Department of Cinema and Television Arts (CTVA)
California State University, Fullerton
Program Performance Review, Self-Study
Bachelor of Arts degree, Cinema and Television Arts
Master of Fine Arts degree, Screenwriting
April 9, 2016

In accordance with the Guidelines and Procedures for Program Performance Reviews published in May 2015, this self-study addresses the following seven topics:

> Mission, Goals, and Environment
> Description and Analysis
> Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student
>   Learning Outcomes
> Faculty
> Student Support and Advising
> Resources and Facilities
> Long-term Plans

The required appendices are attached.

I.   ***Mission, Goals, and Environment***

A. ***Briefly describe the mission and goals of the unit and identify any changes since the last program review. Review the goals in relation to the university mission, goals and strategies.***

Mission. Though providing students with "a comprehensive curriculum and active learning environment that prepare students for meaningful careers in the media industries" remains the department's central mission, the details of that curriculum and environment are evolving rapidly. Some of the specific language used to describe our mission in even the most recently published University Catalog – "telecommunication" and "broadcast, cable, satellite, wireless" – though perhaps technically correct, already feels antiquated, in need of revision, and its emphasis on "modes of delivery" does not reflect the wide variety of curricular foci within the department.

Name Change. The most obvious example of the evolution of the department's thinking concerning its identity is its recent name change – from "Radio-TV-Film" to "Cinema and Television Arts". The change was meant to accomplish two goals. First, the name change was designed to more clearly distinguish the CTVA department from the broadcast sequence in its sister department, Communications. The often poorly understood distinctions between our department, the broadcast journalism wing of the Communications department (which includes courses on video and audio news reporting), and Titan Communications (an extra-curricular internet TV and radio studio) have, faculty believe, hampered the department's mission, making it more difficult for them to prepare their students for "meaningful careers". Second, the name change is meant to more clearly reflect the department's curricular focus: the creation and study of narrative, documentary, and experimental cinema, television, and other digital media.

Goals. In order to clarify the details of its mission, the department is currently involved in the revision of its programs' student learning outcomes. The last Program Performance Review (2008-2009) listed eight goals for students seeking the Bachelor of Arts degree:

> know the foundational history of the film and electronic media industry and how that history shapes the industry's present and future;
> understand the structure and function of film and electronic media in society;
> apply fundamental production concepts to aural and visual productions;
> demonstrate fundamental story concepts and writing proficiency;
> contribute ethically to the media industry;
> consume film and electronic media critically;
> create at least one project or portfolio piece, such as a script, production, or thesis;
> and experience a meaningful internship with exposure to the real workings of the radio, television, and/or film industry.

This year, in response to university requirements regarding assessment, the CTVA Assessment Committee proposed the following more streamlined set of student learning outcomes:

> demonstrate a basic knowledge of historical, legal, and ethical issues that connect the current media environment to a larger historical context;
> write well-executed treatments, scripts, critical essays, and/or research papers;
> effectively apply key concepts of visual design in the creation and organization of moving images;
> evaluate the role of diversity throughout the entertainment industries; and
> apply theoretical and/or ethical concepts in a practical media environment.

These outcomes align more precisely with the requirements of the department's five core courses, an introductory industry history course (CTVA 100), a writing course (CTVA 349), a production pre-requisite course (CTVA 300), a critical studies course (CTVA 301 or 302), and an internship (CTVA 495).

These goals also support both the university's broad mission of "providing students the best of current practice, theory, and research, and integrating professional studies with preparation in the arts and sciences" and its specific goals of "ensuring the preeminence of learning" and "providing high quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community and region". Individual departmental student learning outcomes align with a variety of university strategies for achieving these goals, including "providing experiences in and out of the classroom that attend to issues of culture, ethnicity and gender and promote a global perspective", "providing opportunities to learn from external communities through internships, cooperative education and other field activities", "creating opportunities in and out of the classroom for collaborative activities for students and faculty", and "capitalizing on the uniqueness of our region, with its economic and cultural strengths, its rich ethnic diversity, and its proximity to Latin America and the Pacific Rim".

B. ***Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes.***

Globalization. One important trajectory in the current study of media arts concerns globalization, both the crucial role media play in cultural globalization and the effects of global markets and distribution systems on the content and production of media. Transnational format adaptation (aka "copycat television"), intellectual property in a global market, the social and political dimensions of reality TV, and the popularity of national talent competitions are just a few of the topics scholars and industry executives are wrestling with. All major Hollywood studios have now expanded into the Asian market, where China has eclipsed Japan as the world's second largest box office. Decisions about casting, location shooting, and even story elements and themes are taken with two eyes on major international markets.

CTVA faculty have responded to this trend by revising syllabi so that courses like CTVA 302 (Introduction to Critical Studies: Television), CTVA 365 (Children's TV), CTVA 366 (Reality TV), CTVA 374 (Contemporary World Cinema), and CTVA 377T (National Cinemas) include units that introduce the practical, theoretical, and ethical issues raised by transnational media systems. And a recently proposed standalone course on Global Television is making its way through the curriculum approval process.

CTVA faculty have been playing an active role in the process of cultural globalization through scholarly and pedagogical activities focused on the Pacific Rim. Professor Davis, for example, regularly conducts research at film festivals and markets in Hong Kong, Bangkok, and Tokyo, has published widely on trends in contemporary Asian cinema, and has sat on panels at Tokyo's Waseda University and the University of Hong Kong. He and Professors Frost, Jenkins, and Maloney have taught in summer production seminars at Korea's lavishly funded Dong-Ah Institute of Media Arts. Despite the reputations of our faculty and our school's proximity to Hollywood, however, significant partnerships with prominent international film academies are limited by the impoverished state of our facilities. [See below, section VI.]

Diversity and Representation. Questions of diversity and representation have dominated discussions of film and TV programming in recent years, discussions that, thanks to *Transparent*'s Emmy wins and the controversy over an all-white set of Oscar actor nominees, have spilled over into the popular media.

Because of the unusual make-up of the CSUF student body – almost 40% is Hispanic, another 20% is Asian, 5% is mixed race, and another 5% international students – CTVA faculty have been unusually attentive to the problems of mainstream media's depictions of society. At the start of the period under review here, the department approved a new course, CTVA 305 (Diversity in TV and Interactive Media) that directly addresses this topic. And other courses like CTVA 302 (Introduction to Critical Studies: Television), CTVA 365 (Children's TV), CTVA 369 (Border Cinema, a course cross-listed with Chicano Studies), and CTVA 471T (Topics in Film Theory, two of which are Race and The Construction of Stardom) require students critique media with respect to representation of race and gender. Even faculty in production courses like CTVA 300 (Language of Film, a visual design course) have updated their syllabi to include films whose makers and characters more closely reflect the diversity of the modern world.

Recent faculty hires, too, have signaled the department's desire to emphasize sensitivity to diversity and representation. Professor Sparks, our newest screenwriting faculty member, earned his PhD in American Studies & Ethnicity at USC and was nominated for two NAACP Image Awards and two Sentinel Awards from the Norman Lear Center. He is currently writing and producing Oprah Winfrey and Ava DuVernay's new series, *Queen Sugar*. Professor Hunter Hargraves, our most recent critical studies hire, received his PhD from Brown University's Department of Modern Culture and Media. His principal research focus is popular culture that engages "uncomfortable" questions of race, gender, and sexuality.

Evolving Production Technology. Developments in the technologies of production (cameras, lighting equipment, sound recording devices) have affected the CTVA curriculum in many ways. On the one hand, relatively high-quality but inexpensive DSLRs, LEDs, and post-production software have meant that most students in our introductory production class (CTVA 325, Production 1) can shoot with their own equipment and edit on their own laptops. On the other hand, because they may have been doing so for years, unprofessional habits – a point-and-shoot mentality regarding composition, a reliance on the camera's automated exposure and focus functions, a disregard for established rules of spatial intelligibility, a focus on the minutiae of continuity at the expense of drama, etc – have become engrained.

Still, because students own or can easily access much of the equipment needed to successfully navigate our introductory course, the production faculty have decided to devote what little funds it get for equipment on bigger ticket items for more advanced courses, equipment that more closely approximates the kinds students are likely to encounter in the workplace – Blackmagic cameras, professional lighting kits, ProTools licenses, etc.

Media Convergence. The interplay between the Internet and digitized creative content continues to drive industry practice and technological research and has had incalculable impact on our social and economic landscapes. In response to this flourishing transmedia culture CTVA studies courses have not only introduced students to the scholarship concerning, for example, cross-platform media franchises but even experimented with encouraging them to complete assignments in non-traditional, transmedia-friendly ways, such as producing podcasts in lieu of written essays. Screenwriting faculty in particular are cognizant of the trends towards multi-platform dissemination of creative content and have overhauled classes like CTVA 250 (Writing Short Scripts) to emphasize increasingly popular formats like webisodes.

C. *Identify the unit's priorities for the future.*

The last Program Performance Review (2008-2009) listed four departmental priorities: establishing an MFA in Screenwriting; revising curriculum to meet the changing media landscape and establishing "roadmaps" for students seeking degrees; formalizing procedures for collecting data in order to assess student learning and the achievement of departmental goals; securing space and funding for professional quality soundstages, post-production facilities, equipment checkout, screening facilities, storage, etc.

The external reviewers of that self-study [their review is attached as Appendix IX], while praising the department for its "dynamic and accomplished faculty, extremely effective internship program, extensive connections to the business community, enthusiastic

majors, successful alumni, extensive theory and production-based curriculum, and effective advocacy of globalization, media ethics, and literacy", made several helpful additional recommendations. Among them were the following: clarifying the department's distinct role in the college; eliminating radio from the curriculum and the department name; remaining committed to the "idealistic" academic needs of students by instilling in them the tools of critical and historical-cultural thinking that will serve them and the larger society; emphasizing audio production in the face of the high costs of video production; promoting the department's accomplishments, especially via its website; and developing a yearly alumni survey.

We're happy to report that most of these goals have been (or are in the process of being) accomplished. The MFA program is now in its fifth year. Today's curriculum reflects trends in cinema and television studies, writing, and production. The faculty has adopted roadmaps for both the BA in Cinema and Television Arts and the MFA in Screenwriting in coordination with the university's *u.Direct* education planning software and devised more detailed, informal roadmaps for advising BA students who wish to emphasize either production, writing, or studies. The department's Assessment Committee has begun collecting data on particular core courses and inputting it into *Compliance Assist* (the university's assessment program) [see section III, below]. The department's new name does not refer to radio, and our two courses specific to radio will now be offered through the Communications department. The CTVA department continues to bolster its studies wing, devoting it two of the four faculty hires since the last review and almost doubling the number of studies course offerings. Audio production, along with editing and post-production special effects, has, of necessity, been emphasized: sound equipment purchases have been prioritized, the audio curriculum re-structured, and an advanced audio mixing room built. Securing viable production facilities, however, remains a priority.

The question of self-promotion has begun to be addressed indirectly but importantly through the hiring, last year, of a new departmental chair. Professor Garry Hart brings to the department unparalleled experience and industry connections. For eleven years, he served as President of Paramount Television, developing or overseeing such critical and commercial successes as *Frasier*, *Becker*, and *Star Trek: Voyager*. Before joining Paramount, he was senior vice president at Universal Television. Unusually for someone in his position, Professor Hart also holds a PhD (from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst) and has extensive experience in research methods.

Given this progress, discussion of priorities at the most recent CTVA faculty meeting crystallized around five topics, the first three of which are integrally connected.

1. **Establish an Advisory Board.** The Advisory Board will consist of illustrious industry professionals culled primarily from among the many contacts of the department's newly hired chair. An Advisory Board made up of key industry players would immediately raise the profile of the program, and the Board could be tasked with, among other things, working with the college's director of development to secure funding for the facilities mentioned in priority 2, for big-ticket equipment purchases, for the mentorship program mentioned in priority 4, and for other departmental needs.

2. **Secure professional quality facilities.** Quality facilities remain a top priority. What Professor Fink wrote in the 2008-2009 Program Performance Review remains true today: "Our students want production … The demand for production classes always

exceeds the supply." But without significantly improved facilities and expensive equipment, the department will remain a collection of outstanding faculty and eager students who do not have the resources to accomplish what they should. What is required is a large, quality space, ideally a separate building, that includes a studio, at least one soundstage, an audio recording stage, post-production facilities, an equipment stockroom, an equipment staging area, storage areas, classrooms with high quality sound and projection, at least two hi-definition screening theaters, offices for faculty and support staff, and other rooms. The current facilities are without question inadequate for a program as large as ours. [See below, section VI.]

3. **Explore the possibility of establishing a separate "School of Cinema and Television Arts".**

4. **Formalize and fund a mentorship program for all Screenwriting MFA students.** The screenwriting faculty hope to initiate an intensive internship program that would place each of its graduate students with an established writer for a semester. The mentorship would support two MFA program goals: to "train students in the professional life of a screenwriter and its demands and opportunities" and to "strengthen the profile of CSU Fullerton in the professional film and television communities".

5. **Develop a departmental website that is easily navigable, useful to students, aesthetically pleasing, and illustrative of the department's goals.** The current college-produced website is poorly designed, unsightly, and full of out-of-date and inaccurate information. Some links direct students nowhere. Crucial information, like the department's requirement checklist, is absent. Industrious CTVA faculty who are loathe to send their colleagues at other institutions to the pages the college Web designer has created for them have been forced, for fear of not being taken seriously, to build their own webpages off-site. For at least two years, the College's attempts to address the problems of its website have failed. In order to have any online credibility the department needs to control the design of its website.

6. **Initiate a departmental alumni tracking program.** Neither the department nor the university currently collects data on CTVA graduates with respect to graduate school or job placement. Evidence of CTVA students' success beyond graduation, therefore, is limited to the degree to which individual students remain in contact with their former faculty mentors. It's easy to track the work of Oscar-nominated cinematographer (and CSUF grad) Matthew Libatique online, but it's only through word-of-mouth that we learn that CTVA graduate Aaron Lovell was promoted to Head of Post-Production at Amazon Networks or that Donald Li premiered his first feature at the Shanghai Film Festival, or that Gavin Wynn, a camera operator on *It's Always Sunny in Philadelphia* and *Modern Family*, had yet another feature film he shot accepted into Sundance, or that James Ehlers is casting Paula Abdul's series for CBS or that … or that …

It's safe to say that we've placed CSUF grads in every Hollywood studio and television network, but the department has not had the resources to keep track of them systematically. Perhaps "assigned time" (course release) could be used to start an alumni tracking program.

D. If there are programs offered in a Special Session self-support mode, describe how these programs are included in the mission, goals, and priorities of the department.

CTVA does not offer Special Sessions self-support programs.

II.   *Description and Analysis*

A. Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs, new programs (degrees, majors, minors) developed since the last program review. Have any programs been discontinued? And

B. Describe the structure of the degree program (e.g. identify required courses, how many units of electives) and identify the logic underlying the organization of the requirements.

The Bachelor of Arts in Cinema and Television Arts is a 48-unit major. A minimum of 36 of those units must be taken within the Department of Cinema and Television Arts; the other 12 may consist of additional CTVA electives and/or approved collateral courses in other departments or courses taken to fulfill the requirements of a minor or second major.

Today, the degree has five core requirements: CTVA 100 (Introduction to Cinema and Television Arts), CTVA 300 (Language of Film), CTVA 301 or 302 (Critical Studies: Film or Critical Studies: TV), CTVA 350 (Story Structure), and CTVA 495 (Internship). The CTVA faculty, however, have approved two changes to the core that will be implemented starting Fall 2016. First, in response to concerns about the quality of student writing in upper division studies courses, the department has developed a critical writing course, CTVA 349 (Writing about the Moving Image), capped at 20 students per section, that will be required of all majors. This new course will replace CTVA 350 (Story Structure) as the department's mandatory writing course. At the same time, the screenwriting faculty are developing a large-lecture course on the fundamentals of storytelling, CTVA 354, for the core.

When the university curriculum process has vetted that introductory screenwriting course, the CTVA core will consist of a broad introduction (100); one large-lecture course in each of three principal areas of exploration within the department – production (300), critical studies (301 or 302), and screenwriting (354); an intensive writing seminar (349); and the internship (495). Each area-specific large-lecture core course functions as the pre-requisite to more advanced courses in that area. Taking all three early in his or her academic career should help any student who has yet to choose a focus within the department decide which electives to pursue.

Since the last Program Performance Review, CTVA has implemented a two-year Master of Fine Arts degree in Screenwriting. The Master of Fine Arts in Screenwriting is a two-year, 42-unit degree program designed to prepare a select number of talented writers for careers in the film, TV, and interactive media industries. Ten of the fourteen required courses, all graduate (500) level, are devoted to screenwriting. Four others, a mix of upper division undergraduate (400) and graduate (500) level courses, treat the history and theory of film and television, management, and media literacy. The program is

designed such that students will graduate with a portfolio of quality scripts and with contacts in the professional community.

No CTVA programs have been discontinued.

C. ***Using data provided by the office of Analytic Studies and Institutional Research (IRAS) discuss student demand for the unit's offerings; discuss topics such as over enrollment, under enrollment, (applications, admissions and enrollments), retention, (native and transfer) graduation rates for majors, and time to degree.***

The data provided by the Office of Analytic Studies and Institutional Research included in Appendix I indicates that, between 2010 and 2014, applications for admission to the CTVA program from would-be freshmen increased by a significant 20%, from 656 to 786. Typically, just under half of the applicants were offered places in the freshman class, and about one-third of those admitted chose to enroll. Though the entering class fluctuates slightly around 100 students, the 20% rise in applications suggests demand for programs in cinema and television arts is increasing.

The average number of transfer student applications per year between 2010 and 2014 was about 530. Of these, 40-45% were typically admitted, and 40-45% of those admitted chose to enroll. No particular trends, positive or negative, are evident in that data.

Comparison of the data in Appendix I with that presented in the last Program Performance Review, however, suggests two long-term trends. First, demand for the program has clearly increased. During the five years data was collected for the previous Program Performance Review (2003-2007), 4206 students (first-time freshmen and transfer students) applied to the program. During the five years data was collected for this self-study (2010-2014), 6176 students applied. A 47% increase! Second, the freshmen-to-transfer-student ratio has improved somewhat. Between 2003 and 2007 that ratio was 8:12; between 2010 and 2014, 10:10.

As shown in Appendix I, Table 3-A, departmental graduation rates for freshmen tracked by the OASIR who entered the system between Fall 2005 and Fall 2010 were as follows: 26% of CTVA majors graduated in 4 years or less; 51% in 5 years or less; and 61% in 6 years or less. Over those same years graduation rates for freshmen university-wide were significantly lower than they were for CTVA majors: only 14% of all CSUF first-time freshmen graduated in 4 years or less; 40% in 5 years or less; and 54% in 6 years or less.

Graduation rates for CTVA transfer students [see Table 3-B] are higher than those for freshmen: 63% of CTVA transfer students graduated in 3 years or less; 73% in 4 or less; and 80% in 6. Here too, CTVA rates exceed the university-wide averages by 5 to 10 percentage points.

All of this suggests that, though we may prefer to see higher rates of graduation overall, the department, despite its reputation for relatively rigorous grading and high numbers of pre-requisite courses, is doing a good job shepherding undergraduate students through the requirements of their degrees. Indeed, in 2013-2014, the department awarded 50% more degrees (210) than it did in 2010-2011 (142).

Applications to, admission to, and enrollment in the department's MFA program in Screenwriting have been surprisingly consistent over its first five years. There are typically about 35 applicants, 18 of which are admitted, and 12 to 14 of which enroll. [See Appendix II, Table 5, for details.] This cohort size is optimal for graduate writing workshops.

As indicated by Appendix II, Table 7, almost all MFA students who complete the program do so in two years. Graduation rates for the first three cohorts were 79%, 79%, and 67%. Though the university does not publish graduation rates for all its graduate programs for comparison, our MFA's numbers feel exemplary.

D. Discuss the unit's enrollment trends since the last program review based on enrollment targets (FTES), faculty allocation, and student faculty ratios. For graduate programs, comment on whether there is sufficient enrollment to constitute a community of scholars to conduct the program.

Appendix I, Table 2-A, shows that undergraduate FTES increased 23% between Fall 2009 and Spring 2015, from 468.1 to 574.9.

Graduate FTES, presented in Appendix II, Table 6-A, is – partly because the program is much smaller – more erratic, with enrollment fluctuating between a low of 14.25 (2010-2011) and a high of 21.375 (2011-2012) FTES. Even when graduate numbers are relatively low, there is more than sufficient enrollment to "constitute a community of scholars" and to justify the continuation of the program.

Over the same six-year period between Fall 2009 and Spring 2015, the number of full-time faculty remained constant, at 13, though the number of full-time faculty actually teaching in the department fell from 13 to 12. [Though the OASIR tables include him in their numbers, Professor Fink took positions as director of the Faculty Development Center and then as Associate Dean of the College and has not taught in the department during the past four years.] The additional faculty workload associated with increased enrollment was mitigated somewhat by an increase in adjunct faculty, from 8.63 FTEF to 10.20 FTEF [see Appendix III, Table 9]. Still, the effective student-faculty ratio in 2014-2015 (26.7:1) was a pretty significant 20% higher than it was in 2009-2010 (22.3:1). And the full-time to part-time faculty ratio in the department fell from 60:40 to 54:46.

The data suggests two distressing trends: increasing student-faculty ratios, and shrinking permanent-to-temporary-faculty ratios. It is worth noting that, in 2002, a plan (ACR 73) jointly authored by the Office of the Chancellor, The Academic Senate of the CSU, and the California Faculty Association recommended that the CSU achieve a ratio of 75% tenured/tenure-track faculty to 25% lecturer faculty over a period of eight years. In this area, we are moving in the wrong direction.

E. Describe any plans for curricular changes in the short (three-year) and long (seven-year) term, such as expansions, contractions or discontinuances. Relate these plans to the priorities described above in section I.C.

One major change to the curricular that will be implemented starting Fall 2016 is the replacement of the current writing requirement (CTVA 350, Story Structure) with a new one (CTVA 349, Writing about the Moving Image). As mentioned above, this change is

designed shore up students' critical thinking and written communication skills in order to prepare them for upper division courses within the major.

Next year, as mentioned above, the department also hopes to add to the core a large-lecture introduction to the fundamentals of storytelling that incorporates much of the analytical elements currently taught in CTVA 350 (Story Structure). Students in the new version of that course (350) could then focus more intensively on creative writing.

Other curricular plans include the division of CTVA 361 (American TV) into two parts – one classical, and one contemporary. Courses on Reality TV and Global Television, in addition to a rotating topics course on TV genres, will make their way through the curriculum-approval process. In the production area, three new courses (CTVA 437, 438, and 439) in which students will make, in collaboration with professional mentors, a micro-budget feature film will be launched. And, as mentioned in the priorities listed above [see section I.C], the MFA program plans to initiate a mentorship-internship program in order to place its students with established writers for a semester.

F. **Include information on any Special Sessions self-support programs offered by the department/program.**

CTVA does not offer Special Sessions self-support programs.

III. **Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

A. **Describe the department/program assessment plan (e.g. general approach, time table, etc.) and structure (e.g. committee, coordinator, etc.).**

In response to the recent university-wide emphasis on data-based assessment of programs, the CTVA department elected an Assessment Coordinator (Professor Osborne-Thompson) and an Assessment Committee (Professors Osborne-Thompson, Davis, Engels, and Jenkins) charged with collecting the data required to assess the degree to which it is achieving the desired student learning outcomes (SLOs) in core courses. The committee members have attended a variety of lengthy workshops hosted by the Office of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness and by College of Communications Assessment Coordinator, Professor Doug Swanson.

In Fall 2014, Professor Osborne-Thompson, in consultation with the full faculty and under the guidance of the Office of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness, developed a set of measurable and manageable SLOs and completed a "curriculum mapping" exercise designed to refine SLOs and to determine the areas to best assess them. In Spring and Summer of 2015, she developed a multi-year assessment plan, prioritizing which 1-2 SLOs will be assessed in each year of the assessment cycle. She worked with individual faculty members to determine a method of assessment for the first SLOs and collected the first batch of data.

In Fall 2015, Professor Osborne-Thompson began inputting program SLOs for both the CTVA BA and the Screenwriting MFA into the university's online assessment management repository, *Compliance Assist*, and analyzed the data collected from CTVA 300 (Language of Film) in an attempt to assess the BA program's SLO 3: "effectively

apply key concepts of visual design in the creation and organization of moving images". The next section of this report summarizes that analysis.

The department, in compliance with university requirements, plans to gather data for another SLO this year, then for two more in each of the following five years.

B. *For each degree program, provide the student learning outcomes (SLOs); describe the methods, direct or indirect, used to measure student learning; and summarize the assessment results of the SLOs.*

As mentioned above [see section I.A], the department, partly in response to university requirements regarding assessment, has adopted the following five core-based student learning outcomes for its BA program:

> demonstrate a basic knowledge of historical, legal, and ethical issues that
>   connect the current media environment to a larger historical context;
> write well-executed treatments, scripts, critical essays, and/or research papers;
> effectively apply key concepts of visual design in the creation and organization
>   of moving images;
> evaluate the role of diversity throughout the entertainment industries; and
> apply theoretical and/or ethical concepts in a practical media environment.

A preliminary departmental assessment plan, from 2012, identified several courses through which each of these SLOs could be directly measured and suggested methods of assessment. [See Appendix VII for the 2012 course outcome assessment chart.]

From among the nearly two dozen CTVA courses that support the first SLO – "demonstrate a basic knowledge of historical, legal and ethical issues that connect the current media environment to a larger historical context" – CTVA 361 (American Television) has been selected for assessment. Materials to be collected include 20 representative final papers and the grading rubric for each semester the course is offered between now and the end of 2017. Two independent readers will assess the evidence and report their findings.

From among the nearly two dozen CTVA courses that support the second SLO – "write well-executed treatments, scripts, critical essays and/or research papers" – the department's two university-approved UDW (Upper Division Writing) courses, CTVA 349 (Writing about the Moving Image) and CTVA 350 (Story Structure) have been selected for assessment. Materials to be collected include 20 representative essays (from 349) and 20 representative scripts (from 350) and the grading rubrics for each semester the courses are offered between now and the end of 2020. Two independent readers will assess the evidence and report their findings.

From among the CTVA production courses that support the third SLO – "effectively apply key concepts of visual design in the creation and organization of moving images" – the department's core requirement in production, CTVA 300 (Language of Film), has been chosen to launch the official assessment process. In CTVA 300, SLO 3 is directly assessed by three photo assignments that require students to illustrate design concepts introduced in the course (manipulation of space, tone, orientation of line, quality of line, tone, color, frame divisions, etc) and to conform to certain basic strategies of conventional image-making (focused shots, normal angles, level camera, consistent

11

aspect ratio, etc). So far, data has been collected on over 10,200 photos taken over four semesters (Fall 2014, Intersession 2015, Spring 2015, and Summer 2015, data that can be analyzed in relation to the assignments' grading rubrics.

For the initial round of assessment of this course, the instructor, Professor Davis, in consultation with the Assessment Coordinator, decided to evaluate three basic strategies of conventional image-making – focus, level, and aspect ratio – since those strategies apply to every photo students take, thus making comparisons across assignments possible. Since this SLO is the only one the department assessed this year, a detailed summary of that assessment follows:

1. FOCUS

In the evaluation of student work in CTVA 300 *focus* is defined quite narrowly. Only shots in which the subject and the plane of sharpest focus coincide are counted as *in focus*. Shots in which the subjects may be within the standard depth-of-field but are clearly nevertheless not coincident with the plane of sharpest focus are not considered *in focus*. Shots in which the subjects appear to be *outside* the standard depth-of-field were considered to be more problematic. For the purposes of this assessment the former (not sharply focused) were scored -1 and the latter (out of acceptable focus) were scored -3.

Focus data for Fall 2014:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "in focus"
Project 1	129	704	81.7
Project 1 Re-Shoot	57	662	91.4
Project 2	71	2157	96.7
Project 3	25	573	95.6

Focus data for Intersession 2014:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "in focus"
Project 1	19	130	84.6
Project 2	14	432	96.6
Project 3	4	97	95.9

*There was no opportunity for a Project 1 Re-Shoot in the Intersession.

Focus data for Spring 2015:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "in focus"
Project 1	81	682	88.1
Project 1 Re-Shoot	25	641	96.1
Project 2	32	2196	98.5
Project 3	12	607	98.0

Focus data for Summer 2015:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "in focus"
Project 1	47	241	80.5
Project 1 Re-Shoot	15	208	92.8
Project 2	42	756	93.7
Project 3	12	218	94.5

Interpretation: The data suggests that the feedback regarding focus offered in the evaluation of Project 1 has a significant impact on further assignments. Over the past four semesters the percentage of points awarded for focus on Project 1 ranged from 80.5 to 88.1. Points awarded for focus on projects after Project 1 jumped 10-12 percentage points.

2. LEVEL

For the purposes of this class a shot is considered *level* when there is no perceptible left-right canting of the image. As with focus, evaluation of the levelness of the image in CTVA 300 includes three possibilities. The shot is considered either *level* or *not quite level* (-1) or *not level* (-2) depending on the degree of obviousness of the infraction.

Levelness data for Fall 2014:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "level"
Project 1	191	704	72.9
Project 1 Re-Shoot	112	662	83.1
Project 2	160	2157	92.6
Project 3	54	573	90.5

Levelness data for Intersession 2014:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "level"
Project 1	25	130	80.7
Project 2	42	432	90.3
Project 3	8	97	91.7

*There was no opportunity for a Project 1 Re-Shoot in the Intersession.

Levelness data for Spring 2015:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "level"
Project 1	152	682	77.7
Project 1 Re-Shoot	92	641	85.6
Project 2	123	2196	94.4
Project 3	62	607	89.8

Levelness data for Summer 2015:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage "level"
Project 1	64	241	73.4
Project 1 Re-Shoot	47	208	77.4
Project 2	92	756	87.8
Project 3	26	218	88.1

Interpretation: The data are slightly more erratic here, but the overall pattern suggests that leveling the camera is a more difficult operation than focusing a lens (i.e. there are fewer successful attempts) and that it takes a bit longer to improve performance. This may be due to the fact that cantedness, unlike focus, is not a matter of common parlance, and that, therefore, the student has to devote energy not only to correcting an obvious problem but also to first understanding what that problem is. Nonetheless the pattern of improvement in leveling the camera over the course of each semester is encouraging.

3. ASPECT RATIO

Aspect ratio is defined as the relation of the width of the frame to the height of the frame. In filmmaking, aspect ratios are always horizontal, meaning the width of the frame is greater than its height. Normally, too, aspect ratios are consistent from shot to shot, so, in CTVA 300, students are required to demonstrate they can shoot in a consistent, horizontal aspect ratio. Since vertical aspect ratios are not allowed in contemporary professional filmmaking, a deduction of -4 for each non-horizontal aspect ratio shot was applied.

Aspect ratio data for Fall 2014:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage correct
Project 1	160	704	77.2
Project 1 Re-Shoot	8	662	98.8
Project 2	8	2157	99.6
Project 3	0	573	100

Aspect ratio data for Intersession 2014:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage correct
Project 1	24	130	81.5
Project 2	4	432	99.1
Project 3	0	97	100

*There was no opportunity for a Project 1 Re-Shoot in the Intersession.

Aspect ratio data for Spring 2015:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage correct
Project 1	76	682	87.3
Project 1 Re-Shoot	0	641	100
Project 2	4	2196	99.5
Project 3	4	607	99.2

Aspect ratio data for Summer 2015:

	total deductions	total # of shots	percentage correct
Project 1	52	241	78.4
Project 1 Re-Shoot	4	208	98.1
Project 2	8	756	98.8
Project 3	0	218	100

Interpretation: Applying a horizontal aspect ratio to one's shots is a relatively simple matter. Corrections, as the data above suggests, are easily made. Probably the significant point deductions for failing to implement a proper aspect ratio in Project 1 "encouraged" students to correct any problems they may have had in this area.

In sum, the data collected from CTVA 300 suggests that the course is contributing to the achievement of the SLO, that students who complete the course are more effectively applying key concepts of visual design in the creation and organization of moving images.

From among the dozen-plus CTVA courses that support the fourth SLO – "evaluate the role of diversity throughout the entertainment industries" – a core course, CTVA 302 (Critical Studies: TV) and an elective, CTVA 305 (Diversity in TV and Interactive Media) have been selected for assessment. Materials to be collected include 20 representative papers and the grading rubric for each semester either course is offered between now and the end of 2019. Two independent readers will assess the evidence and report their findings.

Finally, achievement of the fifth SLO in the Bachelor of Arts program – "apply theoretical and/or ethical concepts in a practical media environment" – will be indirectly measured through the internship site coordinator reports and student exit surveys gathered at the conclusion of each semester in CTVA 495 (Internship).

With respect to the MFA program, the screenwriting faculty who administer it adopted the following five program goals:

strengthen students' writing skills, in both craft and creativity;

deepen students' knowledge of film and television history, theory, and criticism;

train students in the professional life of a screenwriter and its demands and opportunities;

develop students' ability to make decisions that are ethical and sensitive to issues of diversity; and

strengthen the profile of CSU Fullerton in the professional film and television communities and create an ongoing network for our students.

Assessment strategies for the MFA are still being finalized by the screenwriting faculty in conjunction with the departmental and college-level Assessment Coordinators. That work is scheduled to be completed by May, 2016.

To summarize, after a year of collaboration with the Office of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness, the department's Assessment Committee feels that it has established a viable plan to evaluate its undergraduate curriculum's ability to direct students towards achievement of the department's learning goals.

C. **Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices and/or overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.**

Since the formalized assessment process has just been launched little data has been analyzed. The data collected for CTVA 300 and summarized above has been instrumental in the revision of the course's teaching materials on frame and aspect ratio and on camera height, angle, and levelness. Additional examples of unintentionally canted camera set-ups and improper vertical aspect ratios have been included in the relevant lectures and online units.

The recent focus on assessment standards has influenced the evaluation of student work even in classes that are not subject to the formal assessment process compiled in *Compliance Assist*. Production faculty, spearheaded by Professor Maloney, in the spirit of increased objectivity in grading and with an eye toward the kind of data collection promoted by the university Assessment Office, have created a detailed rubric used to evaluate student work in their sections of CTVA 325 (Production 1). The two-page rubric included here as Appendix VIII clearly sets out expectations for student projects in the areas of process, image production, sound, editing, production design, etc and can easily be used to chart the improvement (or not) of individual students and whole sections, and indirectly, the effectiveness of the pre-requisite course that feeds CTVA 325.

D. **Describe other quality indicators identified by the department/program as evidence of effectiveness/success other than student learning outcomes (e.g. graduation rate, number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, etc.).**

As indicated in section II.C above, departmental graduation rates for freshmen who

15

entered the system between Fall 2005 and Fall 2010 were significantly higher than graduation rates for freshmen university-wide. Similarly, graduation rates for CTVA transfer students exceeded the university-wide averages by 5 to 10 percentage points. Both are indirect indicators of departmental effectiveness.

Graduation rates for the first three MFA cohorts averaged 75%, even higher than undergraduate rates.

As mentioned in section I.C, one of the department's priorities is to initiate a departmental alumni tracking program. Neither the department nor the university currently collects data on CTVA graduates with respect to graduate school or job placement.

E. ***Many department/programs are offering courses and programs via technology (e.g. online, etc.) or at off campus sites and in compressed schedules. How is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?***

The CTVA Assessment Committee is concerned to compare student performance in the department's handful of online sections of CTVA 100, 300, 350, 374, 377T, and 455 with student performance in face-to-face sections of those courses. The relative success of these distinct modes of teaching is perhaps best measured when the same faculty member teaches the same course in multiple formats. Luckily, tenured faculty teach both in-person and online sections of CTVA 300, CTVA 350, and CTVA 455. Data for CTVA 455 should be forthcoming in the 2016-2017 school year.

Analysis of student success in this semester's in-person and online sections of CTVA 300 (both taught by Professor Davis) will be made available to the committee this summer. Preliminary data from this semester's CTVA 300 sections (based on the two short photo assignments and two midterm examinations so far) suggests a few divergences in student performance, divergences that can be summarized as follows. On the creative projects (the photo assignments), the 40 students in the in-person section performed appreciably better, on average, than the 100 students in the online section, with a median score of B compared to a median score of C. On the other hand, the average online student scored appreciably better on the exam that tested the familiarity with the eleven feature films that made up the required out-of-class viewings for the first half of the course. Interestingly, there seemed to be little difference in the exam scores of in-person vs. online students with respect to lecture and textbook materials. But by far the most striking difference between the two modes of instruction was that fully 20% of the students enrolled in the online course did not even turn in the first two photo assignments! Only two of the 40 students in the in-person section – two students who had not shown up to class since the first meeting – failed to turn in those assignments.

IV. *Faculty*

    A. Describe changes since the last program review in the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocated to the department or program. Include information on tenured and tenure track faculty lines (e.g. new hires, retirements, FERPs, resignations) and how these changes may have affected the program/department's academic offerings. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor).

At the time of the last Program Performance Review, there were 13 full-time CTVA faculty: four tenured and seven tenure-track professors and one lecturer. Since then, three faculty have retired, one moved into administration, five new faculty have been hired, and all previous tenure-track (and three of the new hires) have been granted tenure. So the current composition of the faculty includes ten tenured (six full and four associate) and two tenure-track (assistant) professors, and one lecturer. [Note: the numbers provided by the Office of Analytical Studies and Institutional Research and presented in Appendix III, Table 9 do not reflect Professor de los Rios' 2016 early retirement, Professor Fink's administrative re-assignment, or the 2015-2016 hires, Professors Hargraves and Sparks.]

Because they bring to the department expertise in diverse areas of scholarship and creative activities, the five faculty hires – two in screenwriting (Professors Posner and Sparks), two in studies (Professors Sheehan and Hargraves), and the chair (Professor Hart) – have expanded the CTVA curriculum by creating courses ranging from Sitcom Writing to Border Cinema. But despite the addition to the curriculum of 12 new courses since the last Program Performance Review, and despite a 23% increase in departmental FTES and a 20% increase in student-faculty ratio over the same period [see section II.D, above], the effective number of full-time CTVA faculty has held steady at 13. [For short faculty bios and a partial list of scholarly and creative work accomplished since the last Program Performance Review, see Appendix VI.]

    B. Describe priorities for additional faculty hires. Explain how these priorities and future hiring plans relate to relevant changes in the discipline, the career objectives of students, the planning of the university, and regional, national or global developments.

CTVA needs more full-time faculty. In order to reduce class size to campus-wide targets, the department would need an additional 1.5 full-time faculty (or equivalents). And to meet the 75:25 permanent-to-temporary-faculty ratio recommended by the Chancellor's Office, the CSU Academic Senate, and the California Faculty Association in ACR 73 [see section II.D, above], CTVA would need to make 5.5 new tenure-track hires.

Currently, in addition to the chair, the department is comprised of four studies, four screenwriting, and four production faculty members. Top priorities are a new production hire – half our introductory production courses are taught by adjuncts, and student demand for production workshops remains high – and a full-time "industry" hire, someone with expertise in marketing, distribution, or research. The recent retirement of an associate professor who taught interactive media courses has left that area uncovered, and recent industrial trends towards globalization and media convergence suggest a studies hire targeted towards one of those areas is in order.

C. *Describe the role of full-time or part-time faculty and student assistants in the program/department's curriculum and academic offerings. Indicate the number and percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty and student teaching assistants. Identify any parts of the curriculum that are the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.*

Curricular decisions in the department are taken by the faculty as a whole, which meets regularly to discuss, review, and recommend adjustments to CTVA's academic offerings. Individual full-time faculty may propose a course to the department's Curriculum Committee, which vets the course and makes a recommendation to the full faculty. But the decision about whether to send the course through the university approval system, *curriculog*, is taken only after all full-time faculty have had their say. While such discussions welcome input from part-time faculty, no curricular decisions are their responsibility. [And no CTVA classes are taught by student assistants.]

As indicated in Appendix III, Table 9, part-time faculty constitute a significant portion of the instructional corps. Adjunct FTEF rose 20% in the three years between in Fall 2010 and Spring 2014, from 8.63 to 10.27, mirroring the growth in departmental FTES. This academic year, part-time faculty taught 63 sections of CTVA courses; full-time faculty taught 75 sections. So, part-time instructors taught 46% of our students' sections.

D. *Include information on instructor participation in Special Sessions self-support programs offered by the department/program.*

CTVA does not offer Special Sessions self-support programs.

V. *Student Support and Advising*

A. *Briefly describe how the department advises its majors, minors, and graduate students.*

Until five years ago, when the college opened its Advisement Center, all full-time CTVA faculty served as advisors for major and minors. Open faculty advisement insured that CTVA students were able to get good advice from the professors who were most familiar with their educational goals. Offloading advisement onto the "peer" (i.e. student) advisors who worked the Advisement Center meant that CTVA students often received questionable pointers – variations of "complete your GEs before taking major courses" were commonly reported – from other students, many of whom were often not even affiliated with CTVA.

So, starting in Fall 2015, CTVA opened a departmental advising office and granted former curriculum committee chair, Professor Monti, a single course release to advise our 700+ majors and minors. Professor Monti sets up one-on-one meetings with students during which, using the departmental checklists and informal roadmaps, she assists them in planning their course of study within the major. [All GE advising is referred to the GE advising office in UH 123-B.] She recommends students meet with her each semester. So far, this strategy, though it reduces the number of sections taught by full-time faculty by one each semester, seems to have corrected the problems associated with a centralized college-wide advisement systems and should result in decreased time-to-graduation.

In addition, the chair has established annual, mandatory orientation sessions for freshmen and new transfer students each Fall. These sessions will introduce students to the CTVA course requirements, provide those who wish to focus in production or screenwriting or studies with the relevant informal roadmaps, and give everyone the opportunity to meet faculty in his or her areas of interest.

B. **Describe opportunities for students to participate in departmental honors programs, undergraduate or graduate research, collaborative research with faculty, service learning, internships, etc. How are these opportunities supported? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate plans for the future.**

CTVA has no departmental honors program, but, over the years, several CTVA students have participated in the University Honors Program, in which Professors Davis, Maloney, Monti, Selbo, and others have taught.

All CTVA majors are required to complete at least one 150-hour internship (CTVA 495) during their junior or senior year. Because of CSUF's close proximity to the Los Angeles media center, students regularly end up interning at major studios, production companies, networks, casting agencies, talent agencies, post-production houses, and commercial agencies, and on individual film and television productions.

CTVA students' interactions with film and television practitioners are not limited to their internships, however. CTVA faculty regularly convince notable industry professionals to make the trip to Fullerton to guest lecture. Professors Engels, Hart, and Posner's sections of CTVA 341 (Film and TV Industry) feature almost weekly industry guests. This semester, adjunct lecturer Mike Dillon's section of the new large-lecture course, CTVA 101 (Understanding Movies), has introduced students to a dozen writers, directors, and producers of recent independent features.

Students have worked with production faculty on a variety of projects. Professor Jenkins, for example, employed a student crew for a 2014 documentary about William Kanengiser produced by The Guitar Foundation of America. And she directed a team of CTVA students in a pair of instructional videos – Making Integrity Count" and "Handling Disruptive Classroom Behavior" – commissioned by the Judicial Affairs wing of the Office of the Dean of Students.

Professor Jenkins, along with now retired Professor Perebinossoff, worked with the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, linking class assignments in CTVA 361 (American TV) to the Academy's archive of video interviews. And Professor Davis used funds from three university grants to create, together with a cadre of international CTVA students, subtitles for more than a dozen Japanese films, the resulting DVDs for which are now used in classrooms at the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, Florida State University, Yale University, and the University of California (Berkeley and Irvine), and as research aids for scholars throughout the world.

Four new high-impact courses that feature mentor-student collaborations have been proposed and should be launched during the next two years. One is the intensive mentorship-internship program designed for Screenwriting MFA students and mentioned in section I.C above. The other three make up a set of production courses (CTVA 437,

438, and 439) in which students will create a micro-budget feature film. Following a model that has proved successful for our colleagues in several Asian film academies, the CSUF film will be produced as a collaboration between students and industry mentors. Specifically, about 60 CTVA students will work with a professional producer, casting director, location manager, cinematographer, production designer, editor, and sound designer in one or more of a sequence of three courses (Feature Film Pre-Production; Feature Film Production; and Feature Film Post-Production). By the end of the sequence, CTVA students will have completed a professional quality micro-budget feature. Doing so will have given them an unparalleled opportunity not only to experience the production process as it is currently practiced professionally but also to build relationships with established artists and technicians, relationships that will lead to post-graduation career opportunities.

In sum, current opportunities for students to participate in collaborative work with faculty and industry professional are both built into the curriculum (directly via CTVA 495, the MFA mentorship, and the feature production sequence, and indirectly via CTVA 101, 341, and 361) and *ad hoc* (working with individual faculty on creative projects).

VI. *Resources and Facilities*

A. *Itemize the state support and non-state resources received by the program/department during the last five years*

Appendix V, Table 10 tabulates state budgetary support for the department during the past five years. Budget allocations increased 20% over the most recent five-year period, from to $1,763,450 to $2,124,372. The bulk of that additional support came in three areas. Over 50% of the increase is attributable to increases in the costs of Social Security, Retirement, Health Insurance benefits for state employees. Another 10% of the increase supported the hiring of part-timers who taught the additional courses required to cover rising FTES. Finally, another 10% of the increase was associated with increased faculty salary costs. This final 10% increase, however, was *not* the result of any full-time faculty pay raises, but a result of the combination of tenure and promotion and of consistent salary increases for the department chair.

The appended budget does not include technology expenses since they, unfortunately, are processed at the college and university levels [see directly below, section VI.B]. Though the CTVA department receives a sizable share of the college equipment budget, the fact that faculty never know how much equipment money (if any) they will have to spend makes planning impossible. Typically, production faculty are told in the last weeks of the fiscal year that they have x-thousand dollars to replace outmoded cameras or worn lighting packages and that they must spend that money immediately or it will be forever lost.

B. *Identify any special facilities/equipment used by the program/department such as laboratories, computers, large classrooms, or performance spaces. Identify changes over last five years and prioritize needs for the future.*

As indicated by the list of departmental priorities [see section I.C, above], replacing the inadequate facilities CTVA students work in continues to be a main concern for the department. What twenty years ago was a small production-focused program now has

five times as many students, but no more space in which to train them. Perhaps more distressing is that CTVA now has two fewer (which is to say no) dedicated technicians. Expansion of both the quality and quantity of CTVA production offerings is limited by space, equipment needs, lack of personnel, and organizational bureaucracies.

The current production facilities consist of a TV studio, a 30-seat classroom, a 20-seat classroom, an equipment stockroom, an office that has been converted into an audio mixing room, a 20-seat editing lab, an 8-seat post-production audio editing lab, and three small rooms off the editing lab, one of which is used as an office for the stockroom coordinator. All of these are housed in the Pollak Library basement, approximately 10-minutes' walk from the 6th floor of College Park, where department offices are located.

These facilities were built "for us" in 2006, not only with little CTVA faculty input but often expressly against our recommendations. This was effected by College administrators, whose overriding goal, it seemed to most faculty, was to subsume the CTVA production program under the broadcast journalism sequence of the Department of Communications. At the very least, administrators were intent on fashionably "busting silos" in order to create a "shared space", that is to say shared labs, shared equipment, shared checkout, and shared personnel, ostensibly with the goal of reducing costs but in effect, crippling the CTVA production program by outfitting all labs and stocking the equipment room with an eye only toward the low-end needs of the Communications students. The one million dollars or more spent on this one-size-fits-all organizational strategy got broadcast journalism a dedicated studio space, a gigantic new classroom, an equipment stockroom, an editing lab, and access to CTVA equipment. It got us next to nothing.

The disregard for our concerns with which "the move", as it was called, was forced upon us led CTVA faculty to issue, unanimously, a "vote of no confidence" against the then Associate Dean who was spearheading the move. Though he was eventually removed from his office, the damage was done.

TV Studio. With respect to the TV Studio (PLS, room 49), even the current, unusually diplomatic Associate Dean, formerly chair of the department, wrote in the previous Program Performance Review that "the basement space suffers from ceilings that are too low for adequate lighting angles, ambient noise that far exceeds studio specifications, sewer lines running across the ceilings, no sound locks into the stage spaces, and so on. Additionally, the space is simply too small: the walls are too close together to allow a normal array of camera angles, no sets of any real size can be erected, and so on."

Professor Jenkins, the full-time faculty who teaches in the studio, adds that two of the studio's three camera pedestals are over 20 years old. One of them can no longer hold the compressed gas necessary to raise it. The graphics station that was initially in place after the move is no longer there. It did not work within the power specifications of the control room; its hard drive kept frying. It was replaced by another system, but with the same results. Professor Jenkins has since taken to using a post-production graphics software program instead of the more traditional broadcast-type (Chyron) graphics generator.

According to Professor Jenkins, with the exception of small software and system upgrades, there have been no improvements made to the studio since Fall 2006. The

fixed frequency microphones initially provided in 2006 are no longer compatible with available frequencies. And the floor manager's wired headset is a potential safety hazard.

Instructional studio construction projects after 2004 invariably involved conversion from SD to HD. Ours did not. CTVA's is one of the few TV studios in the CSU system that is still using Standard Definition Television, a format that has not been in industry use since the government mandated conversion to HDTV in 2009. The current stockroom manager, Matt Roberts, reports that, because the studio's equipment, computers, and software are so old, they are incapable of handling HD workflow and that, because manufacturers no longer make parts for or otherwise support such equipment, it becomes unrepairable and therefore unusable. According to Mr Roberts, an up-to-date studio should be able to handle 4K footage, 10G fiber connections, and a host of wireless devices. In addition to production hardware and software upgrades, the studio requires a new set of powerful LED lights, a dedicated green screen, and a variety of modern set pieces, backdrops, and flats.

The lack of sound isolation that Professor Fink mentioned in relation to the studio space in fact renders *all* rooms in the library basement inadequate. In the 20-seat classroom, one can hear the stockroom manager on the telephone next door. In the audio mixing room, one can hear the rumbling of carts in the library above, the instructor lecturing in 30-seat classroom, and students shuffling down the halls.

Post-production labs and stockroom. In 2010, after two years of lobbying for CTVA facilities separate from the Department of Communications', CTVA was granted space for contiguous editing and post-production audio labs (PLS 69 and 78). Then, in 2013, those labs and the CTVA stockroom (and the personnel who oversaw the stockroom and lab), all of which the CTVA department chair had managed, were "re-assigned" as part of a campus-wide reorganization that concentrated control of all campus technology (including CTVA computer labs and all its production equipment) under the Division of Information Technology (IT).

Though the Vice President of Information Technology sat in a CTVA 2013 faculty meeting, assured faculty his office would do nothing without their input, and promised that the department would be allowed to search for a stockroom equipment manager-technician itself, one month later, without informing CTVA, he hired the very person the faculty had warned did not have the qualifications they were looking for.

CTVA was in the process of converting its equipment reservation system from a handwritten to an online one when IT took over the stockroom. IT insisted on taking over the project. Though Professor Maloney wrote, at request, 50 pages of software specification for a new online stockroom checkout system, IT ignored those requests and developed a program that now, three years later, still does not work. Student stockroom workers estimate that the online reservation system works 60-70% of the time. One need only consider how one would regard commercial software, such as the word processor being used to write this document, that only worked 60-70% of the time. The result is a lot of hassle for staff who must manage the discrepancy between what the online system claims is available and what is in fact on the shelves. Students who spend time driving in from their distant homes only to find that equipment they had properly reserved is not available are reasonably discouraged.

Because IT wants all computers in the college to run the same baseline software, the machines in CTVA labs are loaded with software that students not only do not need, but that, due to their amateur or "consumer" nature, production faculty actively discourage students from using. One production faculty summed up the current relation with IT: "They often give us what *they* think we need, without consultation. Then they are upset if we protest. They are severely ignorant of what we do and of what is industry standard."

Though the editing and post-production audio labs are reasonably equipped, software-wise, they are underused since, despite a long history of instructor and chair requests, there is no 24-hour access to the space. [A handful of students in CTVA 425 have been granted access through special coding of the lab door locks, but the vast majority of our production students cannot access the labs after hours or on weekends.] As a result, any *esprit de corps* that could result from students' working on creative projects cheek to jowl in their own facility suffers.

Audio mixing room. When Professor Maloney, along with adjunct lecturer John Hoffhines, convinced him that no advanced CTVA production could be taken seriously without a proper mix, the chair found the money to adapt an unused office space between the stockroom and the 30-seat classroom into an audio mixing room. On weekends, Professors Maloney and Mr Hoffhines applied sound treatment to the walls and floor, installed a 5.1 mixing system, and calibrated the room. Last Fall, the first CTVA 425 projects to boast a 5.1 surround mix were completed.

Production equipment. CTVA production faculty understand that equipment and facilities are expensive. But it also bears reminding that having inappropriate equipment is often functionally the same as not having any equipment at all. Though equipment funds for the department appear in a maddeningly sporadic fashion that actively discourages planning and growth, production faculty believe they have been good stewards of the small sums granted them. The faculty, by means of an Equipment and Facilities Committee, and the stockroom manager maintain a "shopping list" of the department's most needed resources. The current philosophy of the committee, and of the department as a whole, is to use whatever funds may come in to purchase professional quality gear for our advanced classes.

Even so, given the size of the CTVA department, the equipment offerings are still rather paltry. Students in CTVA 425 (Production 2) have access to only two BlackMagic 2.5K cameras. This limits the number of projects that can be produced in that class and may have more severe implications should one of those cameras go down. When 425 students are shooting, other production students in 400-level courses have access to *no* professional camera and are either left with the single Canon 5D the department owns or forced to rent. And CTVA camera kits do not include the accessories – such as handheld rigs, external monitors, and follow focus controls – considered essential by professional standards, making even the department's best cameras difficult to operate.

And though the department invested in a number of high quality microphones for location use and a number of consumer-grade audio recorders to match them, the CTVA stockroom still has no professional audio recorder or mixer available for advanced students. The current selection is usable, and we are happy to have them, but they are, unfortunately, laughable by industry standards.

Classrooms. Teaching space for our program has been a continual frustration. The department controls two classrooms in the library basement and has attempted to convert them into functional spaces.

PLS 061 (the 30-seat classroom) has been our most successful room. In 2012 and 2013 Professor Maloney spent weekends and evenings installing sound proofing and a surround sound system. This, along with an HD projector, has made PLS 061 an adequate 30-person classroom. PLS 068 (the 20-seat classroom) has not been as successful. The room is awkwardly shaped. Despite promises from at least two Deans, a plan to divide the room and create a 20-person classroom and a much smaller storage or student work area has never materialized.

Considering CTVA's numerous course offerings, having just two dedicated classrooms is problematic. Since these rooms in the library basement are booked throughout the week by production faculty, screenwriting and studies faculty are left without any spaces on campus in which they can properly screen materials. The "smart" classrooms on the first floor of College Park the department controls have been outfitted like all other smart classrooms on campus; they may be serviceable for projecting PowerPoint presentations but are wholly inadequate to screen materials for classes in film history or aesthetics. Again, a one size fits all mentality hampers CTVA faculty's mission. The College's approach to classroom projection does not include control of ambient light, proper speakers, or even a reflective screen. College classrooms are fitted with small, low-quality computer projectors that throw their tiny images onto a shiny write-on whiteboard, making that image unviewable from many angles without the projector's hotspot showing.

Because there are no media players in these rooms, CTVA instructors have resorted to playing clips from Internet sites using an infrastructure that delivers blocky pictures punctuated by frequent stalling and caching. When there is a media player it is the built-in DVD drive of an old and fairly underpowered Wintel machine playing through the VGA output – standard for the 1990s, but puzzling in the age of HDMI and DVI connections.

Absent. It may be useful also to consider what facilities CTVA needs, but does not currently have, in order to support our students well. The basement space does not include a soundstage for the department's cinematography and advanced production classes. Such a room would allow instructors to give practical demonstrations of lighting and recording equipment while also providing the students a controllable space for their own productions.

Also missing is an audio recording studio. CTVA students routinely scour the campus for moderately quiet rooms in which to record dialogue replacement (ADR) or sound effects (Foley).

These days most cinema and television programs have built a green screen studio to provide digital effects students an opportunity to explore what is becoming an ever-increasing practice in the industry.

The CTVA stockroom is so small it cannot accommodate an equipment staging area, which is essential for students wishing to test equipment before checking it out. All rental facilities have such an area, which encourages students to check for problems and receive last minute instruction on equipment before taking it into the field.

The department has little storage space. Professor Jenkins has placed her plans to develop an advanced TV Studio course on hold for years because there is nowhere in CTVA-controlled space to store flats, set furnishings, and props. And the CTVA equipment manager regularly navigates a maze of old, broken, and depreciated equipment piled to the ceiling in the small offices he uses for storage.

Perhaps the most obvious omission among the department's facilities is some kind of theater in which to project student work and the films required in CTVA studies classes. Top film schools like USC, UCLA, and NYU have their own theaters, but such spaces are not particularly a luxury feature. CSU Northridge has two: the 130-seat Cinematheque and the 130-seat Arner Screening Room.

Most film production programs support a student showcase like Long Beach's yearly program at the DGA theater in Los Angeles. Screening work outside of class effectively raises the bar for student work. When it will be seen and judged by an general audience rather than just a room full of peers, students tend to work harder so that the distance between class work and professional work is much smaller.

A 100-seat theater with 5.1 surround sound and a DCP projector is not an uncommon feature in the contemporary university. In fact, it is somewhat strange that CSUF has no such facility anywhere on campus.

C. **Describe the current library resources for the program/department, the priorities for acquisitions over the next five years and any specialized needs such as collections, databases, etc.**

Throughout the dozen-plus year history of the department, librarians John Hickok and Roberta Valentine have worked to improve the library's resources relevant to the study of film and television. Since the last Program Performance Review the number of print and e-journals devoted to film and television that are available to students has more than doubled (from 93 to 208); the number of books and e-books devoted to screenwriting alone – as tabulated for the CTVA MFA program – has ballooned from just over 500 to almost 800; and, most significantly, the library's holding of feature films on DVD has swelled from 2000 to over 5000. The library has a significant collection of about 800 Asian films on DVD, partly a result of purchases associated with CTVA 377T: New Asian Cinema. Librarians are quick to purchase materials needed to support screenings for our courses.

Physical media in the form of DVDs (the library has not upgraded to blu-ray) will probably continue to be produced for at least another five years, so the library is committed to purchasing newly available films in that format. Though the distribution of creative content will inevitably transition from physical media to high quality streaming video (or to as-yet-undeveloped formats) that will give students remote access to the library's "holdings", it is too early to make any predictions as to what that distribution system will look like.

VII. *Long-term Plans*

A. Summarize the unit's long-term plan, including refining the definitions of the goals and strategies in terms of indicators of quality and measures of productivity. [See also Appendix VI.]

Since the Department of Cinema and Television Arts has recently completed reviews of the program goals for both its Bachelor of Arts and its Master of Arts in Screenwriting, and since the data-based assessment of those goals has begun, its long-term plans concern those largely non-curricular items listed as priorities in section I.C: establishing an Advisory Board; securing quality facilities; exploring the possibility of establishing a separate "School of Cinema and Television Arts"; formalizing and funding a mentorship program for all Screenwriting MFA students; developing a departmental website that is easily navigable, useful to students, aesthetically pleasing, and illustrative of the department's goals; and initiating an alumni tracking program.

Accomplishing all this will directly contribute to students' success in a variety of ways. An intelligible website should both give students the information they need to navigate the department's requirements and aid in advising. This, in turn, should lead to higher graduation rates and faster times-to-graduation. The MFA mentorship program should both provide students with an invaluable window on the day-to-day responsibilities of the screenwriter and foster a synergy between the CSUF MFA program and the Hollywood industry. This, in turn, should attract even better students to the program and bolster its profile among industry professionals. And state-of-the-art facilities will prepare production students for the workplace, allow them to create projects that could enhance the reputation of the CTVA program internationally, and improve the morale of students and faculty throughout the department.

B. Explain how each long-term plan implements the University mission, goals, and strategies.

The five priorities listed above support the University Mission, Goals, and Strategies (UMGS) in several important ways:

Among other things, goal 1 (establishing an Advisory Board) will

"ensure the preeminence of learning" by "facilitating the recruitment of highly-qualified and diverse staff and faculty" (UMGS section 1);

"capitalize on the uniqueness of our region, with its economic and cultural strengths" and "provide opportunities to learn from external communities" (UMGS section 2); and

"increase external support for university programs and priorities" by "increasing the proportion of campus resources generated by private giving", "strengthening links with our alumni that optimize an on-going commitment to the success of the university", and "conveying a clear message to the public that we are essential to the cultural, intellectual and economic development of the region" (UMGS section 6).

Goal 2 (securing professional-quality facilities) will

"ensure the preeminence of learning" by "developing attractive, accessible, and functional facilities that support learning", "establishing an environment where learning and the creation of knowledge are central to everything we do", "integrating advances in information technologies into learning environments", and "integrating teaching and creative activities" (UMGS section 1);

"provide high quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community and region" by "integrating knowledge with professional ethics and the teamwork skills necessary for students to make meaningful contributions to society" (UMGS section 2);

"enhance creative activity" by "creating a culture conducive to creative activity", "cultivating student involvement in faculty creative activity", and "providing students, faculty and staff access to and training in the use of advanced technologies supportive of creative activity" (UMGS section 3); and

"make collaboration integral to our activities" by "creating opportunities in and out of the classroom for collaborative activities for students, faculty and staff" (UMGS section 4).

Goal 3 (exploring the possibility of establishing a separate "School of Cinema and Television Arts") will

"strengthen institutional effectiveness" by, among other things, "creating simplified and responsive decision-making structures that reduce fragmentation and increase efficiency" and "enhancing a sense of community to ensure that faculty, students and staff have as a common purpose the achievement of the overall goals of the university" (UMGS section 8).

Goal 4 (formalizing and funding a mentorship program for all Screenwriting MFA students) will

"ensure the preeminence of learning" by "establishing an environment where learning and the creation of knowledge are central to everything we do" (UMGS section 1);

"provide high quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community and region" by "supporting graduate programs in professional studies and in the arts", "capitalizing on the uniqueness of our region, with its economic and cultural strengths", and "providing opportunities to learn from external communities through internships, cooperative education and other field activities" (UMGS section 2); and

"expand connections and partnerships with our region" by "developing mutually beneficial working partnerships with public and private sectors within our region" (UMGS section 7).

Goal 5 (developing a departmental website that is easily navigable, useful to students, aesthetically pleasing, and illustrative of the department's goals) will

"ensure the preeminence of learning" by "establishing an environment where learning and the creation of knowledge are central to everything we do" (UMGS section 1);

"create an environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed" by "developing an innovative outreach system that enhances recruitment of qualified students", "facilitating a timely graduation through advisement, career counseling and mentoring", and "providing an accessible, attractive and safe environment and a welcoming campus climate" (UMGS section 5); and

"strengthen institutional effectiveness" by "enhancing a sense of community to ensure that faculty, students and staff have as a common purpose the achievement of the overall goals of the university" (UMGS section 8).

Goal 6 (initiating an alumni tracking program) will

"increase external support for university programs and priorities" by "strengthening links with our alumni that optimize an on-going commitment to the success of the university" (UMGS section 6); and, indirectly,

"provide high quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community and region" by "capitalizing on the uniqueness of our region, with its economic and cultural strengths", and "providing opportunities to learn from external communities through internships, cooperative education and other field activities" (UMGS section 2);

"make collaboration integral to our activities" by "creating opportunities in and out of the classroom for collaborative activities for students, faculty and staff" (UMGS section 4); and

"expand connections and partnerships with our region" by "developing mutually beneficial working partnerships with public and private sectors within our region" (UMGS section 7).

C. *Explain what kinds of evidence will be used to measure the unit's results in pursuit of its goals, and how it will collect and analyze such evidence.*

As befits the department's extremely-practical-if-sometimes-ambitious goals, the kinds of evidence will it use to measure our success in achieving them are rather straightforward.

For goal 1 (establishing an Advisory Board), measurable steps towards success include: gathering names of potential members; making initial, exploratory contact; convening the Board; and formalizing its "charter", including raising the visibility of the department and identifying ways to secure funding for the facilities mentioned in goal 2.

For goal 2 (securing professional facilities), measurable steps towards success include: mapping out the needs of the complex (what facilities are required); projecting a ballpark budget; convincing administrators of the need for such a build-out; identifying potential new space for such facilities; identifying and developing major funding prospects; developing detailed architectural plans for said facilities; launching a targeted fundraising campaign; and constructing the facilities.

For goal 3 (exploring the possibility of establishing a separate "School of Cinema and Television Arts"), measurable steps towards success include: establishing an *ad hoc* committee to review the UPS documents concerning the establishment of "schools"; gathering the necessary documentation in support of the proposal; and lobbying upper level administrators.

For goal 4 (formalizing and funding a mentorship program for all Screenwriting MFA students), measurable steps towards success include: securing funding for such a program, either through internal grants (e.g. Instructionally Related Activities funds) or through external donations; identifying and developing potential mentors; and launching the program.

For goal 5 (developing a departmental website that is easily navigable, useful to students, aesthetically pleasing, and illustrative of the department's goals), measurable steps towards success include: convincing college-level administrators of the need for departmental autonomy in the creation of the website; establishing another *ad hoc* committee to plan the site; gathering information; securing the services of a web designer; and launching the site.

For goal 6 (initiating an alumni tracking program), measurable steps towards success include: appointing a departmental alumni tracking coordinator; working with the college and university alumni relations office to compile a list of CTVA graduates; creating a survey designed to gather information about those graduates; contacting them with the survey; creating a database from the information gathered through the survey; organizing and periodically sending all graduates a CTVA newsletter.

D. ***Develop a long-term budget plan in association with the goals and strategies and their effectiveness indicators. What internal reallocations may be appropriate? What new funding may be requested over the next seven years?***

Since almost 95% of the department's budget is devoted to sustaining faculty and staff salaries and benefits, and since essential office operating expense (phone, copier, paper, and other office incidentals) take up a chunk of the remaining 5%, it is difficult to fund any project that requires moneys in the $10,000+ range through internal reallocations, as there simply are too few discretionary dollars.

One budgeting difficulty, touched on above, stems from the fact that technology money is not allocated to departments but to colleges and that college-level equipment allocations are regularly made at the end of the fiscal year, contingent on the amount of "leftovers" in the college budget. This means that production and other CTVA faculty cannot confidently plan for the future. In addition, equipment and technology purchase decisions have often been made at the college level for the college as a whole, sometimes with no input from CTVA faculty, so that faculty occasionally find that they are gifted equipment they never asked for and have no use for.

Fortunately, CTVA goals 1 and 3 require little or no funding. Goal 5 could require $15-30,000 for web design services over the next seven years, depending on the size and experience of the outfit hired to provide them. Ideally, those moneys would be allocated from the college and IT budgets. Goal 4 is accomplishable only with a fair amount of stipend money. If, for example, mentors were compensated $3000-4000 (the equivalent

29

of six days' "special consultant's pay"), then the cost per year would be around $50,000. Such funds could be requested from the Associated Students' Instructionally Related Activities budget or raised through development channels in conjunction with the Advisory Board. Goal 6 requires "assigned time" (course release) for the alumni tracking coordinator.

Of course, goal 2 would require a great deal of development money. Professor Fink reported that the production facilities built at Cal State Northridge and the University of Oklahoma in the first years of this century cost around $30-40,000,000. So, a state-of-the-art facility that includes a studio, at least one soundstage, an audio recording stage, post-production facilities, an equipment stockroom, an equipment staging area, storage areas, classrooms with high quality sound and projection, at least two hi-definition screening theaters, offices for faculty and support staff, and other rooms might easily run between $50-100,000,000 today.

APPENDICES TO THE SELF-STUDY

APPENDIX I. UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

TABLE 1-A. First-Time Freshmen:
Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

First-time Freshman

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2010-2011	656	278	42%	96	35%
2011-2012	687	340	49%	107	31%
2012-2013	668	298	45%	87	29%
2013-2014	742	359	48%	102	28%
2014-2015	786	350	45%	98	28%

TABLE 1-B. Upper Division Transfers:
Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Undergraduate Transfers

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2010-2011	547	203	37%	106	52%
2011-2012	491	194	40%	89	46%
2012-2013	445	241	54%	97	40%
2013-2014	592	261	44%	95	36%
2014-2015	562	214	38%	92	43%

TABLE 2-A. Undergraduate Program Enrollment in FTES (Lower Division and Upper Division)

Undergraduate Enrollment (FTES)

	LD FTES	UD FTES	Total
2009-2010	158.4	309.8	468.1
2010-2011	189.8	307.3	497.1
2011-2012	209.3	351.6	560.9
2012-2013	208.9	367.7	576.5
2013-2014	203.1	379.0	582.1
2014-2015	204.2	370.8	574.9

TABLE 2-B. Undergraduate Program Enrollment (Headcount)

Undergraduate Enrollment (Headcount)

	LD	UD	Total	Annual Headcount	Annual FTES
2010-2011	214.5	398.5	613.0	613.0	497.1
2011-2012	234.0	440.5	674.5	674.5	560.9
2012-2013	231.5	456.5	688.0	688.0	576.5
2013-2014	227.0	465.5	692.5	692.5	582.1
2014-2015	228.0	462.5	690.5	690.5	574.9

TABLE 3-A. Graduation Rates for Majors (First-Time Freshmen)

first enrollment	Number of Records	Graduated 4 years or less in major	Graduated 4 years or less in other major	Graduated 5 years or less in major	Graduated 5 years or less in other major
Fall 2005	90	14.44%	8.89%	33.33%	22.22%
Fall 2006	61	19.67%	9.84%	31.15%	19.67%
Fall 2007	75	12.00%	10.67%	21.33%	20.00%
Fall 2008	82	20.73%	1.22%	42.68%	10.98%
Fall 2009	70	20.00%	4.29%	35.71%	11.43%
Fall 2010	95	16.84%	9.47%	40.00%	20.00%

→

first enrollment	Number of Records	Graduated 6 years or less in major	Graduated 6 years or less in other major	Graduated 7 years or less in major	Graduated 7 years or less in other major
Fall 2005	90	38.89%	23.33%	41.11%	23.33%
Fall 2006	61	40.98%	22.95%	42.62%	26.23%
Fall 2007	75	25.33%	29.33%	28.00%	32.00%
Fall 2008	82	50.00%	15.85%	50.00%	18.29%
Fall 2009	70	42.86%	14.29%	42.86%	18.57%
Fall 2010	95	40.00%	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%

TABLE 3-B. Graduation Rates for Majors (Transfer Students)

first enrollment	Number of Records	Graduated 3 years or less in major	Graduated 3 years or less in other major	Graduated 4 years or less in major	Graduated 4 years or less in other major
Fall 2005	90	60.00%	4.44%	72.22%	6.67%
Fall 2006	78	52.56%	5.13%	57.69%	5.13%
Fall 2007	98	57.14%	2.04%	69.39%	4.08%
Fall 2008	71	59.15%	8.45%	67.61%	8.45%
Fall 2009	73	58.90%	2.74%	67.12%	5.48%
Fall 2010	56	67.86%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%

→

first enrollment	Number of Records	Graduated 5 years or less in major	Graduated 5 years or less in other major	Graduated 6 years or less in major	Graduated 6 years or less in other major
Fall 2005	90	72.22%	7.78%	72.22%	8.89%
Fall 2006	78	60.26%	7.69%	61.54%	8.97%
Fall 2007	98	74.49%	4.08%	75.51%	5.10%
Fall 2008	71	74.65%	9.86%	76.06%	9.86%
Fall 2009	73	71.23%	6.85%	73.97%	6.85%
Fall 2010	56	78.57%	0.00%	78.57%	0.00%

TABLE 4. Bachelor Degrees Awarded

Degrees Awarded

	BA
2010-2011	142
2011-2012	164
2012-2013	173
2013-2014	210
2014-2015	189

APPENDIX II. GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

TABLE 5. Graduate Program:
Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Graduate Students

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2010-2011	36	18	50%	14	78%
2011-2012	42	18	43%	14	78%
2012-2013	33	17	52%	12	71%
2013-2014	26	17	65%	12	71%
2014-2015	36	18	50%	14	78%

TABLE 6-A. Graduate Program Enrollment in FTES

Graduate Enrollment (FTES)

	FTES
2010-2011	14.250
2011-2012	21.375
2012-2013	21.250
2013-2014	18.125
2014-2015	14.250

TABLE 6-B. Graduate Program Enrollment (Headcount)

Graduate Enrollment (Headcount)

	Annual Headcount	Annual FTES
2010-2011	14.50	11.40
2011-2012	25.50	17.10
2012-2013	25.50	17.00
2013-2014	21.00	14.50
2014-2015	14.50	11.40

TABLE 7. Graduation Rates for Master's-Seeking Students

	Number of Records	Graduated 3 years or less in major	Graduated 3 years or less in other major	Graduated 4 years or less in major	Graduated 4 years or less in other major	Graduated 5 years or less in major	Graduated 5 years or less in other major
Fall 2011	14	71.43%	7.14%	71.43%	7.14%	71.43%	7.14%
Fall 2012	14	78.57%	0.00%	78.57%	0.00%	78.57%	0.00%
Fall 2013	12	58.33%	8.33%	58.33%	8.33%	58.33%	8.33%
Fall 2014	12	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 8. Master's Degrees Awarded

Degrees Awarded

	MFA
2012-2013	8
2013-2014	14
2014-2015	8

APPENDIX III. FACULTY

Table 9. Faculty Composition

Faculty

	Tenured Faculty	Tenure Track Faculty	Sabbaticals at 0.5	FERP at 0.5	Full-Time Lecturers	Part-Time Lecturers	Lecturer FTEF	Total Full-time Faculty	Annual FTES
2010-2011	7^	5	2	0	1	12	8.63	13	497.1
2011-2012	7^	5	3	1	1	23	9.56	13.5	560.9
2012-2013	7#	5*	1	1	1	17	9.65	13.5	576.5
2013-2014	10*#	2	0	1	1	23	10.27	13.5	582.1
2014-2015	10#	2	0	0	1	18	10.20	13	574.9

* includes 1 Leave of Absence
^ includes 1 Leave with Pay
# includes 1 Professor who works full-time in administration

APPENDIX IV. RESOURCES

Table 10. Funding, State Operating and Expense (O&E) Allocation, Other

Fiscal Year	Salaries: Faculty + Chair	Salaries: Support Staff	Student Assistant	Part-time Faculty	Special Consultants	New Faculty Support	Benefits: SS, Retirement, Health, etc
2010	902277	90216	8044	194714	2000	15235	467693
2011	875120	90216	13239	276530	500	15416	498876
2012	919905	75824	9680	234097	1750	14529	582683
2013	951448	85700	11011	276589	0	10199	608292
2014	984825	95613	9787	254018	0	8875	697566

→

Fiscal Year	Operating Expenses	Other	Total Budget*	Total Expenditures	Over / Under Budget	Percentage Over / Under Budget
2010	11929	15747	1,763,450	1,712,887	-50,563	-2.8%
2011	15235	23836	1,899,173	1,848,332	-50,841	-2.7%
2012	14905	16084	1,859,415	1,869,143	+11,879	+0.6%
2013	14011	12986	1,941,904	1,969,107	+30,003	+1.5%
2014	14898	38421	2,124,372	2,102,084	-22,289	-1.0%

APPENDIX V. LONG-TERM PLANNING

How does the information provided in the appendices (e.g., graduation rates, faculty composition, FTES enrollment) inform and influence the long-term goals of the department or degree program?

Department goals are presented in section VII of the self-study. The data included in the appendices shapes some of them in at least the following ways.

Increases in student numbers, both headcount and FTES, suggest the department is still expanding and warrants its own professional facilities (goal 2) and possibly its own "school" (goal 3). The establishment of a high-profile Advisory Board (goal 1), should, in the long-term, bolster both applications to the program and the currently small percentage of admitted students who actually enroll, thereby increasing the quality of the average CTVA student and therefore, presumably, the graduation rate. Similarly, securing professional-quality facilities (goal 2). Prospective students who visit CSUF now are often put off by a studio inferior to those they had in high school.

The budgetary data in Table 10 impacts goal 2 (securing professional-quality facilities) in that it shows that the funds needed to complete the desired build-out are not possible within the current financial constraints of the department. Obviously, development money will be required to attain this goal.

Formalizing and funding a mentorship program for all Screenwriting MFA students (goal 4), should attract potential applicants to the graduate program. Though the MFA is unlikely to increase the size of each entering cohort, an increase in the applicant pool is obviously desirable.

Developing a departmental website that is easily navigable, useful to students, aesthetically pleasing, and illustrative of our department's goals should attract applicants and facilitate graduation.

APPENDIX VI. FACULTY VITAE

Include recent scholarly and creative activity and any research funding obtained.

Tenured and tenure-track CTVA faculty have been unusually productive, generating a wide range of scholarly and creative works. The short bios below include a sampling of their most significant recent work.

Robert Davis earned his PhD at Harvard University before completing an MFA in Film Production at the University of Southern California. He was chief film critic at *SPIN* magazine and a regular contributor to *American Cinematographer*. His current academic work focuses on trends in contemporary Asian cinema.

Professor Davis' publications since the last Program Performance Review include "The Body and Visual Poetics in Tran Anh Hung's Films", with Tim Maloney, in *Mysterious Skin: The Body and Contemporary World Cinema* (Macmillan, 2009); "The Beautiful and the Bad" in *Asian Cinema* (2013); "Hong Sang-soo's *Geuk-jang-jeon* [*A Tale of Cinema*]: redaction criticism and production analysis", with Tim Maloney, in *New Review of Film and Television Studies* (2014); four articles in the *Directory of World Cinema: Korea* (University of Chicago, 2013); and 16 articles in the *Directory of World Cinema: Japan I, II, and III* (University of Chicago Press, 2010, 2012, 2015).

Robert Engels has written scripts for Disney, Warner Bros, Universal, and Paramount. He wrote and co-produced *Murder in Small Town X* – an experimental mix of script and reality programming – for Fox TV. His TV credits include *Andromeda*, *Matthew Blackheart*, *SeaQuest*, and *Sirens*. But he is perhaps best known as writer and producer on *Twin Peaks, Wiseguy, On the Air* - three of the "100 Best Series Ever" according to the AFI. He has collaborated on five film scripts with David Lynch including *Fire Walk With Me* and the legendary, *Dream of the Bovine*.

Since the last Program Performance Review, Professor Engels has created two new series – *Jungleland* for Triangle Entertainment, and *The Gatekeeper* for Rainforest Productions – and has written for the Oprah Winfrey series *Greenleaf.* He recently completed work on Disney's series *Gravity Falls* and developed the series *Rancho Mirage* for ABC.

Jacqueline Frost earned her MFA in Film Production from Miami University. She teaches cinematography and narrative, documentary, and experimental production. Her book *Cinematography for Directors: A Guide to Creative Collaboration* (Michael Wiese, 2009) includes interviews with prominent cinematographers.

Professor Frost is currently producing and shooting a feature length documentary, *Rebel By Nature*, on the life and work of Cuban-born artist Ana Mendieta.

Hunter Hargraves recently received his PhD in Modern Culture and Media from Brown University. His research interests include television history and theory, comparative media studies, affect studies, and popular cultural studies that engage questions of race, gender, and sexuality. He is currently completing a book manuscript, *Viscerally Uncomfortable TV.*

Professor Hargraves' recent publications include "You Better Work: The Commodification of HIV in RuPaul's Drag Race" in *Spectator* (2011); "…Telentangled" in *Spectator* (2014); "Tan TV: Reality Television's Postracial Delusion" in *A Companion to Reality Television* (Blackwell, 2014);

"Teaching Irresponsibly and Uncomfortably: The Role of Theory in the Neoliberal University" in *Cinema Journal* (2015); and "(TV) Junkies in Need of an Intervention: On Addictive Spectatorship" in *Camera Obscura: Feminism, Culture, and Media Studies* (2015).

Garry Hart, former president of Paramount Network Television, joined CSUF last fall as chair of the department. At Paramount he managed more than $1 billion in annual production activities and led a team responsible for the launch and production of dozens of hit series including *Frasier*, *NCIS*, *JAG*, and *Star Trek: Voyager*. He also oversaw the production of 71 movies for television.

Tim Maloney completed his MFA in Film Production at the University of Southern California. He came to CSUF with a background in animation – he directed the popluar ABC Saturday morning interstitial, "Mrs. Munger's Classroom" – and in post-production sound and special effects, having worked for, among other post houses, Digital Domain.

Building on this professional work, Professor Maloney has produced, since the last Program Performance Review, three large-scale creative works. In collaboration with UK collage artist Vicki Bennett, he edited and directed a 45-minute performance piece, "Genre Collage", funded by Arts Council England. He produced, edited, and restored footage for a 90-minute documentary on the late 60s comedy group, Firesign Theatre. And he continued his collaboration with the avant-garde sound collective, Negativland, producing a series of short video works. During the same period, Professor Maloney wrote a mass-market DIY Animation text for Random House, published an essay on the future of film and digital media *Film and Film Culture*, and co-authored a book chapter on Vietnamese director Tran Anh Hung and a peer-reviewed essay on Korean filmmaker Hong Sang-Soo.

Gloria Monti earned her PhD in American Studies at Yale before joining the CSUF faculty. Her publications include essays on Pier Paolo Pasolini, African-American independent women filmmakers, and the representation of women in the films of Jean-Luc Godard, and a book chapter on the adaptation of the Italian novel *Nessuno torna indietro*.

Professor Monti's most recent major publication is "Traversing the Onscreen City: Nannarella's (Mamma) Roma" for a special issue of *Annali d'Italianistica* (2010).

Heather Osborne-Thompson earned her PhD in Television Studies at the University of Southern California. Her research focuses on the intersections of gender and genre in television, both historical and contemporary.

Since the last Program Performance Review, Professor Osborne-Thompson's publications include "The Bionic Woman 2.0" in *Velvet Light Trap* (2009); "The Comedic Treatment of Reality in *Kathy Griffin: My Life on the 'D' List*, *Fat Actress*, and *The Comeback*" in *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture* (NYU Press, 2009); "Tracing the 'Fake' Candidate in American Television Comedy" in *Satire TV: Politics and Comedy in the Post-Network Era* (NYU Press, 2009); and "Seriality and Assisted Reproductive Technologies in Celebrity Reality Television" in *Feminist Media Studies* (2014).

Ari Posner has been writing sitcoms since 1995. Before joining the faculty, he was a writer and producer on *Partners*, *Boston Common*, *Something So Right*, *Popular*, *Reba*, and *Mental*.

Since the last Program Performance Review, Professor Posner has produced 13 episodes of the award-winning Canadian series, *Call Me Fitz*, 6 episodes of Nickelodeon's *Life with Boys*, 2

episodes of the CW series *Hart of Dixie*, and 13 episodes of the Fox series, *Married*. His feature script, *Club Med*, is currently at Happy Madison (Sony).

Before joining the faculty, **Jule Selbo** wrote several episodes of *Tales from the Darkside*, *Monsters*, and *The Young Indiana Jones Chronicles* and produced for both *Touched by An Angel* and *Melrose Place*.

Since the last Program Performance Review, she has authored two books on screenwriting – *Film Genre for the Screenwriter* (Routledge, 2014) and *Screenplay: Building Story Through Character* (Routledge, 2015) – and co-edited the 1000-page *Women Screenwriters International Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). She is co-editor of the *Journal of Screenwriting*. In 2010, she wrote a chapter on pre-code screenwriters for Routledge's *Analysing the Screenplay;* and in 2015 an essay entitled "The Fantasy and War Genres; the Alternate Plane and Displacement" for *Journal of Screenwriting*. Over the same period she wrote multiple episodes of *Olivia* for Nick, Jr and *Pound Puppies* for Hasbro, a graphic novel, and a number of theatrical plays.

Rebecca Sheehan earned her PhD in Comparative Literature and Cinema Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. She taught World Cinema, American Film History, Experimental and Avant-Garde Cinema, Documentary Cinema, Alfred Hitchcock, and Time Travel in Cinema at Harvard University before taking a position at CSUF.

Professor Sheehan's most recent work includes "The Time of Sculpture: Film, Photography and Auguste Rodin" in *Screening the Past* (2010); "Picturing a Film Philosophy: Stan Brakhage, Ludwig Wittgenstein and the Renewed Encounter with the Everyday" in *Screen* (2012); "The Disembodied Wound of *The Piano Tuner of Earthquakes*: The Brothers Quay's 'homage' to Chris Marker" in *Discourse* (2013); "Facebooking the Present: The Biopic and Cultural Instantaneity" in *The Biopic in Contemporary Film Culture* (Routledge, 2014); and "The Victorian Multiple: Cinema and British Sculpture in the Age of Empire," *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth-Century* (2015). She is currently completing two books: *Film as Philosophy: American Avant-Garde Film and the Ethics of the Inbetween* and *Cinema's Laocoön: Film, Sculpture, and the Virtual.*

Anthony Sparks earned his PhD in American Studies & Ethnicity from the University of Southern California while launching his career as a writer. His play *Ghetto Punch* was presented at several off-Broadway venues and optioned by NBC and HBO. Professor Sparks has written and produced on several television dramas including *The District* (CBS), *Lincoln Heights* (ABC Family), *Undercovers* (NBC), and *The Blacklist* (NBC). His work has been nominated for two NAACP Image Awards and two Sentinel Awards from the Norman Lear Center.

Professor Sparks began teaching at CSUF last year and was immediately tapped to write and produce Oprah Winfrey and Ava DuVernay's new series, *Queen Sugar*.

Professors Davis, Fink, Frost, Maloney, Perebinossoff, and Selbo reported receiving grants in the period under review. They include:

2009 University Missions & Goals grant (Davis) – $5000 to subtitle Japanese films
2010 University Junior-Senior grant (Davis) – $3000 to subtitle Japanese films
2011 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Selbo) – $1000 to attend
        International Screenwriting Conference in Copenhagen
2011 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Davis) – $1000 to conduct

research at the Tokyo International Film Festival and Film Market

2011 President's Initiative grant (Selbo, together with Pam Madsen, Associate Professor of Music) – $35,000 for the "Film as a Collaborative Art" distinguished speaker series

2012 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Davis) – $1000 to conduct research at the Hong Kong International Film Festival and Hong Kong Filmart

2012 Hollywood Foreign Press educational grant (Selbo, together with director of development Mike Karg) – $10,000 for completion of advanced student projects

2012 University Junior-Senior grant (Davis) – $5000 for research travel to Hong Kong and Cannes

2012 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Davis) – $1000 to conduct research at the Vancouver International Film Festival

2013 Hollywood Foreign Press educational grant (Frost, renewing the above) – $10,000 for completion of advanced student projects

2013 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Davis) – $1000 to conduct research at the Vancouver International Film Festival

2013 Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences grant (Fink and Perebinossoff) – $5000 to support students interning in the film industry

2013 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Davis) – $1000 to conduct research at the Hong Kong International Film Festival and Hong Kong Filmart

2013 University Junior-Senior grant (Frost) – $3000 towards production of a documentary about Cuban-born artist Ana Mendieta

2014 Hollywood Foreign Press educational grant (Frost, renewing the above) – $10,000 for completion of advanced student projects

2014 Faculty Development Center international travel grant (Davis) – $1250 to conduct research at the Hong Kong International Film Festival and Hong Kong Filmart

2015 University Junior-Senior grant (Davis) – $5000 for research travel to Vancouver, Hong Kong, and Cannes

2015 Hollywood Foreign Press educational grant (Frost, renewing the above) – $10,000 for completion of advanced student projects

2015 CSU Entertainment Industry Initiative grant (Davis) – $6000 for industry collaboration on a micro-budget feature film

In addition, in each of the years since the last Program Performance Review except one, the production faculty who teach CTVA 425 (Production 2) – Professors Davis, Frost, and Maloney – have received grants from the Associated Students' Instructionally-Related Activities budget in order to allay the high costs of production for that course's students. The grants have increased from around $24,000 per year at the start of the cycle to over $40,000 at its end. Professor Frost has also received some IRA funds, around $3000, for CTVA 431 (Cinematography).

APPENDIX VII. ASSESSMENT

The following chart maps departmental SLOs onto courses who learning goals support those SLOs. [Note: this chart was prepared in 2012.]

Course	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5
100	I			I	
220 or 225		I	I, D		I, D
495	M	M	M	M	M
Screenwriting					
250		I, D			I, D
341	D			D	D
345	D	D		D	D
350		I, D		I	
351	I, D	D, M		I	I, D
352	I, D	D, M		I	I, D
353T	I, D	D, M		D, M	I, D
429	D, M	D, M			D, M
455	D, M	D, M		D, M	D, M
456	M	M		D	M
457	M	M		D	M
Production					
300			I, D		I, D
325		I	I, D		I, D
210		I	I, D		I, D
310		D	D, M		D, M
410			I, D		I, D
425		D, M	D, M		D, M
427		I, D	I, D		I, D
431			M		M
434			D		D
435			M		M
Studies					
301	I, D	I, D		I	I, D
302	I, D	I, D		I	I, D
271	I, D	I, D			I, D
272	I, D	I, D			I, D
361	D, M	D, M		D, M	D, M
362	D, M	D, M		D, M	D, M
365	I, D	I, D		I, D	I, D
370	I, D	D		I, D	I, D
371	D	D		D	D
377T	D	D, M		D	D
379T	D	D, M		D	D
472	D, M	D, M			D, M
473	D	D, M		D, M	D
General					
315		I, D			I, D
360	D			D	D
381	D			D	D, M
480	D, M			D, M	D, M
Other					
499	I-M	I-M		I-M	I-M

APPENDIX VIII. ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR CTVA 325 (Spring 2016)

Name _____

PROJECT 1 2 3   Title _____

category	pts	basic score		deductions		deductions
process and presentation	25	Basic Score: all work is complete and on time 25		week 1: no presentation week 1: presentation late week 1: no or incomplete sound week 1: no or incomplete full takes of unused set-ups week 1: no or incomplete full takes used set-ups week 1: no or incorrect slate / black at tails week 2: no presentation week 2: presentation late week 2: no new cut week 2: no or incomplete dialogue smoothing		week 2: no or incomplete initial sound mix week 2: no or incorrect slate / black at tails week 3: no presentation week 3: presentation late week 2: no or incomplete final mix week 3: no or incorrect slate / black at tails format not mpg, mp4, or mov poor resolution, problems playing file
screen shots	10	Basic Score: all work is complete and on time 10		pic folder: no or late screen shot pic folder: labeling errors sound folder: no or late screen shot		sound folder: labeling errors cut folder: no or late screen shot cut folder: labeling errors
image production	25	Basic score 1: excellent: lighting and exposure control strongly reinforce the drama; camera operation is accomplished; excellent compositions 25 Basic score 2: lighting supports the scene; exposures are matched and subjects are delineated; compositions better than generic and support the drama 24 Basic score 3: lighting and exposures neither enhance nor detract from the scene; compositions standard and competent 22		dailies: camera not level dailies: out of focus dailies: unintentional non normal angles dailies: problematic 180-degree violation dailies: exposure problems dailies: poor compositions dailies: other		final cut: camera not level final cut: out of focus final cut: unintentional non-normal angles final cut: problematic 180-degree violation final cut: exposure problems; mismatched exposures final cut: poor compositions final cut: mismatched eyelines final cut: other
sound	25	Basic score 1: dialogue is clear and clean; effects, ambience, and music effectively carry emotional or narrative content 25 Basic score 2: dialogue is intelligible; effects, ambience, and music support material 23		missing or poor effects missing or poor ambience dialogue off-mic dialogue smoothing errors music is the primary element of sound design other		

category	pts	basic score		deductions		
coverage	25	Basic score 1: scene is carefully covered, allowing the editor a wide variety of interesting options 25		Basic score 2: basic to above average, standard coverage 23		Basic score 3: lack of coverage is evident 10-20
editing	30	Basic score 1: editing is the primary storytelling device; emotional and narrative effects are driven by cutting 30 Basic score 2: footage is well organized and editing supports narrative action; timing creates flow to the scene or rhythm 28 Basic score 3: scene "works" acceptably and timing is competent 27		bad match on action or double actions gratuitous use of effects (dissolves, etc) confused screen direction narrative incoherence scene lacks coherent structure timing unintentionally awkward		
location	10	Basic score 1: location contributes strongly to the tone of the scene 10		Basic score 2: location is visually agreeable and appropriate to the scene 8-9		Basic score 3: location is inappropriate, generic and/or unphotogenic 4-7
production design	10	Basic score 1: décor and props contribute strongly to the tone of the scene 10		Basic score 2: décor and props are visually agreeable and appropriate to the scene 8-9		Basic score 3: décor and props feel generally ignored, inappropriate, and/or generic 6-7
costume	10	Basic score 1: costumes contributes strongly to the tone of the scene 10		Basic score 2: costumes are visually agreeable and appropriate to the scene 8-9		Basic score 3: costuming feels generally ignored, inappropriate, and/or generic 5-7
casting and performance	10	Basic score 1: casting strongly enhances the scene; actors seem well-rehearsed and convey character and substance 10		Basic score 2: casting is appropriate for the scene; actors deliver lines adequately 8-9		Basic score 3: casting is awkward or inappropriate; inconsistent or poor performances; or director appears in own his or her film 0-7
tone	20	Basic score 1: director's style comes through 19-20		Basic score 2: a consistent but relatively generic tone is achieved 17-18		Basic score 3: lack of command of tone, generic tone, and/or tonal inconsistency 12-16
extra credit		Director shows effort far beyond normal classroom work, stretches his or her ability.				
TOTAL		**out of 200**				

APPENDIX IX:

External Review: Department of Radio-TV-Film

California State University, Fullerton

June 12, 2009

External Reviewers

Mary C. Schaffer, Department of Cinema and Television Arts, California State University, Northridge

John Short, Department of Theatre and Dance, California State University, Fullerton

Michael Steiner, Department of American Studies, California State University, Fullerton

Introduction and Overview

We would like to begin by thanking the Radio-TV-Film Department faculty for inviting us to provide an external review of their Department and for hosting our onsite visit on April 20, 2009. We had a productive day, meeting with RTVF chair, Ed Fink, and with ten of the Department's full-time faculty and with two part-time faculty at various times. We also met with the Dean of the College of Communications, Rick Pullen, his Associate and Assistant Deans, and with the chairs of Communications and Human Communications--the two other Departments in the College. We toured RTVF Department's production facilities in the basement of the Library, and we had a lively discussion with 25 students in their advanced Screenwriting class (RTVF 455).

We came away from our visit with an abundance of positive impressions about this young Department. We were impressed with the Department's dynamic and accomplished faculty, extremely effective internship program, extensive connections to the business community, enthusiastic majors, successful alumni, extensive theory and production-based curriculum, and effective advocacy of globalization, media ethics, and literacy. There are also a number of areas that seem to require further development and improvement. Areas of possible improvement include: revamping the curriculum to reflect significant changes in business and technology, establishing clear "roadmaps" serving academic and career goals of various groups of majors, upgrading inadequate production facilities and equipment shortfalls, clarifying the Department's distinctive mission within the College, and maintaining a balanced and dynamic relationship between theory and practice in coursework as majors move toward graduation.

Many of the recommendations at the end of our report reinforce the four "priorities for the future" outlined several times in the Department's Self-Study: to establish an M.F.A. in Screenwriting, curricular revision for improved roadmaps to graduation, formal strategy to implement assessment measures, and space and funding for professional-quality production facilities. In addition to providing specific proposals for realizing these basic priorities, we also offer several independent suggestions that we believe would further strengthen your already

healthy program. The following report will briefly outline many of the Department's strengths, discuss areas that need development and improvement, and finally offer specific recommendations for the future.

I. Strengths

There is much to praise about this new and vibrant Department. We sensed a healthy esprit de corps among faculty and students during our visit. The Department's concise Self-Study reveals that RTVF has established a strong presence in its brief history: growing from seven to twelve full-time faculty since 2003, enrolling as many as 600 majors with 100-170 graduating every year, establishing a 21 unit minor with 80 or more students, and launching plans for an M.F.A. in Screenwriting.

Fundamental Missions and Goals

It is clear that Fullerton's RTVF Department provides an effective and inexpensive education for students seeking media production careers in a region whose economy is heavily based on media—that it fills a pressing need for a diverse group of students who can't afford to study filmmaking or TV, video, or web-based production at USC, UCLA, or Chapman. We were impressed, furthermore, with the Department's vigorous effort to put in place a graduate screenwriting program for a broad base of worthy students. It is also clear that RTVF students receive a quality education from a strong and talented faculty whose areas of expertise range from abstract media theory, criticism, and history to practical issues of production, direction, business operation, and story and script writing.

Beyond fulfilling this basic academic and vocational need in our region, we were also impressed with the Department's commitment to furthering important civic principles. We see you as having a vital role on campus, and we admire your commitment to understanding media in a global context and the international work done by many of your faculty. The Department's contributions to greater media literacy and exploring the power of media manipulation are increasingly important and extremely praiseworthy projects. In this idealistic vein, we especially commend the program's goals that stress learning cultural-historical background to media and that develop media ethics, literacy, and critical thinking—all essential skills for informed citizens and especially for people moving into production and entertainment-based careers. We commend your goals of teaching RTVF majors to: "know the foundational history of the film and electronic media industry and how history shapes the industry's present and future," to "contribute ethically to the media industry," and to "consume film and electronic media critically." We strongly urge you to keep these more academic and idealistic purposes in mind as you also work to serve your students' practical and vocational needs.

The Department's mission is clear: "The Department of Radio-TV-Film at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF), offers a comprehensive curriculum and active learning environment to prepare students for meaningful careers in film and telecommunication -- broadcast, cable, satellite, wireless, digital, and interactive media."

The Faculty

Our conversations with ten full-time and two part time faculty as well as our session with twenty-five students in their advanced scriptwriting class affirmed that a major strength of the Department is its dynamic and accomplished faculty. Although we would have appreciated seeing faculty curriculum vitae, a selection of course outlines, and student surveys included in the Self-Study to gain a more grounded understanding of the Department's scholarship and teaching effectiveness, we were impressed with a strong sense of commitment and community among the faculty and with corresponding appreciation from their students. Students lavishly praised their full and part-time professors—for their teaching abilities, personal experience in the field, and willingness to meet outside the classroom. The faculty has left a lasting impression on their students. Nancy Byrne, the College's Director of Development, said, "Whenever I connect with alumni, they always talk about specific professors that had an impact on them."

When pressed to name things they didn't like or would want improved in their major, a few students mentioned the need for more structure in an introductory course but the majority of concerns were of a pragmatic and vocational nature, expressing the need for more practical skills and hands on experiences. This issue will be touched upon later in our report, but at this point we commend the RTVF faculty for the high quality of its teaching and ability to maintain a necessary balance between the more academic and applied aspects of their field, between the historical, theoretical, and critical approaches to media studies and its production and career based applications. We were impressed with a vibrant, fairly young, diverse faculty who seem to be active, widely recognized scholars (once again, faculty cvs would have been extremely useful), and who are devoted to teaching a spectrum of important fields, ranging from film history and criticism to story structure, script writing, and film, TV, and video production.

Internships and Industry Connections

We were also impressed with the Department's effective Internship Program and extensive connections to the media and entertainment industries. There are several areas worth noting: the internship program, alumni career panels, and ongoing programs with major industry organizations.

An Internship (RTVF 495) is one of three required core courses for every major, and it was clear from conversations with students, faculty, and college administrators that the Department has been highly successful in finding creative work situations for its students and guiding them toward a wide array of media-related careers. The fact that the college is using an online system, a secure authenticated website only for students in the program, is impressive. The College has a Faculty Coordinator who facilitates internships across all three Departments; this is most impressive and indicates a commitment from the Dean. The requirement is to complete 150 total hours for three units, which averages ten hours per week for a 15-week semester. Students are able to take this course twice, which provides a diverse educational experience for students, especially those who intern at two very different companies or intern in different types of jobs. It was indicated that many faculty take time during the summer to visit companies that provide internships. Again, this shows a commitment by the faculty to assure that these internships are solid and that the internships benefit the student, the Department, and the individual company. A

quick inquiry into the nature of these internships revealed students who are currently working with Jim Henson Productions, legends in children's television, and with noted director Ridley Scott. This is an impressive program, an area where the Department could, and perhaps should "blow its own horn".

In addition to the required Internship, the RTVF Department sponsors Alumni Career panels. Professor Emeritus Lynn Gross has facilitated many of these panels, again showing that retired faculty of this Department continue to give their time and contacts. A list of more than 70 RTVF alumni underscored an astonishing range and depth of current careers and positions among its graduates. Department alumni in the work world range from founders, executive producers, and vice presidents of a cross section of entertainment and media companies to sports and weather announcers, talk show hosts, CFOs, and an array of production managers across Southern California.

It was obvious from our conversations with faculty that many have strong ongoing ties to the media industry and that they are devoted to finding careers for their students. As one of the professors who teaches RTVF 341 (*The Biz: Idea to Screen*), told us: "These students want jobs; they can't wait," and we were impressed with the success with which their students have found jobs and careers.

There are many ongoing programs that the RTVF Department has with the industry, and this is an area, once again, where the Department could "promote its own work." Fullerton faculty and students, for example, have worked with the Academy of Television Arts and Science's Archive of American Television. Not only did RTVF students edit material provided from the Academy, they also used the Academy's resources in their classes. Continuing this program enhances the production side of the RTVF curriculum. A number of the professors we spoke to, as well as students, discussed guest speakers. All the guest speakers who are coming to Fullerton are noted industry professionals. Once again, this shows the strong ties professors have to the industry.

Several students and faculty also mentioned the involvement and acceptance of student films into the Newport Film Festival. Again, this demonstrates a strong relationship with the community and provides a real-life experience for the students since for many this will be the first film festival that their film is accepted and screened. Another significant industry connection involves a partnership between the Department and KCET-TV. Although it is currently on hiatus, basically due, as we understand it, to internal issues with KCET, this is an excellent connection that hopefully will resume in the near future.

Curricula

This is an area that we feel is both strength, and an area of concern. We see your curricula as both a strong offering, and as currently organized and constituted, a weakness. The courses available from the 100 to 400 levels seem varied and interesting. There are clusters as you call them that cover a lot of ground in the field, from writing to production to critical studies. The critical studies area we feel is particularly impressive given the heavy emphasis on "doing" things in this discipline. Shooting, editing, audio, and writing are all activity based in their various ways and are all designed to produce something. Which, of course begs the question:

49

produce what exactly? Your students need a grounding in the history and whys and wherefores of the medium, and we are impressed in the Department's efforts here in the course offerings and the people who teach them.

The curricula as it's currently constituted in the "cluster" format seems ill designed to foster the direction in which the Department seems to be moving. We believe that it would be an excellent idea to have a complete and thorough course review. In so doing a few courses could be dropped, others added, and everything reorganized to give the students a better, clearer path to a degree that fits their goals, and training that suits their current needs and even their future aspirations in some cases. This would also enable students to graduate in a more expedient fashion. While the Department does well in comparison with the university six-year graduation rates (and we see no real problems in this area) it would still be a residual benefit.

In speaking to the Dean, head of the Department, and a substantial part of the fulltime faculty, the sense is that the Department would very much like to move further away from its affiliation with Communications and instead head in the direction of filmmaking and writing, especially of the narrative variety, combined with a rigorous and thought provoking range of critical studies offerings to give a context and a raison d'entre, if you will, to the whole creative process. We agree with this line of thinking and have some specific suggestions that might facilitate this process.

Resources and Facilities

Production space and equipment is a major factor affecting curriculum decisions in the RTVF program. The outside reviewers spent considerable time discussing these issues with administration, faculty, staff, and students. We toured the production facilities in the library. This section is divided into four subsections: (1) classroom, office, and meeting space, (2) field-production equipment, (3) studio space, and (4) post–production facilities and discusses the current equipment and space issues.

Walking through the offices and space within the College Park Building was a joy. Students were engaged in small group conversations and working on projects both individually and in groups. The Department should be commended for the use of its space on the sixth floor. The wide hallway is furnished with appropriate sized tables and chairs that provide workspace for students. The faculty offices are off of the hallway providing students with easy access to their instructors. The number of faculty who had their doors open was impressive.   One professor was meeting with students prior to 8 AM. This space outside the faculty offices is well designed and obviously contributes to the engagement of students and professors. The two small rooms further down the hallway are beneficial for group discussions, production meetings, and even small group tutorials. This hallway and the faculty office space allow for productive interactions with faculty and student and contribute to a unified Department.

RTVF has a heavy production component. Many of the students we spoke with discussed their production projects. The majority of non-production classes appear to be taught in the College Park building while the RTVF equipment facilities, production studios, and labs are housed in the library basement, which is across Nutwood Avenue, a busy street.   This is not an ideal

situation, but with the increased enrollment and expansion of the campus, this is workable at the present time. It would be advantageous to have all RTVF classes, production, and non-production (theory, screenwriting, etc) in the same building, since the close proximity of all students (as well as faculty) engages them in the entire program rather than segregating the production classes from non-production classes. Both types of classes work with each other and are not separate entities.

Currently, the Department offers 45 different courses. Of these, one is an internship and does not use the campus facilities. Of the remaining 44 classes, 13 are production classes, which mean that 29.5 percent of the classes are housed in the production facilities in the library. These classes normally have an enrollment of twenty students. There are 697 students enrolled in RTVF, with no separate count as to how many of these students are enrolled in production classes. There does not appear to be separate options within the Department such as a film production option, a screenwriting option, or a television production option. This structure has its own pros and cons. However, since the Department has been a stand-alone Department for seven years, at this point, it is a wise decision to offer one degree and allow the students to select their course work within the requirements that have been put forth. The Department has three clusters--Criticism, Production, and Writing--and students can take classes from all three for their Bachelor of Arts degree, providing a balanced academic course of instruction. (Moving forward, the Department needs to re-examine the "cluster" issue. We address this issue in Items 3 and 4 under Recommendations). The production classes are crucial to a well-rounded RTVF program. As noted in the self-study, the Department has "added more sections of production courses to try to address the bottleneck," as the demand for production classes increase. This is to be expected since Fullerton is a "feeder" into the Hollywood production community. The Department, however, does face issues with both studio space and specific equipment requirements.

One significant problem the Department has is studio space. The existing studio has an inadequate space to teach proper studio techniques and is completely inadequate. The studio suffers from ceilings that are too low for required lighting angles and prohibits the permanent hanging of lights and a grid. There is no sound stage, so teaching proper studio audio is nearly impossible. There is little if any buffering of external noise as is apparent by the exposed sewer lines running across the ceilings. The space is small and cramped. The studio has three 16:9 widescreen standard-def cameras, purchased in 2006, which are adequate for the studio.

The field equipment--cameras, tripods, lightening equipment, and audio equipment--are another essential component to this program. Both faculty and students are committed to this area of the program. The Department has created its own proprietary on-line software check-in/check-out system, which appears to be working well. There was no discussion of theft or extensive damage (other than normal wear and tear) to the equipment. The faculty teach the students to properly use the equipment and students appear to treat the equipment with respect and care. The students we talked with were well versed in the equipment, which shows appropriate interest and knowledge of the program and equipment. There are eight Canon XL-1 cameras. Two each were purchased in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003. There are eight Arri-S cameras, the oldest was purchased prior to 1990 and the last three being purchased used in 2003. The Department has two Arri-SR2 cameras, one purchased prior to 1990 and the second one purchased used in 2004.

Again, the Department is to be commended for its care of equipment. While some of the production gear is old, it is in good working condition. The Department appears to have given thought to staggering the purchase of equipment.

It is obvious that the Department (and the College) engaged in careful planning for the purchase of their post-production hardware. While computers continue to change year-to-year, when this hardware was purchased three years ago, it was indeed "state of the art." The editing labs, that have Final Cut software and audio lab which has Audio Pro Tools software, were in full-use when we toured the facilities at approximately 12:30 PM. There was no class in session, however, there were several students using the computers and the editing software (the students were not using the computers for email but were editing, a very positive sign). Approximately 40 percent of the video editing computers were being used and twenty-five percent of the audio editing equipment was being used. The number of students using the equipment and working on what appeared to be class projects was impressive for that time of day. This hardware and software used by the students is similar to what they will use when they graduate and move to the workforce.

The Department is to be congratulated for having the foresight to move to digital audio and video production, both in studio-based and field-based courses. The migration from digital tape recording to digital solid-state recording (hard disk and removable drive media) is commendable. The Department has acquired state of the art equipment when funding was made available to them.

Despite their previous planning, now is the time for the Department to take total inventory of equipment, software, and classes and make hard decisions. Since our initial visit in late April, the state budget appears to be in far worse condition and money will be scarce. RTVF needs to create a plan on how classes will be taught with these limitations. While we would like to strongly recommend that a new state-of-the art production facility be built (Goal 4 as noted on page 14 of the Self-Study) we surmise that with the current budget issues in California that this may not be possible in the near future.

Faculty, students, and staff all appear to be cognizant of the production equipment and facilities problem, but have obviously worked around many of these obstacles. Not only are the faculty teaching good production techniques, they are creating an environment of critical thinking and problem solving.

II.   Recommendations

1. We were impressed with the proposed M.F.A. in Screenwriting and strongly urge the Department to forge ahead with this worthy plan. It seems well thought out, and in these days of tight budgets, very realistic. We recommend this new degree program be up and running as soon as feasibly possible.

2. The Department of Radio, Television and Video is only seven years old. The Department has made impressive strides in its first decade. As it moves into its second decade, we

recommend that the chair and the faculty clarify the Department's distinct role in the college. The Department is strong and needs to define its curriculum, the structure of the major, and its continuing relationship and role with the two other Departments in the College, Communication and Human Communications.

3. We strongly recommend that the faculty review the three "clusters" and improve the tracks/roadmaps.

   a) Separate areas of study into tracks with specific course offerings designated for each track. For instance there could be three tracks: production, screenwriting, and media theory. Another suggestion is production, writing/critical studies, and TV Film or general studies. This latter track could be well suited to those who just want a degree in something interesting as quickly as possible. This would be the sort of student who several faculty members said they encounter; students who seem to be taking classes that fit their work schedule as opposed to being highly motivated to make films or write screenplays. This would also serve to winnow out the pretenders keeping the production classes (and top drawer equipment) especially reserved for the Production track. In this vein the Department could institute some sort of process to be accepted into the Production Track. We hesitate to say exactly how this might be accomplished, but similar merit based systems are being used to good effect in the Music and Theatre and Dance Departments. Many universities have used the portfolio process, which may include a personal statement, artwork, photo story, video work, as well as series of questions developed by the faculty.

   b) In light of the Department's mission, we suggestion that the Department consider courses or additions to the current courses in wireless, digital, and interactive media.

4. In conjunction with improving the "clusters", we recommend that the Department eliminate radio from its curriculum and title. The offerings in this area seem weak, and we sense little enthusiasm from faculty or students. The university has no broadcast radio station or license for same. It is totally unclear if Titan Radio is under the auspices of the RTVF Department or another Department within the College. However, Titan Radio.org is available online, which addresses the need for more digital audio versus traditional radio classes. Radio seems a much better fit for the Communications Department. You could offer it back to them. If they decline this generous entreaty, then just drop it.

5. At the same time that we praise the Department's focus on media practice and furthering its students' career goals, we also strongly urge you to maintain your emphasis on more abstract but equally important educational goals. Your commitment to promoting media literacy and critical awareness of media manipulation serves an increasingly crucial function for your majors, the campus, and the larger community. You should never lose sight of this important educational and civic function. As you work to fulfill your students' vocational needs, we urge you to also attend to more idealistic academic needs: to instill them with tools of critical thinking and historical-cultural understanding that will serve them well in the larger society. RTVF appears to have maintained a necessary balance between theory and practice, between a more academic and a more hands on approach, and we strongly recommend that you continue this vital interplay in the future.

6. We recommend that production classes spend less time in the studio and more time on location. The current "studio" is so inferior, especially in terms of audio and lighting, that it would be wise not to force the studio issue but rather spend time teaching location audio and location video and post-production. While this is not the most ideal situation, it would greatly benefit students and faculty alike. We offer several suggestions:

    a) Rather than be frustrated in the studio setting, let the students and faculty be creative in location work. While trends in television programming change, the current trend is reality television and the majority of that is done on location. Currently, there are fewer television programs being shot in a studio. Additionally, many television programs are creating companion episodes, which are shot on location. RTVF has the opportunity to distinguish themselves focusing on location rather than studio work. Granted, studio production is relatively easier to teach, but students will have a greater learning curve when they are required to think critically and creatively when they are on location.

    b) Another way to increase production work is to have a course that focuses on service learning. There are many successful models that have included production and service learning as one. Working with a non-profit in the community, and having students produce Public Service Announcements, information videos, or promotional videos, would not only provide real-life work for the students, but increase the field production work– again taking production work out of the studio and into the field.

    c) If the current partnership with KCET is discontinued, we strongly urge the Department to develop a partnership with KOCE-TV, Channel 50. This may help solve some of the issues of not having a proper studio on campus. There are many scenarios that could be developed – students working on KOCE-TV studio programs, students producing their own once a week or monthly program at KOCE-TV studios (e.g. PBS's *Independent Lens* or PBS's *POV)*, as well as working on KOCE-TV field productions.

    d) Take a long hard look at your three camera offerings. The sit-com format for example is pretty much dead in the world of television. Instead you can shift these resources to developing offerings in new media, specifically webisodes. This fast growing area of the field is cheap to produce and highly creative. You want to be at least even with the new media curve, if not ahead, but certainly not behind it. Your students will be wildly enthusiastic about exploring content for the web and it will greatly help you manage your deficiencies in the sound stage area. Creating narrative content for the web can be shot almost anywhere with a variety of camera options. Since shooting traditional TV/Film product is difficult given the limitations of your soundstage make lemonade out of lemons by creating nontraditional product outside the building.

7. In reviewing new equipment purchases, if the Department does look specifically at field production rather than studio production, additional equipment would be needed. One area

to consider is field audio. The cost of field audio production is less expensive than studio equipment. If the Department removes the Radio classes, field audio could be emphasized. The area of audio for television and film production along with the emerging areas in the World Wide Web (including audio podcasting and internet radio) and mobile devices could potentially put RTVF at leading-edge in curriculum rather than following older trends, fulfilling part of the Department's mission statement in the process.

8.   The Department needs to review all the current production equipment and make sure that some of the basic equipment is available. We did hear complaints about tripods and other accessories being broken, not useable, or too few available. Too often this is overlooked when purchase orders are submitted. It is recommended that all production faculty meet with the person responsible for the equipment room and review all the equipment. This needs to be a series of formal meetings. After that, a list of equipment would be created and prioritized.   This list needs to be reviewed whenever "any" funding becomes available. Tripods and accessories are necessary for solid productions and should not be overlooked. The Department is encouraged to look at creative ways to acquire some of these lower level purchases**,** perhaps through alumni fundraiser, or small grants from equipment companies.

9.   Improve the entry area of the Studio facilities, post-production facilities, and check-out room. Currently, when walking down the steps and into the basement from the outside, the area appears both dark and dingy. This may not be a Department issue, but may be a safety issue. Additional outside lighting would not only enhance the area but provide greater security for students entering from this entrance at night. In addition, the Department should meet with plant management to determine if a ramp or some other accommodation may help in the ease of loading and unloading equipment. Signage would also be beneficial. RTVF and Journalism production are in adjoining studios to each other in the library basement. Clear signage should denote that this is all part of the "College of Communications."

10.   The faculty needs to continue its well-conceived work on assessment. While the Department's five person committee has worked to realize the goals set forth in the 2002 Assessment Guidelines, more focused effort should be taken. A more formal process of using the assessment data for planning needs to be developed. We recommend that the assessment data be further developed and explained between now and the Department's next Self-Study. As an example, while the current Self-Study indicates that individual faculty use class assessment in teaching there is no explanation as to how they use it.   Assessment can be used both internally and externally. Strong assessment may help in external funding.

11.   Promotion. The Department needs to promote itself better. It is obvious that both students and faculty are proud of what they do. Two areas need immediate attention; (a) signage and (b) the Department website. The entire Department needs better signage, from the library basement facility to the 6th floor of the College Park Building. Second, considerable attention needs to be paid to the Department's website. RTVF has outstanding faculty. They not only are excellent instructors, they are also renowned in their field, having published books and journal articles, created documentaries and films, written and sold screenplays, and the list goes on. However, looking at the Department's website, no-one would know of the outstanding faculty that the Department has. This alone may assist in the fundraising for

equipment. Several of the graduates are working in the profession, but there are no "bragging rights" of the Department's alumni. This Department has a lot to celebrate, yet the Department does not promote its own. Two noted items were discussed during our visit. Professor Jacqueline Frost's upcoming book to be published this summer and the number of student films being premiered at the Newport Film Festival.   On the Department's website there is a photo of the students at the Newport Film Festival – but little is written about their accomplishments. RTVF needs to promote itself. It has earned the right to do so.

12. Alumni Survey. It would be extremely helpful as the Department matures to develop a yearly alumni survey. Just as we would have appreciated seeing faculty curriculum vita and representative course outlines, we were surprised that an alumni survey was not included in the Self-Survey. We feel that a well-designed survey would provide valuable data for the Department, indicating areas for development and affirming its many strengths.

13. The Department and the College Dean should create a long-term plan regarding building needs. Currently, the film and television industry as we now know it is undergoing a conversion to digital and a convergence with the Internet, the World Wide Web, and mobile media. There is no way to predict the future; however, it is important to stay abreast of the trends. It is obvious that over time, the RTVF Department is going to need a new studio facility as well as additional digital equipment. Under the current economic climate, we do not recommend moving forward advocating for a $ 50 million building. We recommend that the chair or an "ad hoc" Departmental committee go out into the Fullerton community and using the alumni or "angel" type database find a businessperson who owns a space that could be rented for a nominal fee. A warehouse or unused office building perhaps might be functional as an alternate soundstage for the Department. This way the sorry state of the economy can be an asset and not an impediment. Someone may have a space that they cannot rent and would be happy to work out an arrangement with the University for say a dollar a year (and a nice tax write-off). There would be some cost certainly to soundproof and so on, but it would be relatively inexpensive compared to building something, and such a space could be found and converted in months, and not years.

14. And finally…**WHAT'S IN A NAME?** Well, according to Shakespeare, not much, if you take him at his word about the qualities of a rose, but we feel differently about your name. New nomenclature would do nicely for the reconstituted, new, improved (and minus radio) Department. We think something like the Department of Film, Television, and Digital Media or the Department of Cinema and Television has a nice ring to it. Just a thought. (This latter name suggestion comes from Professor Short and not Professor Schaffer, lest you think she is trying to foist Northridge nomenclature on Fullerton.)