is a concerted effort on the part of the department to match RTVF faculty with RTVF majors and TA faculty with TA majors (see Appendix F). Degree planning sheets are available as roadmaps for both the RTVF and TA majors and minors; these forms are available in hard-copy format and as PDFs online at the TRFT website, and they are used routinely by faculty and students alike to assist in students achieving their degrees in a timely fashion. RTVF majors must balance major, minor, GE, and other university requirements, they often find the competing demands difficult to juggle, and informed advising is critical. Nevertheless, there is a perception among some TRFT students (which may be typical of the SJSU student population generally rather than specific to the department) that effective advising should be easier to obtain. Despite their already overcommitted schedules, TRFT faculty may need to play a more proactive role in their advising (e.g., emailing their advisees at the beginning of each semester about the importance of meeting with their advisors) and in educating themselves across the programs, not just within their own specific RTVF or TA divisions.

b. In Fall 2007 the TRFT Department administered a preliminary exit survey targeted at senior TRFT majors scheduled to graduate in Spring 2008 to allow it to begin to identify and assess key issues from a student perspective. The survey was distributed in a range of departmental courses likely to contain significant numbers of RTVF and TA majors (e.g., required courses for each major, departmental GE courses with known high enrollments). Of those students surveyed, 58% felt that the TRFT curriculum provided a strong basis for a career in performance (acting or directing). 58% felt that the TRFT curriculum provided a strong basis for a career in production (design, technical theater, editing, cinematography). 81% felt that the curriculum prepared them “exceptionally well” or “more than adequately” with the research skills required in their discipline. 77% felt that the curriculum prepared them “exceptionally well” or “more than adequately” with a broad knowledge of theories and principles in their discipline. 74% felt that the curriculum prepared them “exceptionally well” or “more than adequately” with the communication skills required in their discipline. 72% were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with faculty as mentors. 68% were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their instruction in academic areas. 64% were “very satisfied”
or “satisfied” with their instruction in performance. 64% were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their instruction laboratory skills.

From this limited data and sampling, we can conclude that while TRFT majors near graduation currently believe themselves better prepared for any research and academic-related skills they anticipate needing in their chosen field after graduation, they do not feel as confident about their preparation in performance (acting and directing) or production (design, technical theater, editing, cinematography). Practically speaking, one reason for the difference in these numbers may be that, in general, TRFT majors at SJSU are more interested in performance and production than they are academics, and they may feel that they get more academic or scholarly instruction than they may actually want or think is necessary and that they are hungry for as much performance- and production-related experience as they can acquire.

4.3 STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

a. The TRFT Department actively engages in student recruitment in a variety of ways and has recently extended its efforts to reach out to (and retain) underrepresented student populations. Our monthly online newsletter Performances is devoted to Department activities and operates as an effective and continuous outreach and recruiting tool for existing and prospective students. It also doubles as potential professional networking and fundraising contact points for theatre, film, television, video, and radio. Because of the success of the newsletter (2 million pages requests last year), a print version is planned for fundraising and marketing purposes.

The Student Touring Ensemble Program (S.T.E.P.) is a theatre outreach program that has existed for 10 years. STEP goes into local middle and high schools as well as community organizations to present the opportunities and diversity of the education and training available at SJSU. S.T.E.P. also serves acting students at the beginning of their careers, and is designed to give them their first experiences before smaller, less critical audiences.

In addition, just prior to the start of Fall 2007, Professor Ethel Walker inaugurated an intensive, two-day comprehensive orientation program for freshmen and new students (including transfer students), the goal of which is to prepare new students for the academic and co-curricular environment of the Academy. Given low retention and graduation rates, especially among Latino and African American students, this project seeks to give them a “jump start” at their academic careers. The program received very positive feedback from both the students and parents who attended. Assistant Professor Alison McKee worked with Professor Walker in coordinating and executing this orientation, and she is in the process of analyzing preliminary student data from Fall 2007 to assess the effectiveness of the orientation in terms of only one of the criteria of success (i.e., the attendees’ first semester grades). It is hoped that the Department will be able to continue to offer and expand such orientations as a way of building relationships with students from their first
days at the university and of tracking their progress and mentoring them throughout their timely journey through the department.

A major recruitment device is our public Web: www.TVRadioFilmTheatre.com

Averaging over 4 million page requests a year, it is a large collection of degree and production information, obviously visited by students seeking film and theatre program information. It is designed to recruit those interested in the program and to reinforce existing majors.

b. To ensure student retention, the Department encourages student participation in theatre, film, radio, multi media, productions and research projects. Our diverse student population gains real world experience in conjunction with academic requirements.

c. We encourage students to receive academic advising on regular basis to ensure graduation in a timely manner.

4.4.1 STUDENT SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

Although the majority of majors in the TRFT Department are interested primarily in performance, writing, directing, and technology for stage production and filmmaking, both TA and RTVF majors receive education in scholarly and academic work. This training allows those who wish to do so to continue to pursue graduate degrees (M.A., Ph.D. or M.F.A.). For example, two years ago RTVF major Shelley Warkentin was accepted into UCLA’s prestigious and highly competitive Moving Image Archives Studies M.A. program (she competed against a number of applicants who already held advanced degrees in related fields). Students in our Theatre Arts M.A. program have also gone on to pursue Ph.D.s in well-known programs (MA graduate Carol Fisher has completed her coursework for the Ph.D. in Theater at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and is writing her doctoral dissertation; MA Grad Kathie Kratochvil is completing her doctorate at UC Santa Cruz while teaching part time in the department).

RTVF graduate Todd Banhazl was accepted into the prestigious American Film Institute, AFI, for the MFA in cinematography.

The 30-unit Theatre Arts M.A. program combines research in both electronic media and theatre and performance studies. It prepares students from a wide variety of backgrounds for careers as teachers, administrators, managers, scholars, and creative figures within various performing arts contexts. A major objective of the program is to prepare students for competitive entry into doctoral programs. Many of the graduates pursue opportunities elsewhere in the United States or abroad. A number of our current and recent M.A. students attend academic and professional conferences, present papers, and publish in peer-reviewed journals, despite the
frequent inability of the Department to fully or even partially fund these scholarly endeavors.

With its emphasis on dramatic performance and its societal context, the University Theatre production program (Appendix F) creates daily lessons in the ways that different cultures are represented through the performing arts. In fact, the program advocates a specifically multicultural approach that addresses the diversity of our student population providing course-based activities for thousands of SJSU students each year. In 2006-2007, the department produced four main stage productions. Dale Wasserman’s adaptation of Ken Kesey’s One Flew Over The Cuckoo’s Nest, allowed students to contrast a theatrical performance with a award winning film and novel examining the plight of the mentally ill. Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet) by Ann-Marie MacDonald exposed students to a modern feminist interpretation of two of Shakespeare’s greatest works: Romeo and Juliet and Othello. TRFT adapted a production of The Kite Runner; the university reading committee had selected the novel for the reading program and the novelist participated in a post show discussion. The play exposed students to cultural issues in Afghanistan and their affect on American society. Big Love, by Charles Mee, is an adaptation of the classic Greek play, The Danaids by Aeschylus. The Director’s Showcase featured four student directed plays, where faculty and staff mentored student directors.

The University Theatre production program also provides a thorough preparation for students specifically seeking careers in theatre and the many related fields of the entertainment and communications industries. It educates the performers, directors, writers, producers, designers, technicians, and managers who will apply their academic knowledge and practical training to a variety of professional opportunities. SJSU Theatre is now regarded as perhaps the best production program in northern California, and its graduates are responsible for much of the cultural life of the south bay.

The TRFT Department offers a unique combination of performance, writing, directing and technical curriculum for stage production and film making using 16mm, 35mm and digital and high definition formats.

The department FM station, licensed in 1963, has provided many career opportunities in radio broadcasting. The primary goal of the radio station is to provide to all interested SJSU students the opportunity to learn communication skills using radio. The secondary goal is to provide a public radio service from the university to the outside community. This is accomplished by airing campus special events and talks, university men’s and women’s sports, and the PSA or Public Service Announcement. In this latter category, we air about 35,000 thirty second announcements per year.

Most of KSJS programming is music, with the emphasis on diverse music formats for underserved audiences. Examples are Jazz and blues, Alternitivo Espanol, electronic, none aired by commercial stations. In addition to music programming, we air SJSU sports with the emphasis on woman’s and less commercially-popular activities, we broadcast literary speakers, cultural events, live entertainment and educational
seminars. The Provost hosts a weekly interview show featuring university newsmakers.

The department’s major successes have been in the production of narrative film and this includes students, faculty and staff from both degrees. Much of the Department’s recent screen work has been done by faculty and students collaborating with Spartan Films, a production company formed in 2004 to build opportunity for students to develop production skills by collaborating with seasoned professionals on commercial-level productions on campus. The fruitfulness of that combination is clear in the proliferation of student work in the following creative endeavors, including:

- The feature film *Glory Boy Days*, only one of 29 films accepted into the Slamdance Film Festival, out of 1,200 submitted. Written and directed by TRFT student Paul Encinas. Cinematography by TRFT student Todd Banhazl.
- The feature film *All About Dad*. Co-produced with Spartan Films. Written and directed by TRFT student Mark Tran. Cinematography by Todd Banhazl.
- *We Bombed in Baghdad*, an animated political satire musical feature film. In production. Written and directed by Associate Professor Scott Sublett. A cooperative production between students and faculty in the Department of Television-Radio-Film-Theatre, the School of Music and Dance, and the School of Art and Design.
- *Making It Right*, a TRFT documentary. Co-produced with Spartan Films and with the participation of SJSU students. Premiered at Cinequest International Film Festival in 2007. Executive-produced by TRFT graduate and Director of Productions Barnaby Dallas, Professor David Kahn, and Nick Martinez. Produced and directed by filmmaker, sociology professor and part-time TRFT instructor Bob Gliner.
- The feature film *Drifting Elegant*, Co-produced by Spartan Films. Directed by Professor Amy Glazer. Written by Stephen Belber. Crewed by TRFT students. Premiered at Mill Valley Film Festival 2007 and accepted into the Ashland Film Festival, Atlanta Film Festival, and the Santa Cruz Film Festival.

- *Nut Houze*, a music video crewed by TRFT students. Directed by Associate Professor Babak Sarrafan. Awarded “Best of Show,” Faculty Production Competition, Broadcast Education Association, April 2008.

TRFT student work has been accepted and displayed in several prominent academic and professional competitions, festivals, broadcasts and conferences. Highlights include an official selection at the Slamdance International Festival (hosted by Sundance), a student Emmy, CSU Media Arts finalists and winner, BEA finalists, participation in the Cinequest International Film Festival, the San Francisco Gay and
Lesbian Film Festival, The San Francisco Latino Film Festival and The San Francisco International Asian American Film Festival.

4.4.2 STUDENT ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

a. We have three student organizations that produce theatre, film and radio for the university and local community. They activities range from productions, to fundraising for charitable organizations.

b. Student productions seek the involvement for the local community. (See the attached press release from our latest student production.)

4.4.3 GOALS AND PLANS

The RTVF production sector has been growing in quality and quantity since the last program review. This is evident in faculty, student, and departmental productions. However, to maintain high level of student productions and to continue to grow, there is a need to look at current curriculum in RTVF and fine-tune the related classes. Certain specialty classes such as advanced audio recording and mixing for film is an important part of any production but doesn’t exist as a class. We need to address this. Identifying problems like this will have a direct effect on who we need to hire in the near future.

We need to look at core classes’ relevancy to current and future trends and existing classes and fine-tune their objectives. This can be achieved by proper assessment of classes and their goals, qualification of instructors for that class, and specific agendas for the classes. This insures that students leave our production sequence with a portfolio of various worthy projects. This also will supply our presence in the CSU media festival and BEA student festival.

Within the BA RTVF, most students identify with narrative film making as their top career path, and we have identified three outcomes for graduates. First, we want every graduate to leave with a completed screenplay, and to have an entry-level knowledge of narrative story structure. Second, we want every graduate to have worked on one of our professionally-staffed Spartan Films productions, so that they understand and can experience the structure and discipline of a professional production environment. The third outcome is that we want every student to have produced a short film or video, using good story structure, directing, lighting/sound, and editing. It is this final outcome that needs the most attention. Our screen writing students have won major awards, our Spartan Films-produced features attract many students who anecdotally say they learn a great deal (and find job placement), but the quality of the short film projects is mediocre to uneven. This is our greatest production education challenge.

The BA Theatre Arts goal is to increase its major numbers. Hundreds of non-majors audition for the theatrical performances every year but this has not translated into
more students in the program. In addition, our technical classes are low on enrollments and so our numbers come primarily from GE classes Therefore our goal is to examine the curriculum and make changes that will attract more students the major

Future planning should provide opportunities for both learner and the teacher to obtain and use information about progress towards learning goals. It also has to be flexible to respond to initial and emerging ideas and skills. Planning should include strategies to ensure that learners understand the goals they are pursuing and the criteria that will be applied in assessing and completing their work.

We need to continue and expand our scholarly and research activities, along with our theatre and film productions and performances. All of this requires leadership by the permanent faculty.

5. FACULTY

5.1 FACULTY PROFILE

a. Our tenured faculty profile breaks down to six females and seven males. We have ten full professors, two associate professors and one assistant professor (tenure-track). Three of our full professors are currently in the FERP program and we have two expected FERP/retirements within the year. We have a very diverse faculty in terms of ethnic and gender breakdown. (Appendix D)

b. We have thirty part time instructors and a revolving number of teaching assistants which feed in from our graduate program. There is an equal and growing trend to hire more lecturers to fill current student demand with a rising number of part-time faculty in the stage acting and film production areas.

c. Our greatest challenge is an increasing number of retirements, particularly in the technical theatre area, and the ability to adequately replace/fill those voids with the same positions and areas of expertise. These same retirements will shift and diminish the current balance and ethnicity of our over-all department.

5.2 FACULTY SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

a. 1) Faculty and staff publish research, books, option screenplays, and present papers at conferences. 2) Several faculty and staff have had films accepted by major film festivals, received distribution, broadcast on cable and network television and won awards. 3) Faculty and staff have received grants for project and professional advancement. (Appendix D)
b. Collaboration is on-going between TRFT and Communication Studies, Creative Arts, Sociology, African American Studies, Art (Animation), English, Music and Dance, and the School of Education. We also have a working relationship with departments at Santa Clara University, San Francisco State University and CSU San Bernardino and Sacramento, the Shanghai Theatre Academy, as well as numerous bay area high schools and community colleges.

c. (See appendix D. and faculty biographies)
http://ksjs1.sjsu.edu/MA/Pages/faculty.html

5.3 SERVICE AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

a. The department is involved in the university orientation program, providing both advisement and performances. This includes the Faculty Mentor Program, MUSE, Center for Faculty Development, Teachers/Scholars program and Black Student Orientation Program sponsored by The University EOP.

The Department sponsors a theatre touring theatre company, STEP, the School Touring Ensemble Program, which presents a repertory of plays in the elementary and secondary schools as well as other local venues. The Company emphasizes the performance curriculum of the Department and reflects the diverse population of the University which in turn reflects the diversity of the community

b. Given the mission of San Jose State University within a metropolitan and culturally diverse community, The TRFT department is actively involved in several endeavors that address community involvement and articulation with other schools (elementary, secondary, as well as other colleges and universities), as well as liaison with many other theatre organizations.

The department also works with several high school students who are preparing for university entrance. Some of these programs are The College Readiness Program, Harambee Scholars Program, and Summer Bridge. High school career days and the 2002-2003 "Showcase(s) for Learning" provide further outreach opportunities where the department participates actively. Many of the faculty and some staff, as well as many of our graduate students, provide technical assistance to area middle and high schools. Advanced undergraduates from the department provide artistic assistance in the form of after-school workshops and classes, directing and designing productions and facilitating drama clubs. Faculty members conduct in service workshops and lectures as a part of teacher training within the entire public school system.

Several department faculty members have been active adjudicators for The American College Theatre Festival (ACTF). Faculty members also
participated as judges for The San Jose Unified School District High School Monologue Competition as well as for the county wide High School Musical Theatre Honors Program sponsored by American Musical Theatre of San Jose. Faculty have served in various capacities with the CSU Summer Arts program. A current faculty member is working on the on the CSU Summer Arts Faculty Focus group to develop current course offerings in the stage and video areas of performance for the summer of 2008. Faculty have served the California Arts Council as professional theatre site evaluators, and as delegates to International Theatre Institute and other international theatre research programs.

We have established close working relationships and liaisons with many of the major theatre houses in the Bay Area including San Jose Repertory Company, San Jose Stage Company, Teatro Vision, Tabia Theatre Ensamble, Berkeley Repertory Theatre, American Conservatory Theatre, TheatreWorks of Palo Alto, Magic Theatre, California Shakespeare Company, Marin Theatre Company, Center Repertory Company, Lorraine Hansberry Theatre to name only a few. We also have a full time faculty member currently working on development projects at Dreamworks Studio.

The department’s work with the local theatre organizations is quite active. Faculty members serve on the boards and as consultants for several of these theatres. The local theatres use many faculty and/or staff members as guest directors, designers, technicians and actors. Our students also work in several capacities and add to the talent pool of our local theatres.

Over fifty producing organizations in the San Jose area alone contact the performance area each semester to offer opportunities and financial support to our student directors, designers, crafts people, managers, and performers. In addition, work in performance, direction, and design is offered through dozens of schools and community colleges, radio and television stations, clubs, churches, civic, fraternal and social organizations, private parties, industries, and even shopping malls.

Other opportunities to work come from our partnership with San Jose’s premier film festival, Cinequest, film production companies, ad agencies filming in our area, film extra work, multi media and voice over work, and touring companies seeking to augment their production staffs. Literally hundreds of these opportunities are offered each semester and individuals are contacted, offers screened, and notices posted to apprise our students of this potential work.
5.4 GOALS AND PLANS

Our departmental goals and plans are to hire two tenure track positions in the immediate future, one in RTVF (lighting design and cinematographer) and one department chair, which fills our immediate need to bolster the tenure-track, full time teaching pool. Also see self-study appended B for both job descriptions.

The attrition of Theatre Arts faculty combined with the need to expand RTVF faculty has stretched department resources and caused us to hire temporary faculty to teach in the curriculum. The department has had to "do more with less," by streamlining its curricular offerings, maintaining high efficiency in controlling production expenses, and increasing integration between Theatre and RTVF to eliminate budgetary and curricular redundancies. Many faculty must perform multiple duties teaching in two, sometimes three, degree programs, working actively in production while producing published scholarships, serving in major community and professional service capacities while instituting new curriculum, etc.

6. RESOURCES

6.1 PROGRAM SUPPORT

a. The short answer is that there is never enough money to adequately support the increasing numbers of students seeking the department’s laboratory-based film, television, radio and theatre production programs. This is made more complex under the “formula” used to calculate the allocation of support personnel, a formula primarily based on the size of the department. TRFT is the smallest department in the College of Humanities and Arts, but in terms of the number of support staff, we are third, so we have since the 1980s been defined as “over formula.” This has always meant that according to San Jose State University, we have too many support personnel. While not impossible, this has made it difficult to get funding for additional staff.

We are an expensive collection of instructional programs, most needing technical support staffs. What other department on this campus has a television engineer, a radio station manager, a scene shop technician, a costume shop technician, an accountant and a lighting technician? Because of the laboratory nature of the program, instructional faculty in these areas must be supported by technical staff, for safety, for equipment operation, and for the viability of the laboratory spaces.

But it is the most popular program, film production, that needs additional support resources. Currently, our in-house film production company produces at least one major music video and one major feature film per year, attracting several hundred students each semester who work under industry professionals in creative, technical and business processes under a model of
professional film making. The “company” is managed by two half-time support staff, one of whom is serialized, the other I am paying out of Continuing Education revenues.

And while we have met a mandate of the CSU to offer classes on Fridays and during the summers, it too has stretched our marginal support staff resources. The feature film has become, in the past 5 years, an important summer activity, attracting 100 plus students who build, costume, crew, film and feed a professional production company, all under the supervision of the support staff. In the past the summers were used to organize and clean lab spaces, fix video, lighting and sound equipment and tools. Now there is no down time, and this has caused staff fatigue and it could eventually lead to injury.

In summary, while the clerical and technical support has been mostly effective in serving our programs, it is not adequate enough to serve the recent growth of the department of over 50 FTES (one Full Time Equivalent Student equals 1 student taking 5 three unit classes) in a single semester (F07). Those who are current staff are beginning to suffer from burnout, the accumulation of excess overtime, and a growing realization that they are inadequate to serve the current student demand.

b. The program’s home, Hugh Gillis Hall and the University Theatre, was constructed in the middle 1950s, and is far beyond its SJSU-mandated 27 year replacement cycle. We have a theatre space constructed in the 1950s, and while recent safety modifications have been completed (new rigging, wiring, and seating), there are aging parts of the theatre that our directors and technical support staff work around. Old lighting technology, inadequate sound reinforcement, no curtains, leaking hydraulic lift, asbestos problems—all limit some of what we are able to do to provide a theatre education. Add to that the demand by others on campus who want to use the space, and we have stretched the existing space as far as it will go, and more frequent equipment failures are likely.

The other facilities-related problem, perhaps the most serious in terms of numbers of students served, is our television studio and control room. Used by 200 plus students each semester, the 1950s-built studio has always had inadequate space and lighting. But now the equipment is becoming outdated and inoperable. The three studio cameras are far beyond their life cycle, 20 years at least, and parts have had to be obtained through e-bay. The purchase of three cameras, pedestals and switcher would cost several hundred thousand dollars but will have to happen soon to continue our required level of instruction.

An ongoing resource success story is our radio station, KSJS-FM. Licensed in 1963 as education/non-commercial by the FCC, (Federal Communications Commission) the station receives money from sponsored public service
announcements managed by an outside telemarketing company. While this is ‘soft money’ and could end at any time, the radio station has been able to keep up with equipment and facility needs with little support from the department other than the salary for the station manager and a portion of the television engineer. Note that if the department had to pay the real and actual cost of KSJS-FM, it would have even less money for theatre, film and television.

A recent grant from the CSU Chancellor’s Film Initiative provided 30 Apple computer work stations for the editing of film and video and for the multimedia lab. We are now in excellent shape for editing the output of cameras, but the actual cameras and lighting and sound support equipment needed cannot be purchased in the numbers needed to meet student demand in film production.

We used to have more discretionary money beyond that for faculty and staff. Until three years ago the College of Humanities and Arts gave each member department up to $12,000 a year for equipment, and every three years Music, Art and TRFT would get a so-called “big hit,” $75-100k. All equipment money has been discontinued as scarce State funds must go to teach the growing enrollment demand.

c. Spartan Film Studios feature films are typically funded by outside fund raising, but this is not dependable, and the company’s fiscal unit, the SJSU Foundation, has extended a line of credit, meaning we owe them about $200,000. Pending distribution of some of the completed films, a model must be found to ensure that this very high end instructional experience can continue.

There are three areas which receive student fee money, called Instructionally-Related Activity Fees, or IRA. Film production, theatre performance and KSJS-FM each get between $25,000 and $35,000 per year. Most of that pays for student assistants to support laboratories, stages, editing rooms, check out rooms, the scene and costume shops.

d. The department is next door to the new library, and the department librarian, Paul Kauppila, is an excellent resource in all department areas. He provides access to resources, tries to find funding to purchase resources needed by professors, and he conducts workshops in research methods for our classes. He is the best department-assigned librarian in my memory.

While money is no longer available for traditional printed journals and periodicals, most of what our media and performance-focused curriculum requires is in electronic form, on line.
6.2 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

a. Faculty and other teaching resources are allocated based on both the College budget given to TRFT and student demand. We are in good balance; that is, our supply of classes now exactly meets student demand. The College closely monitors enrollment needs and manages to find enough money to pay for all the classes needed. Partly this is because of the SJSU mandate to increase enrollment, and the promise of additional money to pay for FTES demand. (Note that with the current California budget shortfall, this will change, and there will be cutbacks as of Fall 2008 semester.)

Other resources are allocated according to need, and of course lecture-only classes are less costly than laboratory classes. This means that much of the additional “soft money” funding is used to support production and technical classes, those typically using support staff and technical facilities. Only State money to pay faculty and staff is guaranteed.

b. TRFT is typical in the ratio of full time to part time faculty. It is about 70-30%, full time to part time, but because of the committee, advising, coordination, personnel evaluation, curriculum, assessment, and planning responsibilities (and the release time it requires) of permanent, tenure-line faculty, much of the important instruction falls to part time faculty. Being in the Bay Area has allowed access to a high caliber of temporary and professional faculty.

Looking at both BA programs, the RTVF enrollments historically have been higher than theatre enrollments, and when you factor dollars per student we spend much more money on theatre faculty and production support than on RTVF. If you remove General Education and service class enrollment, in Spring 2007 the FTES of the theatre arts major classes was 75.6, while in RTVF it was 227.6.

Based on what we now pay just for faculty salaries, the cost of educating a Full Time Equivalent Student (1 FTES = one student taking 15 semester units) in the RTVF major is $875, while in theatre it is $1985, more than double. It is exactly these numbers that our Dean, our Provost and the CSU use to measure us, fund us, and allocate tenure line faculty dollars. So while theatre is an expensive program now, if we can figure out a better, enrollment-favorable approach and attract more students, we’ll get more money and more needed theatre faculty. For now, extra money for theatre, as we now raise for large film productions, can only come from raising money from the private sector. All of this will require time and leadership.

c. Priority number one is to serialize and fully fund the Director of Theatre and Film Production currently paid through a combination of faculty dollars and
Continuing Education, CE, funds. By continuing to fund the position in this manner, the CE money cannot be used for needed equipment as in the past.

By creating a full time staff position for this important supervisory role, we solve a number of problems: First, we free the part time faculty dollars now used for director of theatre so they can be reallocated for instructional purposes. Second, we bring stability to an area which has had a series of reluctant faculty and part time staff trying to manage the theatre operation, some lasting a year or less, “a revolving door,” six people in 10 years.

Third, we solve two problems at once, film and theatre production. In the past the two areas never worked well together, meaning that film production was relegated to a second-class position within the department, even though film enrollments always exceeded those of theatre. Now with one individual coordinating both areas, compatibility has returned. Finally, this position has been a fiscal football, as we have cobbled together College, department, box office, KSJS telemarketing, Continuing Education, and other sources of money to pay it on a month-to-month basis. This position is too important to be funded in this manner.

Priority number two is additional technical theatre faculty. In the past 10 years the formerly theatre-only faculty and staff have also been expected to support film production, and with two out of three technical faculty in the early retirement program, new tenure-track faculty in this area are important to the overall program.

6.3 GOALS AND PLANS

Personnel Needs: As described above, the most important goal for the continued success of all department production programs is to have made permanent the Director of Productions position. We are asking for a so-called serialized position, meaning the funding is permanent. Presently, this position is funded party out of part time faculty dollars, partly out of Continuing Education funds, but partly out of the generosity of the College Dean’s office. The detail, the budgeting, the coordination, and reporting necessary for this position are not tasks that faculty need for their tenure and promotion process, and they are better done by staff. There is such a position in the CSU, California State University.

Production Equipment Needs: The rapid change in film, video, and stage support technology has and will continue to impact the production curriculum of the entire department. If we are to give students a realistic technical environment with which to learn the craft and art of film and theatre, a long term plan must be in place for lab equipment evaluation and replacement.

The University Theatre space remains equipped with 1950s-era lighting instruments and an audio system just good enough for basic sound reinforcement and playback of
music and sound effects. If we are to use this space to stage musicals, to teach event production, or to continue to support a traditional theatre season, new lighting instruments and a lighting board will have to be purchased. The electrical infrastructure of the space was upgraded in the past decade, but this was for capacity and safety only. None of the lighting instruments are of the automated/computer controlled devices needed for modern-day theatre and event production. There needs to be a commitment to purchase of a wireless microphone setup adequate to current needs. Finally, the University Theatre has been evaluated for acoustical treatment, but the work has yet to be funded.

As discussed above, the television studio is another 1950s-era space using discarded and surplus lighting instruments connected to power outlets controlled by household on-off switches. This studio is used by 100 students per semester, and the while the three 1980s-era studio cameras have been replaced by used cameras and parts purchased via e-Bay and Craig’s List, they are not digital or high definition, and with the exception of the audio board, nothing in the facility is current and the switcher and character generator are in the final years of their life cycle. A commitment must be made to either upgrade or discontinue the required studio sequence. Again, this is a curriculum-based decision but it must be made soon.

The curricular support area of greatest student demand and enrollment is in video cameras and related support technology for location production. In this area we have purchased new digital and high definition equipment, and through the CSU Entertainment Initiative, we have received 30 Apple work stations for editing. We are in the process of evaluating demand for these cameras and eventually we must replace everything with high definition cameras and related editing software, but this is difficult to do with no equipment budget. We have a small 16MM film class, and for this there is no working equipment, so the future of this class will have to depend upon using rental equipment.

Finally, we are going to re-think the computer lab. We have a sequence of classes in Web design and Flash animation technology, and while the classes are full, the students typically bring their own computers and software. The lab space is still used but replacement of aging computers will remain a low priority, partly because most of the students in lab-related classes are not majors in RTVF or theatre and partly because we see a future in which students have their own technology as most do now.

All of these resource needs are based on a curriculum that in most areas is attracting students and, based on limited research and anecdotal evidence, our technology-supported classes are resulting in entry-level classes and advanced degree opportunities for our graduates.

In summary, we are planning for a future with adequate support technology, sufficient technical faculty and staff, and a Director of Productions as overall coordinator of our film and stage production seasons.
RTVF 064 – Makeup for Stage and Video
This class is cross-listed with TA. While hair and makeup techniques differ from stage to screen, they intersect significantly. This course, therefore, has the potential to be a valuable bridging course for the entire department, and could offer useful craft skills to students in both programs.

RTVF 77 Broadcast Communication From the catalogue description, this appears to be the sort of introductory course one might expect to find in a communications program or a broadcast journalism program. It addresses the history and development of broadcasting and touches on government regulatory issues. While it seems relevant to radio students in particular, I question it as a requirement for all RTVF students, who generally see themselves as involved in a narrative media production program. It might be wise to drop the “required” status and reserve this as an elective for students in the radio emphasis.

Judging from student interviews, RTVF 77 overlaps significantly with RTVF 110. This invites two questions: 1. Could the content of both be collapsed into a single course? 2. Are the classes as they are actually taught deviating from the catalogue descriptions, which describe significantly different course content?

NOTE: I see the need for an introductory required core production course (provisionally numbered RTVF 75). In our program, this is a beginning audio class that initiates students in the hardware and software of production. It provides foundational skills in audio recording, format transcoding and sound editing/mixing, all of which translate into more advanced postproduction work in future courses. (I offer my own syllabus for such a course in Appendix E, TFM 121 as an example of how this might look).

RTVF 82 - Introduction to Film
The description should either clarify what is meant by “production elements,” or drop the term, as it seems to imply a production component. If it is not already, this course might be a “cash cow,” capable of generating high FTES. The aforementioned model for employing G.A.s from Theatre Arts could be implemented to support larger enrollments. It might also be a required entry-level critical studies course for majors.

RTVF 091 – Introduction to Radio and Television Production
As taught, this course appears to focus principally on audio production and applications such as Pro Tools. A common complaint students expressed was that RTVF 91 is not “hands-on” enough. It also seems to be one of those courses weakened by inconsistency, as part-timers or graduate students who do not share a common syllabus sometimes teach it. The catalogue description indicates that RTVF 91 is both a radio production class and a TV production class! I’m not sure this makes the best sense. It seems to me that audio and TV production ought to be addressed separately.

I recommend the audio and radio content be relegated to the aforementioned new course, provisionally numbered RTVF 75. It should introduce students to Pro Tools and Final Cut Pro editing through structured audio assignments. RTVF 91, on the other hand, should be organized around TV/DV studio and field production assignments. Your current RTVF 171, as taught,
would be a good model for this class. Both could be part of a required core production sequence, and like all core production sequence courses, concrete, hand-on production should be stressed through carefully structured group assignments.

**NOTE:** At this point in the core curricular sequence, a required beginning 16 mm course should be required. Since RTVF has such a course in its RTVF 182A, my recommendation is to retain it and require it, but give it an appropriate beginning level number, such as RTVF 85. Appendix B, TFM 122, offers a syllabus for such a course that has proven very successful in our program. Without adding a new course, RTVF can offer two entry-level production courses, RTVF 91 on the TV side and RTVF 85 on the film side that will provide the technical fundamentals for more advanced narrative production activity. It is important that this be single-camera (film-style) production class. RTVF may even want to debate whether it need be strictly a 16 mm class, or could it be a DV/16 mm class?

**RTVF 094 – KSJS On-Air Operations**
Since this is central to the RTVF appellation, a self-sustaining operation, and a valuable training experience for students, my recommendation would be to support this course as is.

**RTVF 098 – Film and Television Aesthetics**
As described in the catalogue, this should be a valuable contributor to the understanding of formal design in media. I would imagine Zettl’s *Sight Sound Motion: Applied Media Aesthetics* as the appropriate text for this course. One caveat would be to make a clear distinction between RTVF 98 and other courses such as RTVF 110 and RTVF 173. It would seem important that this class analyze formal design, not history or theory.

**RTVF 105 – Graphics for Stage and Video**
Cross-listed with TA, the title seems a bit misleading. In fact, it appears to be a production design course, and thus, another potential bridging course for TRFT. Development of this area would distinguish the RTVF program, as few media programs include production design in their curriculum. Much would depend on instructional support. From what I observed, RTVF has an extraordinary resource in John York, but he is a staff member. It may be worth exploring if there is a way teaching could be included in his job description (we have successfully achieved this with especially qualified staffers). My sense is that this would pay off were it possible. The evidence is clear in York’s contribution to the Spartan productions. Are there other faculty in TA who could teach production design from both the perspective of stage and screen?

**RTVF 110 – Electronic Media and Culture**
This appears to be a media and culture course that would fall under the general rubric of “critical studies.” Students report a great deal of content overlap with RTVF 77 as well as with RTVF 173. As described in the catalogue, this class has the potential of serving as a very good introduction to the critical content of the major, perhaps obviating RTVF 77 as a requirement.

My recommendation is to make RTVF 77, as it is described in the catalogue, a prerequisite elective for the radio emphasis students, and, as noted above, create a new entry-level craft course focusing on audio production and audio postproduction (RTVF 75). This class would serve as an important introduction to the tools of editing (ProTools and FCP). In my judgment,
the current RTVF 110 and RTVF 77 courses should be analyzed with the idea of collapsing their content into a single course (RTVF 110).

**RTVF 129 - Advanced Dramatic Writing (recommend dropping “Advanced” from title)**
Why does the prerequisite (RTVF 175) have a higher catalogue number? From the description, this class seems to be taking on more than is possible in a semester (writing plays, film scripts, and television scripts). This description suggests an overview of the various formatting protocols rather than a truly advanced-level screenwriting course, such as is suggested by the title. It might be a good idea to make some adjustments to the content and offer 129 as the prerequisite to an advanced RTVF 175 class that would center on the creation of truly advanced screenwriting projects such as feature screenplays or television series bibles/pilots.

Given the presumed RTVF mission to center on narrative filmmaking, I would recommend this course offer an overview to the different standard formats (standard screenplay, two-column and standard teleplay) and be organized around short form writing assignments in these formats. Certainly, the basics such as three-act structure, inciting incident, conflict, crises, climax and resolution should be addressed. This could serve as the foundation for more advanced (feature) screenwriting, and could even produce short subject material for the production sequence.

**RTVF 141 – Internet Production and Performance**
The description (HTML, digitizing audio/video with a performance analysis component) raises the question of the direct relevance of this course to the mission of RTVF. Discussions with faculty indicate that mostly non-RTVF students take it. In her 1999 report, Dr. Gross suggested that multimedia courses such as this are “laudable because this is a direction in which the industry is headed and it is very germane to Silicon Valley – another good fundraising jewel.”

Eight years ago, this may have seemed a good analysis. And while I strongly agree that your proximity to Silicon Valley needs to be nurtured, this, in my judgment, is not the way to do it (I hope to suggest a more fruitful strategy for relating to Silicon Valley in the “Community Outreach” section). HTML, digitizing/audio video and performance, not to mention compositing, are rather quotidian operations that now appear in most modern production curricula. My advice would be to leave multimedia to the SJSU Art Department, and incorporate the elements of this course into your production and postproduction curriculum.

**RTVF 142 – Multimedia Production and Performance**
The catalogue description suggests this is a Macromedia Director course with a performance component that is not clear to me. I do not question that this is a good course, but again, it seems to belong in the Art Department. As reported, this class accommodates mostly non-RTVF students. I would raise the same questions as I did for RTVF 141. If RTVF 141 and RTVF 142 are not servicing TRFT students, it might be a good idea to consider the following two options:

1. Convert these two courses as follows: 141 could cover editing to include digitizing, format transcoding, audio manipulation; 142 could cover compositing, motion picture graphics and other digital visual effects.

2. Integrate the content of 141 and 142 into your production and postproduction curricula.
The skills described in the catalogue have become commonplace in film/video production, and do not necessarily require dedicated courses. We have successfully integrated web design, compositing, performance analysis, audio design, digitizing, transcoding, etc. into our intermediate and advanced film production classes, as well as into our editing classes.

Either one of these options could provide craft and technical support to a core production sequence model.

**RTVF 150 – KSJS Radio Programming and Production**
This supports Radio, a key area under the RTVF rubric. It therefore seems a logical and natural course in the RTVF curriculum. It may expand students' skills with Pro Tools as well as offer marketable training to students interested in radio and/or audio production. Finally, it serves a valuable community outreach function. The only question I would raise is, should it remain a required course, or could it become an elective course? The answer hinges largely on how big a role you want radio to play in your major. It would also be influenced by any limit on the number of required courses you can impose, certainly a consideration if you add new required courses to create a core production sequence.

**RTVF 151 – Lighting Techniques for Stage and Video**
This course seems to be essentially a stage lighting course. I don’t believe lighting for film and video can be adequately covered given the wide range of topics listed in the description. My strong recommendation would be to create a dedicated cinematography course (RTVF 163?) that would address sensitometry, contrast, lighting styles, location lighting, grip and gaffing support equipment, etc. for film and video. TA 151 should center on theatrical lighting. Doing this would not augment your overall course inventory, but would make better sense from a pedagogical perspective.

**RTVF 153 – Costume for Stage and Video**
We have had success with a similar course in our department. Although it is likely to attract mainly TA students, we have found that they adapt well to film and video work and offer valuable support to our film/video productions. The question is, can instructors adequately cover both theatre and film costuming? Our experiment suggests that it is quite possible.

**RTVF 155 – Advanced KSJS Programming and Production**
(See comments under RTVF 150)

**RTVF/TA 163 – Lighting Design for Stage and Video**
(See comments for RTVF 151) Rather than “dilute” these two courses by requiring them to cover theatre and film, my recommendation is to dedicate this class to cinematography, and the 151 to theatre. These two parallel craft areas simply do not overlap enough to justify a hybrid course.

**TA 164 – Advanced Makeup for Stage and Video**
Like RTVF 153, this offers valuable support for film/video production students. It will attract mostly TA students, but as such, the class affords a bridging function between the programs
RTVF 166 – Topics in Cinema Studies
The catalogue describes a rotating topics course, the topics ranging from film history to theory to critical perspectives. It could include genre studies, cinema history, auteur studies or film movements. This course is repeatable for credit and should contribute significantly to the development of "film literacy" among RTVF production students. I would therefore regard the course as valuable to the program mission, and might even suggest including it among the required courses. One suggestion would be that the content rotate through three or four known topics, and that general content templates be developed to insure consistency.

RTVF 170A – Acting and Directing for the Camera (consider using a new RTVF 167 designation)
My understanding is that this class is taught as a scene replication class. I have seen one exemplar from an SJSU student we have admitted into our graduate program. While I strongly support the scene replication concept, I would reserve this activity for another class that I will describe, and encourage RTVF to consider conforming this course to its catalogue description. As such, the class would be mutually beneficial to TA and RTVF. At SDSU we have had great success with an “acting for the camera” class that uses actors from our Theatre program and directors from our film program. In our case, it is team taught by a faculty member from each program. Scenes are carefully planned and are shot live in our studio by the film students in the class. The scenes are then critiqued from the standpoint both of acting and directing.
Recommendation: Re-number the course (say RTVF 167), recast the content of “170A” and “170B”

RTVF 170B – Advanced Acting and Directing for the Camera (consider changing name and using RTVF 170 designation)
RTVF seems to have had some success in the 170A and 170 B sequence. My understanding is that these courses, however, as taught, do not conform to the catalogue description, which suggests the description should be revised. In fact, what I see in the 170 A, B sequence is a scene study class culminating in the production of a short film. This gets at the heart of your mission to center on narrative filmmaking, and could significantly address a key weakness you have identified in RTVF, namely, the lack of quality and quantity in the short film output of your students.

Having learned what is done in the 170 A, B classes, I urge you to consider making this one pivotal core production course that employs film and DV technologies. I would call it a scene study course. It would be based on three key group-produced assignments culminating in a short film. The first assignment would be a scene replication assignment such as what is done in 170 A, the second assignment would be a scene interpretation assignment. Students would produce a finished scene from a script taken from the script a sure-footed director’s work. The director and the film from which the scene is taken should not be revealed to the students until their work is critiqued. The third assignment would require students, working in production groups, to write, produce and direct their own original short.

Five weeks would be dedicated to each assignment. This is an intense course, but it is possible; in fact, it has proven to be one of the most successful production courses in our TFM curriculum.
Moreover, it is the class in which film and digital technologies could converge. For details, see Appendix C, TFM 260 Syllabus.

RTVF 171
Television Production
As taught, this involves the production of an ad-lib talk show assignment and a commercial. The content appears to me to be appropriate for a beginning-level television production course, perhaps with some modification. My recommendation is to incorporate its content into the newly proposed RTVF 91 television production class, and raise the bar on the RTVF 171 course so that it could serve as your intermediate level core television production course. There are many forms this might take. My recommendation would be to organize the course around three group production assignments, some field, some studio. This might be a good place to include field documentary production.

RTVF 172 – Digital TV and Film Production
While it makes sense from a pedagogical perspective to segregate digital and film production at the beginning levels, it seems to me that at the advanced level, students ought to decide if their projects are more appropriate to film or digital acquisition. Certainly beyond the production stage, all production is digital! One recommendation, therefore, would be to change the name of this class to “Advanced Filmmaking,” a name that does not reference the format used since “filmmaking” is now a generic term.

Since according to the core curriculum design I am proposing, digital production would have been covered at the intermediate and beginning levels, my recommendation is to recast this course as the culminating course in the RTVF core production sequence. It would be the advanced production course in the sequence, and thus, a capstone experience. Accordingly, it might be advisable to give it a higher catalogue number and the name “Advanced Filmmaking” to reflect its advanced status. This class would be an advanced film-style production course dedicated to the production of one highly competitive, festival-worthy short film. Appendix D offers a model from our curriculum that has worked exceptionally well.

NOTE: Given the current status of the RTVF television studio, and the probably student demand, I would suggest the studio television curriculum culminate with RTVA 171.

RTVF 173
Media Theory and Research
Interviews with students and faculty suggest that this is one of the least successful courses in the RTVF curriculum. Students complained of redundancy, inconsistency and general disorganization. This was echoed in the appraisals of several faculty members. Some of the problems seem to stem from the fact that it is apparently often taught by different part-timers. The catalogue description conjures a kind of social science or mass communication bias. I believe, given its mission, RTVF would be better served by critical studies courses that revolve around film and television history, genre studies, major film theories, or auteur studies. My recommendation, therefore, is to drop this class, or if feasible, consider substituting more
relevant content such as the aforementioned.

**RTVF 175 – Film and Television Writing**

This class seems to be one of the RTVF success stories, resulting in advanced student work, some of which has contributed to the Spartan Films project. My recommendation is to make it clear that this is RTVF’s Advanced Screenwriting course, which could be indicated by a title change to “Advanced Film and Television Writing.” The self-study suggested requiring all students to produce a screenplay. I do not know if, by this, a feature screenplay is intended, but if it is, this class would have to remain a requirement, which could drive you over whatever the limit is for number of required courses. See “Student Goals” below, under “STUDENTS” for more discussion on this topic.

**RTVF 176 – Television: Form, Content, Criticism**

As described in the catalogue, this is a course that focuses exclusively on television: program analysis, judgment criteria, critique of TV in its myriad forms. The description suggests strictly a television studies course, and, like so many in the RTVF catalogue, reflects a mass communication bias that is no longer relevant of how TV and media are generally studied today.

The “green sheet” Professor McKee provided me for RTVF 176 indicates a more relevant course that centers on visual literacy and that is “organized around a series of critical and theoretical perspectives that will provide a range of tools for making sense of visual narratives, aesthetics, representations, and design systems that organize not only what we see but also how we see it and, in turn, how we make sense of what we see.”

It is important that each course retain a distinct identity. Measures should be taken to insure against redundancy. This course, and others such as RTVF 82, 110, 166, and 173 should be associated with specific and distinct content areas that are reflected in their titles. I would recommend a title change for RTVF 176 that is reflective of its critical/theoretical focus, and one that does not feature Television so dominately.

**RTVF 177 – Broadcast Management** (Consider name change to “Production Management”)

As taught, this class has little to do with its catalogue description. What is taught, however (essentially production management), has a clear and even crucial value to the Program. The students I interviewed corroborated this soundly. RTVF has an incontestable need for a production management course that could address both film and perhaps television production. It would have direct relevance not only to the big productions that Spartan Films produces, but also to short film production, which is so central to your mission. If it is not already, I suggest the class be organized around content similar to that detailed in Ralph Singleton’s texts and workbooks on scheduling, budgeting and planning productions.

**RTVF 181 – Modern Film**

Apropos of the comments I made above with respect to the need for an organized critical studies component in the RTVF curriculum, this course seems a logical and necessary elective.
Recommendation: do not change

RTVF 182A – Film Production, Theory and Techniques
(See note under RTVF 91)
This should be a valuable beginning-level production course in the required core production sequence. I recommend giving it a catalogue number commensurate with its beginning or advanced-beginning-level status (I have suggested RTVF 85). It should center on single-camera (film-style) production technique, composition-in-movement, basic cinematic effects, screen graphics, manipulation of color and black and white, and editing. As mentioned, Appendix B, TFM 122, offers a successful template for such a course.

NOTE: At this point in the core curricular sequence, a required beginning 16 mm course should be considered. Since RTVF has such a course in its RTVF 182A, my recommendation is to retain and require it, but give it an appropriate number, such as RTVF 85. The self-study report cites inadequate 16 mm camera equipment to support the class. There are two solutions to this: 1. Consider purchasing used Bolex and CP-16 cameras, as previously suggested, or 2. Teach the class using DV cameras (although film would be desirable, single-camera style shooting and narrative articulation are the central focus of this course, not the format).

Appendix E, “TFM 122,” offers a syllabus for such a course that has been very successful here at SDSU. The idea is that without adding a new course, RTVF can offer two entry-level production courses, RTVF 91 on the TV side and RTVF 85 on the film (or film-style, single-camera) side that will provide the technical fundamentals for future narrative production activity. Again, the most important consideration in this course is not the format, but the single-camera (film-style) approach.

RTVF 185 – Special Topics in Radio, Television and Film
My understanding is that this is a “place marker” for the Spartan Productions program. Perhaps it can be applied to other projects or situations as well. At any rate, it seems to afford the RTVF curriculum an important element of flexibility. I see no reason to change it.

RTVF 188 – Alternative Cinema
This was described to me as an international cinema class, which raises the question, should the title reflect internationalism? For many, the title “Alternative Cinema,” connotes avant-garde cinema. Does the course include domestic independent cinema? If so, perhaps “alternative cinema” should be retained. I suspect a name change to “International Cinema” would attract a larger FTES, and since this is a general education course, this may be worth considering.

Apart from these considerations, this is a valuable class in the RTVF curriculum, and I urge you to consider ways to expand the FTES even beyond where it is using TA graduate assistants to support the expansion. As mentioned, Appendix A offers a model for a very large International Cinema class.

RTVF 190 – Digital Video Post Production
This is an exceedingly valuable elective in the RTVF curriculum. The question is, how is it taught. One way is to center on software applications, keystroke short-cuts, motion graphics, etc.
This certainly has a great appeal to students. The other way is to approach editing from a more conceptual perspective: how can editing shape narrative design? Either way, this class, in my judgment must be chiefly a hands-on crafts course organized around concrete assignments that can be screened and critiqued.

We have found that it is possible to strike a balance between the conceptual approach and the applications approach. The latter can be very effectively addressed by means of structured lab assignments from a textbook. I recommend Michael Wohls’ *Advanced Editing Techniques in Final Cut Pro*, which provides media on discs for lab exercises that address not only key editing concepts, but also a myriad of key-stroke short cuts, effects, graphics, sound editing, etc. Appendix F, TFM 327, offers a syllabus for such a course.

**NOTE:** I agree with the self-study that there is a need for an advanced audio class (sound design), but it may require more faculty staffing than you currently have (see recommendations in the “FACULTY” section.

**CURRICULUM CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The RTVF Program is chiefly identified with production, particularly, *narrative* production; but the curricular design does not support that identity adequately. Students reported that it is possible to graduate without ever having been involved in production. My strong recommendation has been to design a more logically developed production curriculum buttressed by “academic” classes – history/theory/criticism/genre studies – that are more relevant to the production of narrative work.

Many of the “academic” courses as described in the catalogue seem more appropriate to a Communications, Mass Communication or even social sciences curriculum than to a production/film studies curriculum. These should be carefully examined to determine their relevance to a production-centered mission and their appropriateness to your faculty’s expertise. In examining the RTVF catalogue and advising form, it strikes me that many of the sorts of courses that would better support an active narrative production curriculum can be found among the RTVF electives. Some of these, such as the RTVF 166, in my judgment, should be required.

My opinion is that the production curriculum should develop along two parallel paths – television production and single camera film/digital production – that converge at the advanced levels, reflecting the reality of the industry and technologies. These convergent paths would constitute the core production sequence, which would be supported by a carefully considered “academic” curriculum. The following shows what such a core curriculum might look like:

**Required (core) production courses should include:**

1. An introductory radio/audio/editing class (see proposed RTVF 75)
2. A beginning DV/TV course (see RTVF 91)
3. A beginning screenwriting course (see notes on RTVF 129)
4. A beginning-level *single-camera style* production course centering on 3 short group-produced assignments (see my notes on RTVF 182A. Proposed new catalogue number: RTVF 85).
5. A comprehensive intermediate-level single-camera production course (see notes on RTVF 170 B. Proposed change to RTVF 170)

6. An intermediate level television production course (both studio and field). The proposal is to elevate the content of RTVF 171 to make it a more advanced course while diverting some of the more elementary content from the current RTVF 171 to RTVF 91.

7. An advanced-level film production course dedicated to the production of competitive short subject narrative films, shot digitally or on celluloid. (see notes on RTVF 172)

**Required “academic” support courses**

These courses would be designed to complement the core production courses, providing students with the aesthetic, conceptual, artistic and historical underpinnings necessary for informed creative endeavor. In designing a “critical support” curriculum for the production sequence, it would be important to consider carefully how to balance history, criticism, auteur study and genre study. My own opinion is that film history and genre studies are the most adaptable to an undergraduate curriculum. These, therefore, would be my choice for required classes.

1. An introductory Film History class (either RTVF 88 or a reconfigured version of RTVF 110)
2. A Topics in Cinema Studies course (see RTVF 166)
3. A Modern Film History course (see RTVF 181)
4. A theory/criticism course centering on visual literacy (either a carefully revised RTVF 173 or, preferably, the RTVF 176 taught as it currently is).
5. TA 100 (my understanding is that this is a requirement, so I have left it as it is).

Many of the electives I have commented on above would be important to the support of the RTVF production mission. I would retain and strengthen the emphasis concept, perhaps requiring students to declare an emphasis for which they would be required to complete courses from a carefully drawn list for each. I recommend reducing the number of emphases to include “Radio/KSJS/Audio,” “Film and Video Production,” “Writing and Directing,” and “Cinema Studies.” Unless I am missing something, I would suggest eliminating Multimedia Design and folding “Film and Video Technical” into the “Film and Video Production” emphasis.

---

**STUDENTS**

**Ratio of Men to Women**

The self-study reports that “men dramatically out-number women in the RTVF Program.” This is not uncommon in programs such as RTVF that are perceived to be equipment-intensive or “technically-driven.” This perception, of course is inaccurate, but it takes time to combat it and especially to ameliorate the ratio imbalance. The television and film links on the department website do a good job featuring women, but until ocular evidence of successful women in the RTVF Program emerges in the form of awards, festival recognition, and general exposure, this remains a difficult challenge. Development of short film production should be key to a positive shift in direction. Faculty should work hard to demystify the technology and to encourage women to assume high visibility positions, such as writer/director or cinematographer on short
films. Also, talented women should be identified for leadership roles or key creative positions in the Spartan Films Program.

Student Perception of the RTVF Program
Although the students I interviewed fairly uniformly identified RTVF as chiefly a production program, they complained about not gaining adequate production opportunities. They admitted that RTVF graduates come away with a solid film studies background, but they felt that this comes at the expense of production training. Some even complained of "false advertising." While it is common for production students to complain about having to take so many film studies classes, my sense was that these students were less concerned about this than they were about redundancy in the film studies curriculum. The curriculum recommendations I have made address both these problems.

Alumni Networking
This spring, an alumnus from your department, Darlene V. Shiley, was awarded an honorary doctorate in Fine Arts at our College's commencement. Darlene is a very big donor to the arts at SDSU. My first thought was that with nurturing, she might have been (or even still could be) a big donor to her alma mater. My point is that your alumni list can be a hidden gold mine, not just in terms of funding, but also in terms of support at many other levels, including networking, internships, guest lectures, in-kind donations, etc. It is important to maintain and continually update a comprehensive database of alumni. I suspect TRFT or RTVF may already have such a database, but I would stress the need to keep it current, and especially, to maintain contact with the alumni on a regular basis. Send electronic newsletters, information about TRFT events such as film festivals and plays, announce any accomplishments alumni achieve and invite them to events. Dr. Gross suggested this might be a job that could be assumed by a student club. This would indeed be a way of deflecting some of the burden from faculty, but it would still require faculty oversight, and there would need to be assurances of continuity as club members pass through the major.

Student Achievement
The most striking student achievements I observed were the success and self-sufficiency KSJS, and the success of the Spartan Films program, which has resulted in professional caliber independent productions that afford the Program prestige and visibility. I attended a radio staff meeting under the guidance of Nick Martinez and Barnaby Dallas, and was impressed by the level of professional organization with which the students conducted business. I am equally impressed that the station has found the means to be entirely self-sufficient.

I also got a chance to see three feature-length Spartan films and one very sophisticated music video produced by Spartan Films. This is clearly the apex of student craft to be found at SJSU, and could constitute a capstone experience for students in key creative craft positions. I would reiterate that it is important to insure the security and continuation of this program!

Student Goals
The self-study delineates three clear goals for students graduating from RTVF:

1. Every student should graduate with a finished screenplay and should have an entry-level knowledge of story structure.
2. Every student should have worked on one of the professionally-staffed Spartan productions.
3. Every student should have produced a short film or video.

I applaud the spirit of these goals, and generally support them; but I would offer the following caveats and suggestions:

1. I support the requirement that each student show competency in screenwriting. It may not, however, be realistic to expect a feature screenplay from every student. Some students are writers, while others are sound designers, production designers, directors, or cinematographers. Moreover, if such a requirement were imposed, the curriculum would have to support it with an advanced screenwriting course (see notes on RTVF 175). A more realistic and productive goal might be to require short subject narrative screenplays from each student, the number of which would have to be determined.

2. I do support the Spartan Films requirement provided reliable continuation of the program is guaranteed. In fact, such participation amounts to an internship in terms of practical experience, and thus, participation a Spartan Films production might fulfill the current internship requirement.

3. I would amend the third goal to require every student to have played in a key creative role on at least one short film. Such roles might include 1. Writing/directing, 2. Cinematography, 3. Producing, 4. Sound Design or 5. Editing. Again, it may not be realistic to expect every student to helm a short film. This simply does not play to the diversity of talents of the students, many of whom will aspire in specific craft areas, and is therefore likely to result in lower quality films.

FACULTY
Respectful comments from students, as well my own observations, conjure an enthusiastic and talented faculty. Student complaints centered not on individual faculty members, but on frustration at not having enough faculty to accommodate adequately a production program. Indeed, many of the production instructors corroborated this frustration in private discussions with me.

Part-time Faculty and Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty
The self-study report notes that the part-time to full-time faculty ratio is 70/30. This of course means that the burden of instruction falls chiefly to part-timers. This can work very well, as part-timers often bring a welcomed currency to their instruction. A large part-time faculty, however, requires careful vetting of those being hired. It also requires tenure and tenure-track faculty to provide the oversight for the majority of curriculum shouldered by part-timers. This relates directly to my suggestion that consistent course templates be developed to “anchor” the curriculum.

Finally, it should be noted that because the recompense for part-timers is not comparable to tenure/tenure-track faculty, there tends to be a high turnover among part-timers. Where possible,
I would urge RTVF to seek part-time instructors from among the ranks of working professionals who want to teach "on the side" because they tend to have more longevity.

Retirement and RTVF/TA Parity
The self-study cites several imminent faculty retirements, especially in the Theatre Arts Program. This will have a dramatic impact on the profile of TRFT and the way it will do business. Because the University can offer no guarantee that there will be a one-for-one replacement of retiring faculty, it seems clear that Theatre Arts will have to reinvent itself in the near future if it is to survive.

Comparing the RTVF Program and the Theatre Arts Program, there is a conspicuous imbalance in the faculty numbers. It seems to me that faculty hires should be prioritized with respect to student enrollment statistics, and that generally, TRFT should aim for parity in its faculty profile to reflect its student population. Current student enrollment statistics show a substantially higher number of RTVF majors (309 RTVF undergraduate majors vs. 107 TA undergraduate majors AND masters students). Moreover, the overall FTES numbers show roughly twice as many RTVF students as TA students (331 vs. 168). In view of these numbers, if, say, three new hires will be requested, you might consider two of them being in RTVF.

Need for RTVF Faculty Hire in Production
RTVF has a dire need for at least one production faculty hire. This person would cover some of the core production curriculum outlined in the above proposal. I recommend that this hire be a "utility" player who can teach cinematography, or, put another way, a cinematographer who could teach core film and digital production courses. Because the strongest candidates for such positions often come from the industry, I would urge you to craft your job announcement to attract candidates with MFA degrees or MA degrees with teaching experience. You may even be able to require "equivalent professional experience" in lieu of Masters degree (two of our most effective faculty, one tenured, have no advanced degrees). I should stress that this hire is pivotal to the success of the new proposed curriculum design.

The self-study ranks the replacement of the technical theatre faculty as a number two priority, and given that two out of three technical faculty are FERPing, it is hard to argue with this. I do, however, want to stress that, given the student composition of the department, a second RTVF production position should be at least placed on the docket with a high priority. Again, the department should aim for a "utility" player who could cover more than a narrow specialty area. A person skilled in postproduction, who could cover a much needed advanced sound design class, as well as editing and composting, would allow the production curriculum to reach critical mass.

STAFF AND FUNDING
Because the allocation of university support is based on a formula that favors large departments, TRFT, being the smallest department in the College, is at a disadvantage. And yet, the fact that you are one of the most, if not the most expensive departments to maintain behooves you to do some lobbying to secure necessary university support. The self-study cites the problem of "over
formula,” which implies TRFT has too many support personnel. There are precedents in the CSU system supporting “disproportionate” funding for departments that can demonstrate higher cost overhead (our own School of TTF is one of them). Theatre and media production programs are notoriously expensive, and it might be reasonable to justify increased university support on this basis. This may get down to a question of university diplomacy and negotiation.

Director of Theatre and Film Production
Given the production mission of both programs within TRFT, I strongly agree with Professor Cooke’s assessment, and that of the TRFT self-study, that the most urgent resource management priority is to serialize and fully fund the Director of Theatre and Film Production position. This position is crucial for the very production and organization of the department’s product. Moreover, it promotes parity and collaboration between RTVF and TA, and even involves fundraising. The jewel in the RTVF crown is the work produced under the Spartan moniker, yet this work hinges critically on the efforts of a staff member, whose salary is cobbled together on a month-by-month basis from a fruit cocktail of money sources, including Continuing Education funds that could be used for the equipment budget.

Shop Foreman
One of the distinguishing features of the Spartan Films is the professional quality of the production design evidenced in the films I saw. Presumably this is also reflected in the theatre productions. This level of quality appears to be attributable to the resourcefulness and artistry of the Shop Foreman, John York, whose role in the both programs seems pivotal. Beyond his usefulness to the department as shop foreman, student comments suggest he is an effective teacher and mentor. Indeed, to the extent possible, it may be wise to have him teach, but measures should be taken to protect this position and to prevent “burn-out.” If the department has not already assigned him student assistant support, this might be at least a minimal step to be taken.

NON-FACULTY RESOURCES

Equipment Checkout Room
In my phone exit interview, I referred to the impact the equipment checkout facility can have on a media production program. A well-organized, well-equipped and user-friendly facility in a central location invariably becomes a nexus for students, the informal exchange of ideas and the formation of creative collaborations. Strong production programs seem always to have highly functional and attractive checkout facilities that show off the program.

Since it does not appear to be feasible to identify a larger space to fulfill this function, I urge you to reconfigure the space you have so that it is as presentable and efficiently organized as possible (I know Jim LeFever is working on this). For the room I saw, I suggest organized floor-to-ceiling shelving, categorical labeling of equipment, and a means by which students can see at a glance when and what equipment is available. A scheduling board outside the room should reflect who has what equipment when, but this should be backed by a reliable digital scheduling database system. One such prepackaged software application that could work very well is Bookingpoint, available for under $1400 (see http://www.hi-voltage.com.au/bookingpoint.php
If money is an obstacle, and the RTVF engineering staff has the time, know-how, and inclination, a custom scheduling system can be created using Filemaker Pro. Since our engineer
is in the process of converting our manual scheduling board to an electronic one using Filemaker Pro, I will be able to share the details with you when we have completed it, before the fall semester.

Having spoken with Jim LeFever about the checkout space, it is clear that he is limited in what he can do. I saw 2 storage rooms on the second floor of the building that contained mostly outdated analogue equipment (a Steenbeck Flatbed, etc). Perhaps these rooms would better serve RTVF if they could be used to house part of the checkout inventory. It is not an ideal arrangement, but it could accommodate the inventory in a more logical and organized way. Finally, if it has not already been done, I would urge you to explore the possibility of granting qualified students unit credit (special studies) for staffing Checkout. Because this would require gaining a working familiarity with a wide range of equipment, as well as with equipment inventory management, I believe this can be justified as a legitimate learning experience.

Prioritization of Future Equipment Purchases
Balancing the reality of shrinking equipment and facilities budgets with that of maintaining technological currency will be a serious challenge in the foreseeable future. RTVF's should have carefully considered and regularly updated wish lists prepared for requests for new and replacement equipment requests from the Dean's office (if, indeed, such list might be forthcoming). These should include suggested vendors, costs and justifications. I am aware that I am probably preaching to the choir, but I am also aware that we have been caught off guard when new equipment requests come from our Dean's office. Even if your system cannot possibly accommodate wish lists, it is a good idea to prioritize needs in the event that other opportunities arise.

Equipment Evaluation and Maintenance
I echo the assertion in the self-study that "a long term plan must be in place for lab equipment evaluation and replacement." Also the long-term cost of equipment maintenance should be realistically assessed and considered with respect to revenue such as student fees and university support.

Field Cameras
I applaud your recent purchase of the new Panasonic HD field cameras, and urge you to prioritize the expansion of your HD inventory in the future, as money permits. Also, to remain competitive with production programs of similar caliber to RTVF, I recommend that you explore the possibility of acquiring low cost Super-16mm cameras and Bolex cameras. It is fairly easy to...

---

2 I understand there may be some resistance to surveying out old analogue equipment that was highly prized. I even share the sentiment, being from an analogue era; but these technologies are clearly obsolete now. I have come to believe that students must be trained in current technologies they will encounter in the industry. Because RTVF has an impressive complement of Power Macs, and Apple software, my recommendation would be to standardize and base your editing operations on Final Cut Pro. Both Avid and FCP are commonly seen in the industry, and are very good systems; but the few Avid systems RTVF has might best be reserved for special studies students who want to learn that system. Sticking to one editing system insures and uniformity from course-to-course, and this is very important from the instructional perspective.
locate used, converted CP-16R sound cameras and Bolex H-16 cameras. You may need to secure a warranty from the vendor to satisfy your university's purchasing requirements, but what you would save buying reliable used equipment would be very substantial, and unlike electronic equipment, obsolescence is not a significant problem.

RTVF's standard definition field cameras (Canon GL-1 and GL-2) should be used for beginning classes, but, given their age, will soon reach a point of diminishing returns in terms of maintenance and format usability. I echo your self-study recommendation: If and when possible, these cameras should be replaced with HD cameras similar to the Panasonic AG-HMC70U that you have purchased. Another good low-cost choice, budget permitting, would be the Panasonic HVX and HPX cameras, since they are ubiquitous in the industry.

The grip and camera support inventory appears reasonable, although perhaps light on good fluid head tripods.

The Television Studio
Although the current studio cameras are outdated, the fact that Jim Lefever was able to cobble together a working system out of parts shows an impressive resourcefulness. Nevertheless, the cameras and other studio components are in need of upgrading if the studio is to remain viable.

RTVF must answer some key questions before choosing a direction for the television studio:
1. What are the pedagogical requirements of the studio based on the RTVF curricular design?
2. What will be the distribution destination for the television studio productions?
3. What is the demand for studio television training, given the proximity of SFSU, which has a well-developed and well-supported studio television program?
4. Given all of the above, is a high-definition capability feasible?

My position is that a television studio remains a pivotal part of the RTVF curriculum, although it is not likely to match that of SFSU. A more modest, but functional, studio can be an important tool for training directors and producers, and for acting for the camera classes. Television courses also offer important technical and craft training that translates well beyond the studio. Chances are, most student work will not be broadcast. My understanding is that some funds have been earmarked for new studio cameras. Jim Lefever tells me he plans to wait before making a hasty purchase. I applaud this cautious approach, and offer the following thoughts and recommendations of my own:

A functional HD studio will be much more expensive than a standard definition studio, although HD will certainly be the way of the future, and therefore a good PR tool. Standard definition, on the other hand, offers an affordable solution that perfectly suits the pedagogical needs of the program, especially as outlined in the above curriculum proposal (I do not suggest television studio training beyond the intermediate level). My recommendation, therefore, would be to purchase low-cost studio-configured HD camcorders with the capability to output an analogue standard-definition composite signal compatible with the existing studio components (switcher, routing monitors, record decks, etc). The JVC GY-HD 250-U studio package offers a turnkey
solution that lists at $11,995. It includes a zoom lens, viewing monitor, focus controls and a CPU, and is gen-lockable.

The advantage of such a low-cost turnkey package is that RTVF could grow into an HD studio if and when circumstances permit, and the camera can double as an excellent field camera if needed. A teleprompter should probably be considered if the budget permits. Autoscript offers a good one for under $4000. (see: http://www.bhphotovideo.com/e/product/443182-REG/Autoscript_ELP15FS_Free_Standing_Professional_Teleprompter_ELP15FS.htm)

Other considerations for a reliably functional television studio include the need for a new switcher. I recommend one that is both standard-def and high-def and can mix the two. An ideal low-cost transition switcher, if the budget permits, might be Echolab’s Overture 1 (see: http://www.echolab.com/pages/overture1_md.html)

Student Fees and Equipment Maintenance
As is the case in our program, there is no dependable maintenance budget, certainly not an adequate one. Noting the declining support RTVF can expect from sources such as IRA, I would urge a careful analysis of the student fee structure. My sense is that RTVF student fees are substantially lower than might be expected to maintain such an equipment and facilities-intensive operation as RTVF’s. Our student fees range between $20 and $25 per student per class, with class sizes between 20 and 25 students.

Funding Student Films
The paucity of production funds that can be expected from the university behooves students and faculty to seek creative strategies to support this notoriously expensive medium. An approach that has proven successful for us is the creation of a Foundation Fund we call “the Advanced Filmmakers Fund.” We use this primarily for advanced student work for which there is a fair amount of lead-time before production commences. One attraction to this idea is that students themselves take the initiative for their own fundraising. The concept is based on charitable donations for which corporate employers offer matching funds (a monetary donation to the SJSU Foundation is considered a charitable donation). There are literally hundreds of corporations that match or even double-match, their employee’s donations. Donations can be earmarked for specific productions, but not for specific students.

Students in advanced production classes should be encouraged to be entrepreneurial in every way possible. As part of an advanced production class, students could be required to collate their productions in a student-created website that explains and promotes each production. This is an example of how content from the current RTVF 141 class could be folded into the production curriculum. For an example of how this might look, see www.cine560.com which promotes seven student productions from our spring TFM 560 class. On the class website there are links for each film, and a button explaining donations for each production.

Apart from corporate donations, the Program should develop a core of dedicated producers who seek donations of products and services from local merchants. A very easy call for student filmmakers is craft service (food) donations in exchange for film credits. Our students have had
a great deal of success with this as well as camera rentals, telecine transfer cost reductions, film stock donations and grip support equipment donations.

Appendix G is a document that explains the Advanced Filmmakers funding process in detail. It includes information on the tax deductible donation of products and services and a list of employers nationwide who match (and sometimes double and triple-match) employee donations.

COMMUNITY INTERACTION

Silicon Valley and the Bay Area
San Jose State University is not only the metropolitan university of the Silicon Valley, but enjoys geographic proximity to the entire Bay Area, where several significant media enterprises are based. Professor Gross, in the previous evaluation, advised “forming an Advisory Board of local leaders in the electronic media/multimedia field who might hire graduates, host interns, make curriculum relevant, serve as adjunct faculty and even become involved in fundraising.” I’m not sure if such an Advisory Board was formed, but participation would require a good deal of commitment to RTVF, the kind one might find in SJSU alumni. It is likely that hiring graduates, hosting interns, and possibly identifying adjunct faculty, would be the most immediate and realistic benefits to be gained. For the Advisory Board idea to deliver, my suggestion would be to identify companies and organizations whose activities and goals intersect with the production mission of RTVF. It would be from such companies that potential Board members could be identified. As with alumni, nurturing and maintaining relationships with individuals within these companies requires commitment and follow-through. The important thing would be to offer a mutually beneficial relationship, and this most likely would take the form of internships. I’m confident that anyone reading this will have many ideas, but some of the companies with a production mission that I am aware of in the area include:

- Dreamworks Animation (formerly Pacific Data Images)
- I.L.M. (a good internship opportunity)
- Fantasy Studies (East Bay area)
- Tippet Studios (in Berkeley)
- Revolution Studios (commercial and TV work)

Other companies in the Silicon Valley with whom RTVF might forge relationships based on the use of technology include:

- Apple
- Advanced Micro Devices (Sunnyvale company that manufactures computer processors)
- Intel
- Seagate
KSJS
The radio station is another proud example of success in the Program. It can boast of thoughtful and high-quality programming, and does an excellent job involving the University in the community, and the community in the university.

The RTVF Student Film Festival
A well-produced and well-publicized student film festival is a powerful P.R. tool, and an excellent way not only to involve the community, but also to gain visibility in the community that could lead to local support. The festival I saw was, indeed, well produced, and there was a sizable audience, presumably composed of students as well as community members. The RTVF Student Film Festival should be established as a bi-annual event. The most effective thing that RTVF can do to enhance the festival is to improve the technical and narrative quality of the short films. This would come about as a function of a curriculum design that truly centers on the production of competitive short films. As suggested, such a shift would be greatly facilitated not only by reconfiguring the curriculum, but also by hiring another production faculty member.

REFLECTIONS ON THE THEATRE ARTS MA
The Theatre Arts Masters Thesis
As stated, it is difficult to consider RTVF apart from TA. Although a transition into a truly more unified department is likely to be met with some resistance, it appears inevitable, and ultimately, a symbiotic relationship between the two programs seems healthy. Given the retirement forecast and the production mission of TRFT, it seems that the department will need to realign its TA curriculum, and perhaps the TA mission, to accommodate the current reality of resources and student enrollment profiles. Fortunately, this is outside the purview of this evaluation report!

One paradox that emerged in my conversations with Professors McKee, Kahn and Massey is that the TA Masters program currently prioritizes scholarship, viewing the program as an intermediary step for students wishing to pursue the doctoral degree; yet, at the same time, the dominant complaint was that the majority of the MA students do not have the research and writing skills necessary for publishable scholarly research. They do, however, according to the self-study and other sources, often engage in production activities on either side of the TRFT aisle, and evince an interest in this in general. This prompts two thoughts that I raised in my exit interview:

1. If scholarship is an earnest goal, a more rigorous screening process should be instated in order to insure the admission of students whose backgrounds and talents qualify them for the level of scholarship the program requires. This would certainly necessitate the imposition of a minimal undergraduate GPA and minimal GRE scores, the applicant’s submission of scholarly writing samples, and perhaps, as I do as TFM Graduate Advisor, an oral interview either by phone or in person.

2. TA may wish to accommodate students whose interests are more in concert with a production mission. This, too, should call for careful vetting, as well as a modification of the thesis format to accommodate production projects.
A Possible Production Thesis Model
I want to stress that I feel strongly that scholarship and research should play a role in the attainment of the Masters degree whether the focus is project oriented or research oriented. The history of our own department may offer a model of how this could be orchestrated. When I arrived here more than twenty years ago, all Masters students were required to deliver a written thesis, based on a standard 5-chapter dissertation format. While most of these students were not involved in production, several were. The latter group was required to explain their creative work in terms of scholarship, often a tortured undertaking. As more and more Masters students became involved in production, we developed a modified Masters thesis format that, while still requiring solid research and scholarship, related better to the creative process. Because of demand, our Masters program evolved over the years to a pure production program.

To insure success, we require Masters students to pass a Midway Qualifying project before they can submit a thesis proposal. The Thesis Proposal itself is essentially the first three chapters of the written thesis, and must pass approval by a faculty committee. These three chapters will eventually be revisited after the project is completed, and a fourth conclusion chapter will be added. An abbreviated schematic of the first three chapters is as follows:

Chapter 1: The Problem and its Setting
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature and Film
Chapter 3: Methodology (general aesthetic approach, or proposed stylistic tactics and strategies).

After the project is completed, these chapters are revised and a conclusion, Chapter 4, is added analyzing the success of the project with respect to the goals set out in chapter one, and the strategies proposed in chapter three. What would normally appear as chapter four — "Presentation of Results" — in a conventional scholarly thesis is replaced by the presentation on DVD of the creative project.

There are two key advantages to this approach to the thesis requirement: 1. It insures a solid conceptual underpinning to creative thesis projects, and 2. It retains a reasonably strong connection to Masters-level research and scholarship. Appendix H, "Thesis Chapters Explained," details what our program expects from a student doing a creative project. Appendix I, "Sample Thesis Proposal," is a thesis proposal recently submitted by one of our students. It captures the general academic spirit and quality we look for. It also includes the student’s proposed film treatment, as well as budget and scheduling information that would not be included in the final thesis document.

Graduate Assistantships, FTES and the Future of the MA Program
From my perspective, Theatre Arts will need to reinvent itself in the context of the realities of evolving economic and faculty resource conditions if it is to continue to play a vital role in the TRFT Department. My opinion is that the TA Masters Program, and TRFT, would profit in the long term by integrating production into its MA curriculum. I am referring primarily to theatrical production, but would suggest exploring where media production might intersect with the program’s mission.
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INTRODUCTION
First, I want to praise those who assembled the self-study that serves as my starting point for this report. It was detailed, well organized and highly informative. It provided a clear context and articulated both strengths and perceived weaknesses in the RTVF Program in a respectably objective manner. Finally, it reflected a sincere desire to address the weaknesses it identified.

I was pleased to have had the opportunity to meet most of your faculty, all of the RTVF staff, and a large cross section of your students. I found all to be passionate, open, frank and serious about the program and this assessment process. Faculty, staff and students alike evinced a heartfelt interest in seeking creative ways to improve the program.

For the benefit of anyone reading this who may not know my history, I come from a department (actually a “school” – the School of Theatre Television and Film – within the CSU system that is, in many significant ways, parallel to your Department of Television, Radio, Film and Theatre. In fact, I serve in a program that is equivalent to your RTVF Program. I have also taught in the Media Production Program within the Visual Arts Department at UCSD, the Media Program at the University of Barcelona, and was head of the Film Program at the University of Oklahoma for 4 years. At the latter, I faced many of the resource challenges that you currently face in RTVF. Other relevant experience includes seven years as Chair of our college’s Peer Review Committee and, ten years experience with graduate programs as TFM Graduate Advisor. Finally, I have dedicated much time to curriculum design, at both graduate and undergraduate levels, in our TFM Program. I would like to think that these experiences, along with numerous investigational visits to university media programs in the USA, Cuba and in Europe, have afforded me a perspective that will be helpful to you.

With that said, I want to stress that I do not presume to understand you and the nuances of your situation as well as you yourselves do! I sincerely wish to avoid the trap of hasty judgment and presumptuous recommendations. I can assure you that I gave this a great deal of thought, but if I can be of any value to you, it will clearly be as an outside informant, someone who, precisely by virtue of his distance, may see what is difficult for the inside participant to see at close range. I
would suggest, therefore, that my recommendations be regarded as provisional — catalysts to more comprehensive and detailed work and discussion.

Something I did not anticipate was the degree to which my recommendations might affect, and be affected by, the Theatre Arts Program. Given the TRFT Department's configuration, it is simply not possible to consider RTVF entirely independently from TA. I am sure that you intend RTVF and TA to be symbiotically related, and indeed, there seems to be a great potential for this that has been only partially realized. I will take this up in the context of "Curriculum," "Faculty," and "Reflections on TA and RTVF."

My general organizing principle for this report will be to address the topic areas you raised in your self-study, in the order they were raised. Except for "Curriculum," no priority ranking of these topic areas should be inferred by the order in which they are presented, although I do hope to make evident through the context those issues I believe to be most crucial. *I will say at the outset that I believe your most urgent challenge is a careful re-examination and realignment of your curriculum.* For that reason, I have dedicated by far the most copy inches to that topic, which leads this report.

**CURRICULUM**

**Identifying Curricular Focus.**

At the top of the RTVF advising form is a description of the BA degree that reads almost like a mission statement: "The Bachelor of Arts in Radio-Television-Film is a 45-unit major emphasizing media scholarship and criticism, screenwriting, and film and digital video, and its practical application in the production of narrative film and television."

Apart from the conspicuous absence of the word "radio," I am struck by the ambitiousness of this description, given the faculty resources to cover all of this. The description suggests to me parity among all those areas mentioned, and a consequent diffuseness of focus. I think RTVF would be better (and more realistically) served if it were to establish a clear programmatic identity that can be expressed in this description, an identity that reflects what RTVF actually does, or aspires to do. For reasons I hope to clarify shortly, I would submit that that identity ought to be a focus on production.

**Program "Branding."**

An overwhelming majority of the students I spoke with identified their primary interest as production, and characterized RTVF as a *production* (meaning film/video production) program. The TRFT self-study, as well as individual faculty members with whom I spoke, corroborated this perception. Whether it is an accurate identification or not, it does suggest a focus around which curriculum could be meaningfully organized. This is not to suggest a diminution of the value or relevance of the other areas such as media scholarship, criticism or screenwriting, but *television.* An adjustment in the phrasing of the degree description, albeit semantic, would "brand" the program, making it easier to sell outside the University. Significantly, it would suggest a clear programmatic identity that could inform a curricular realignment. It would be important to discuss how you might position documentary and music video under the rubric "narrative film and television," since these are two forms your students and faculty produce.
Need for Coherent, Hierarchical Curricular Structure

One of the most salient problems that emerged in my conversations with individual faculty, and especially with students, is that of overall curricular design. This was especially evident in the production curriculum. Students particularly complained about redundancy and lack of hierarchical structure in the curriculum. One faculty member described the TRFT curriculum as a “Winchester House” that evolved piecemeal as a function of the predilections of past faculty members with parochial views of the program and of the department. As a result, there are many “legacy courses,” especially in the media studies area, that are not particularly relevant to the mission of the Program.

With respect to RTVF, the lack of design is most evident in the production curriculum where, ideally, each successive course would build on the challenges posed, and skill sets established, in previous (prerequisite) courses, while posing new challenges and furthering skills in successive courses. This structure is particularly crucial to any production curricula. While clearly some thought has been given to this, my sense is that the current structure needs much more scrutiny. While more faculty support would be useful, RTVF appears to be well positioned to accommodate such a hierarchical design without stressing faculty resources beyond their current level. This structure could easily culminate in a capstone experience such as a Spartan production or an alternative project offered in an advanced production class.

The “Core Course” Model

As implied above, my strong recommendation would be to consider a core course model in which the curriculum is organized around Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced production courses, culminating in a capstone experience. This requires careful coordination, but once in place, works exceedingly well. Generally, the beginning level would focus on the myriad technical aspects of production; the intermediate level would stress aesthetics, style and craft development while further advancing the technical training; and the advanced level would center on the production of truly competitive short films.

It is essential to the success of a core course design that learning outcomes for each course be clearly defined and that instructors strictly enforce prerequisites, something that is not adequately enforced currently. Once a core sequence is established, it becomes easy to see how other courses, both production-oriented and “academic” courses, dovetail with, and buttress, this curricular “spine.” A core course design featuring production hinges mightily on the strength of supporting screenwriting, history, theory and criticism courses. Again, an examination of the required and elective courses currently offered by RTVF suggests that this can be done without further taxing faculty resources.

Course Descriptions and Content Consistency

Central to the problem of curricular design is an apparent disparity between the catalogue titles and descriptions of many courses and what is actually taught. Moreover, there seems to be an alarming inconsistency in the content of certain courses from semester to semester, and from one instructor to the next. This appeared especially problematic in courses that would seem to call for stability and consistency from semester to semester. RTVF 77, RTVF 91, RTVF 173, RTVF 176, and RTVF 177 are some of the courses you might wish to examine for either of these problems.
Content Templates
Content inconsistency is a serious threat to the integrity and strength of your curriculum. It seems partially attributable to a high turnover in part-time faculty, each new instructor tending to re-invent his/her course “to taste.” I would suggest as a remedy that the program develop content templates, or even syllabi templates, to be used from semester to semester to guarantee consistency and continuity. The “green sheets” posted on your website are a good start, but very few are actually accessible on the web! An important caveat, of course, would be to insure that these templates or “green sheets” be revisited with sufficient frequency to accommodate programmatic and technological evolution.

The Minor Requirement
The minor requirement consumes between 18 and 21 units. The students I interviewed generally voiced a frustration at not being able to concentrate adequately in RTVF and TA courses. They specifically complained that the minor requirement prevented them from taking courses they believed were critical to their academic goals, especially in the area of production. While the idea of encouraging a broad education is admirable in theory, I would submit that the General Education requirement addresses the “broad education” concern sufficiently. I strongly agree with the self-study, and with Dr. Lynne Gross, that the minor requirement ought to be abolished. Eliminating the minor requirement would open up more possibilities for each student and offer them more curricular flexibility. My recommendation would be to guide students according to the emphases that are indicated on the RTVF Advising Form, and to put tooth into these emphases as explained below.

Emphases and Advising
Once the RTVF curriculum is realigned, preferably into a logically developed, core course structure emphasizing narrative production, RTVF should capitalize on its existing emphases by actively guiding (even requiring, if this is possible) majors to take courses from a carefully drawn list developed for each emphasis area. It appears that the courses listed under each emphasis are only suggested. I would urge RTVF to explore the possibility of establishing official emphases that would be reflected on the diploma. Whether or not requiring such courses under particular emphases is feasible, a more aggressive and effective advising strategy should be employed to encourage students to identify appropriate emphasis areas, and to take the courses listed in these areas. Students should be very clear about what courses are required (or encouraged) in their respective emphases. This can be greatly facilitated by the creation of online PDF advising documents for students.

Curriculum and FTES
The TRTF self-study indicates that measures are being taken to increase FTES, but it appears large class enrollments are limited by available room size and by lack of G.A. support. Not much can be done about the former, but creative solutions might be invoked to address the latter. Here at SDSU, we have discovered that by designating our International Cinema class, our Film Classics class and our Film as Art and Communication class as “General Education,” we have

1 The CSU Curriculum Guide suggests that this process from a clerical perspective is not terribly difficult.
dramatically increased enrollments (ex: 2 sections of 500+ students each in International Cinema). Two to three 5-hour/week Graduate assistants share the reading/grading load with the instructor. Due dates for papers are determined alphabetically by the students’ last names so that the workload is evenly and reasonably distributed across the semester. This model would have the additional advantage of supporting the TA graduate students while strengthening the integration of RTVF with TA. For more details, see Appendix A, “Sample TFM 363 Syllabus.”

Integration of TA and RTVF
My initial sense, given enrollment figures and retirement forecasts, is that TA must change what it does in order to relate more meaningfully to RTVF. The TRFT self-study cites the value and uniqueness of integrating its adjacent programs, and offers examples of how this is being done. Interviews with your students, however, give the impression that much more cross-pollination is needed to fulfill the promise of integration. TRFT students seem to identify with one or the other program, as opposed to with TRFT, and report that there is not much crossover.

I agree that there is a great potential in integration, and urge you to strengthen and capitalize on what you have begun. Coming from a dual theatre/film school, I am aware of some of the advantages and difficulties in cultivating a “bi-cultural marriage” of this sort. Curricular requirements on both sides could encourage more integration, but I would warn that meaningful areas of intersection must be identified so that the two programs relate in a natural, symbiotic fashion. Cultural differences between the two programs should be acknowledged and even celebrated as you identify areas of intersection. Certainly acting for the camera and directing are relevant to both programs. Also, acting and directing classes in TA could offer valuable support to RTVF students aspiring to direct.

One measure we have taken to unify our School of Theatre, Television and Film curricula has been to require film/TV students to attend plays and Theatre students to attend our student film festivals. While not required, many of our directing students study acting and directing for the stage; our production design students often take theatre design classes while theatre students take art direction classes; and cinematographers sometimes take stage lighting classes.

The proverbial “bear in the kitchen” with respect to the RTVF curriculum seems to be the Theatre Arts MA degree. While this is nominally outside my area of address, problems with this degree must be addressed for the health of the entire Department. I will submit my own thoughts about this later in this report under “Reflections on Theatre Arts MA.”

Short Film Production
Short film production is the sine qua non of virtually all serious university film production programs. It is relatively affordable on a student budget, and with more than 2,000 festival and online venues today, there exists the real possibility of achieving recognition and even future opportunities both for students and the programs with which they are associated. Moreover, short film production affords more opportunity for artistic success on an individual level by virtue of quantity of films produced each semester. Short film showcases are a powerful means by which a program can achieve visibility, and, if student product from a particular program reaches a high enough standard, influential domestic and international festivals will feature their work in special festival programs.
For these reasons, I strongly urge you to invest in the development and improvement of your short film product. While the Spartan projects constitute a unique and impressive achievement, well worth supporting, short film production in RTVF does not appear to have developed to the level it should and could. I had the opportunity to see some excellent short film work, but the output at this level is neither consistent nor dependable, and much seems to be produced by an outside student group (the Film Production Society). In my judgment, weakness in this crucial area is traceable to the design of the curriculum. To reiterate the aforementioned, a realignment of the courses along hierarchical lines, in combination with realistic faculty and facilities enhancement, could transform short film production in RTVF quite dramatically. Later in this document I hope to delineate in more specific terms how this might be accomplished. Appendixes B, C and D offer sample syllabi for a beginning, intermediate and advanced production sequence. We have had great success, both in terms of quantity and quality, with this core sequence; and while these syllabi would have to be adapted to accommodate the resources and other circumstances in RTVF, they begin to suggest the possibilities.

Spartan Productions
This is one of the Program’s obvious successes, and therefore it is important to guarantee its continuation; but I question how dependable the funding is to insure its continuation, especially as we see academic budgets shrinking. The self-study report indicates that so far, the SJSU Foundation has funded the Spartan productions, and that TRFT may still owe the Foundation for past productions. There may be a possibility of a return on their investment from distribution deals, but this should not be regarded as a stable, reliable or predictable revenue source. There may be a possibility of securing production money for future Spartan projects on the basis of DVD distribution. I have tried to research ORU’s (organized research units) to learn if this might be a way of gaining more reliable year-by-year university support for Spartan Films, but I do not know enough about how this works outside of the University of California system. It may be an idea worth pursuing. Apart from university funding, I would recommend exploring corporate donation funding such as the Advanced Filmmakers Fund described below, under “Funding Student Films,” in the “NON-FACULTY RESOURCES” section.

Retooling RTVF Curriculum
As stated, retooling the RTVF curriculum, in my judgment, is the most urgent task RTVF faces. My own experience with this suggests the process will be onerous and time-consuming, but exceedingly valuable. My recommendation is that a special RTVF curriculum committee be established as the academic year resumes. Because both RTVF and TA faculty cover RTVF courses, careful consideration must be given to the size and balance of this committee. Individual commitment to the process is also, of course, critical.

It is imperative to insure that each member of the committee be made aware of the content and goals of each course as it is currently taught. Your “green sheets” should help, but they all need to be revealed for this to work. Syllabi and course assignments for all courses should be laid out, along with the current catalogue descriptions. It is clear that some instructors, in practice, deviate considerably from their own syllabi, so, again, it is essential that the committee understand what is actually taking place in each course. It would be useful to talk both to faculty and students to insure accuracy.
The first order of business should be to identify content overlap (redundancy) in the curriculum as well as gaps in the curriculum (I attempt to do this myself below in a course-by-course commentary). Once a clear picture of what is actually being taught is established, the committee must agree on what in the current curriculum works and what doesn’t. They must also agree on the general focus they want the curriculum to take, and begin the process of designing a logical, hierarchic curriculum that reflects this focus. I would reiterate my opinion that a curricular “spine” of core courses be considered that would forge a branding identity for the program. The committee will need to address the Big Questions of training vs. scholarship and what it would like all students graduating from RTVF to know. Curricular decisions would emanate from this focus.

I don’t want to give the impression that I am not suggesting starting utterly from scratch – much appears to be working well; it is chiefly a question of systematizing and coordinating the curriculum. This would also be the time to insure that the titles of courses reflect the pedagogical reality, and to consider the logic of the course numbers. Finally, I should say that I do not believe the overall number of courses need change significantly.

Finally, once a curriculum is established, a content template for specific courses should be developed to insure consistency over time. The best-qualified instructor in each subject area should be identified, and his/her syllabus should be the basis of a course template. Oversight is crucial, as is assiduous checking of prerequisites.

COURSE-BY-COURSE COMMENTARY ON RTVF COURSE PROFILE
I want to restate that I am writing from the perspective of an outsider whose exposure to the RTVF curriculum is limited; nevertheless, I wonder how much awareness each of the faculty members has about exactly what the others are actually teaching. I base the following comments, observations and suggestions on a careful examination of the RTVF catalogue copy, impressions from interviews with students and faculty, and also on follow-up interviews by phone. I will follow this course-by-course commentary with a conclusion that offers specific curricular recommendations.

RTVF 010 – The Art of Film
This appears to be equivalent to our “Film as Art and Communication,” which has recently been designated a G.E. course. The catalogue description overlaps significantly with RTVF 82. I assume that because this is a G.E. course it serves to generate FTES. Given this, my only suggestion would be to consider some of the ideas for expansion of FTES mentioned above, under “Curriculum and FTES.” This is one of those courses that could be used to support TA graduate students, who in turn, could make larger FTES feasible.

RTVF 040 – Telecommunications and Society
Although this is not listed among RTVF requirements or electives, from the description, it might be a good candidate for a G.E. course. Like the current RTVF 77, however, it seems the sort of course one might expect to find in a communications program. Does it overlap with anything in Journalism? My recommendation would be to consider how it might better relate to the core mission of RTVF.