

**Department of Cinema and Television Arts  
(CTVA) California State University, Fullerton  
2024**

**Program Performance Review  
Bachelor of Arts degree, Cinema and  
Television Arts  
Master of Fine Arts degree, Screenwriting**

**Department of Cinema and Television Arts  
(CTVA) California State University, Fullerton  
2024**

**Program Performance Review  
Bachelor of Arts degree, Cinema and  
Television Arts  
Master of Fine Arts degree, Screenwriting**

**Section 1: CTVA Self Study**

**Section 2: External Review**

**Section 3: CTVA Chair's Comments**

**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 22, 2024**

In accordance with the guidelines and procedures for Program Performance Reviews for the 2023-2024 cycle, this self-study addresses the following seven topics:

- I. Mission, Goals, and Environment
- II. Description and Analysis
- III. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
- IV. Faculty
- V. Student Support and Advising
- VI. Resources and Facilities
- VII. Long-term Plans

The required appendices are also included.

**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.* According to the most recent CSUF catalog, the Department of Cinema and Television Arts (CTVA) has as its central mission creating “a comprehensive curriculum and active learning environment [that] prepare[s] students for meaningful careers in film and television.” This mission is reflected in department’s twin curricular foci: the creation of and the study of narrative, documentary, and experimental cinema, television, and other digital media.

*Goals.* Though their wording has evolved over the past eight years, the department’s student learning outcomes remain those outlined by the CTVA Curriculum Committee in 2016. They are:

demonstrate knowledge of historical, business, and cultural issues that inform current and future media environments;

apply theoretical and/or ethical concepts in a practical media environment;

understand the role of diversity throughout all aspects of American and global media environments;

write well-executed treatments, scripts, critical essays, and/or research papers, employing information literacy in the process; and

analyze and/or execute key elements of production.

These outcomes align with the department's seven core courses, an introductory industry history course (CTVA 100), a production pre-requisite course (CTVA 300), a critical studies course (CTVA 301 or 302), a narrative analysis course (CTVA 304), a media business course (CTVA 341), a critical writing course (CTVA 349), and an internship (CTVA 495).

And they, together, support both the university's broad mission of "cultivating lifelong habits of scholarly inquiry, creative and critical thinking, dynamic inclusivity, and social responsibility" and its specific "values" of promoting "the collaborative exchange of ideas through rigorous academic and creative activities" and encouraging "free expression, both as a right and a responsibility". Individual departmental and curricular student learning outcomes also align with a variety of university strategies for achieving these goals, including "building increased cultural competencies", "developing programs that provide a transformative experience for students", and "ensuring all undergraduates participate in at least three high-impact curricular or co-curricular experiences".

***B. Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes. Identify the external factors that impact the program (e.g. community/regional needs).***

***Media Convergence, Augmented Reality.*** The Internet, with its incalculable impact on our social and economic landscapes, continues to drive technological research and the form of digitized creative content, and now it has become the subject of significant critical analysis. In response to our ubiquitous media-saturated culture CTVA studies courses have introduced students to the scholarship focused on a wide range of topics, from mass-appeal content (cross-platform media franchises like the "Marvel Universe" and the "Disney Experience") to artist-based work in "expanded media" contexts such as gallery installation, livestream, and web-based pieces.

Virtual and augmented reality platforms, choose-your-own-adventure-style television series, and short form social media apps are all examples of emergent popular forms that evidence the broad trend of "intermediality", the breakdown of media-specific barriers to content creation, consumption, and study. This trend has been addressed in classes like CTVA 250 (Writing Short Scripts), which, when it was first implemented, required students produce traditional "short film" scripts but which now, cognizant of the trends towards multi-platform dissemination of content and of the plethora of short-form distribution formats (from webisodes to TikTok videos), treats a variety of structuring systems. Indeed, screenwriting faculty indicate the industry is undergoing a broad shift in emphasis towards both shorter forms, on the one hand, and more extended series, on the other. This shift has implications for the job market that newly trained screenwriters face – the proliferation of streamers has resulted in lower pay and fewer staff writing positions – and screenwriting faculty have equipped their students, especially those in the MFA program, with the information they need to navigate this reality.

***Artificial Intelligence.*** A related concern for faculty is the recent advent of generative AI. The Writers Guild of America, to which all CTVA's full-time and part-time screenwriting faculty belong, is ardently working on best practices for the use of AI. For the time being, MFA faculty have implemented a policy forbidding its use on student scripts. But they are collectively keeping tabs on the evolution of these best practices; and as they are adopted industry-wide, instructors plan to adjust their syllabi accordingly.

***Media Ecology.*** CTVA Critical Studies faculty also point to the rise of environmental justice (eco-criticism) as a recent trend. [Eco-criticism attempts to account for the impact of cinema and

media on the environment and to contemplate how AV media can serve environmental needs.] Two of them report incorporating units on ecology and cinema in their courses, and Professor Sheehan has written two essays in this subfield – one on Sharon Lockhart’s “Eco-Cinema” and another on “atmospheres” in contemporary experimental documentary.

**Diversity and Representation.** The problems epitomized by the #OscarsSoWhite campaign continue to dominate discussions of film and series programming.

Because of the unusually diverse make-up of the CSUF student body – 47% Hispanic, 22% Asian American, 4% mixed race, 2% African American – CTVA faculty have been especially attentive to the problems of mainstream media’s depictions of society. Longstanding courses in Diversity in Television (CTVA 305), Border Cinema (CTVA 369, cross-listed in Chicano Studies), and Topics in Film Theory: Race (CTVA 471T) have recently been joined by Queer Film and Television (CTVA 382). And many other courses – such as Critical Studies: Cinema (CTVA 301), Critical Studies: TV (CTVA 302), Children’s Television (CTVA 365), and all screenwriting and production courses – emphasize analysis of representation.

Our most recent tenure-track hires broaden our faculty’s diversity and underline its commitment to diversity. Professor Anthony Sparks holds a PhD in American Studies & Ethnicity at USC and has been nominated for four NAACP Image Awards and two Sentinel Awards from the Norman Lear Center. He was the showrunner for Oprah Winfrey and Ava DuVernay’s series, *Queen Sugar* and was recently honored, along with his wife, Anita Dashiell-Sparks, by the USC School for Dramatic Arts, which named part of its new complex of buildings “The Sparks Center for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion”. Professor Hunter Hargraves, our most recent television studies hire, focuses his research on popular culture that engages “uncomfortable” questions of race, gender, and sexuality. He also serves as an Affiliated Faculty for the Women’s & Gender Studies’ Queer Studies minor. Professor Mun Chee Yong brings her experience as a director of Asian dramatic and documentary television to her production classes. And Professor Nils Longueira Borrego will join the tenure track at CSUF in Fall 2024 as a result of an international search for a specialist in Latin American Cinema. He will join Professor Rebecca Sheehan in working with the College’s Latino Communications Initiative, an organization for which she’s hosted students at the Hola Mexico Film Festival, the Pedro Almodóvar Exhibition at the Academy Museum, the Lourdes Portillo Screening at LACMA, and similar events.

Other faculty have participated in Equity Pedagogy Modules and are currently experimenting with what they have learned there regarding best practices in grading and engaging all students.

With the explosion of streaming content, qualified production graduates are now increasingly working in narrative and visually sophisticated documentary production. And importantly, because of the pressures on industry guilds and studios to work towards more diversity in their crews and staff, CSUF’s CTVA department, with its majority-minority student body is in a unique position to serve Hollywood’s representation needs. This opportunity to simultaneously serve the community, the field, and our students cannot be stressed enough!

Preparing our students for the production job market, however, requires both resources and professional mentors. Resources (equipment and facilities) will be discussed below in section I.C and in detail in section VI.B.

Connecting production students to professional mentors has been a major goal of the department’s unique new series of three courses in Feature Film Production – CTVA 437: Feature Pre-Production, CTVA 438: Feature Production, and CTVA 439: Feature Post-

Production – courses funded by the Hollywood Foreign Press Association (now the Golden Globe Foundation) and by CSUF IRA grants. In these courses CTVA students work with professional producers, ADs, casting directors, location managers, cinematographers, gaffers, production designers, sound designers, editors, post-production supervisors, and many others to make an ultra-low budget (roughly \$250,000) feature film. To date we have completed one film, are awaiting release of funds to complete post-production on another, and are prepared to start a third once the University agrees to a workable protocol for the dissemination of the funding students have been granted. [See directly below, section C.]

This program, the only curriculum in the country in which undergraduates participate in the creation of a feature-length project, allows students to learn the most up-to-date techniques and protocols from highly skilled practitioners and to create valuable contacts with equipment rental houses, prop houses, studio costume departments, post houses, mixing studios, visual effects companies, and the like. In sum, the project bridges the opportunity divide, giving CSUF students – many of whom are first-generation college students and none of whom have access to the kinds of facilities they might have had at USC, Chapman, Emerson, CSUN, etc. – the opportunity to collaborate with professional filmmakers on a large-scale production.

***C. Identify the unit's priorities for the next three years (short term) and seven years (long term).***

The 2016 Program Performance Review suggested that the CTVA department's priorities included securing professional quality facilities, establishing a separate School of Cinema and Television Arts, establishing an Advisory Board, initiating an alumni tracking program, and improving our department's website.

Through the efforts of our department chair and former head of Paramount Television, Professor Hart, CTVA now has a strong Advisory Board which includes luminaries such as actor and producer Kelsey Grammer; former MGM studios president of television, Steve Stark; former global head of YouTube's original programming, Susanne Daniels; Paramount Pictures CFO, Mark Badagliacca; CAA literary agent Ava Greenfield; Amazon Studios casting executive, Ashley Banks; and others.

Unfortunately, however, not only has progress been stalled for the first two goals – the two identified by faculty as the most important: proper production facilities and greater autonomy – but more recent, production-related concerns are now occupying departmental energies.

Production courses are the curricular core of our department – student demand for them always exceeds supply. So it is not surprising that CTVA faculty responded to a survey by indicating that **re-vitalizing the department's production sequence** with funding for equipment, facilities, projects, and faculty is their highest priority.

The recent suspensions of two production faculty and the eventual settled separation from the University of one of them caused significant challenges to the production program. For three semesters (Spring 2023, Fall 2024, Spring 2024), the chair had to scramble to find adjuncts to take over several courses the suspended faculty members taught – including our core production workshops, CTVA 325 (Motion Picture Production 1) and CTVA 425 (Motion Picture Production 2). The substitute faculty, through no fault of their own, were ill-equipped to deal with unfamiliar facilities and University bureaucracies and with the special needs of our students. Further, three semesters of slapdash training in pre-requisites courses have had a ripple effect.

Students come to more advanced courses without the kinds of preparation instructors of those courses have come to expect.

Now, as a result of both the separation and the fact that another full-time production faculty member will retire this summer, production faculty will have fallen from a high of *six* in the mid-2010s to *one* at the start of the 2024-2025 academic year. And though a new tenure-track production search is underway, with a desired start date of January 2025, two is not six. Even critical studies faculty are deeply concerned about this situation. They understand that most of our students are not majoring in CTVA to take film history courses. Students want the small production and screenwriting courses that allow them to hone skills that will be marketable upon graduation. Without those courses, our overall student enrollment will inevitably plummet.

Further damage to the production program and its students resulted from the University's failure to provide a viable way for students in the Feature Film Production sequence of classes (CTVA 437-439) to access nearly \$250,000 in grants they had been awarded for the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 academic years. After two successful iterations of the series of courses in 2018-2020 and 2021-2023, the process of accessing the IRA funds that make up the bulk of the projects' budgets shifted from a *reimbursement* system to a *requisition* system. Instead of self-financing projects and filing for reimbursements, student crews and their faculty were asked to submit requests to the University to make payments to select approved vendors in advance and, once (or if) approved, wait for those requests to be processed through a time-consuming and cumbersome Contracts & Procurement bureaucracy.

When this system of accessing funds was first proposed in 2022, production faculty and the department chair made it clear that it was unworkable. Successful financing of a feature film relies on its producing team's ability to make thousands of budgetary decisions on a day-to-day basis, decisions based on the accomplishment (or not) of the previous day's work, actor availability, unpredicted adjustments to schedules, the weather, changes in equipment needs, etc. It is simply impossible to precisely plot all the details of complex production in advance with any certainty. The first feature project used over a two hundred different vendors and paid over a hundred actors and technicians. The University's plan, concocted by people who had no production experience, imagined crews could do their work through a half dozen vendors; and it offered no workable options for paying actors or technicians.

So, the faculty, the chair, and the financial officers agreed to pursue another path to securing the funds, one that mirrored actual independent production processes – depositing the grants into a short-term LLC and letting that temporary production company pay for production costs. But this plan has, so far, been thwarted by the University bureaucracy such that students in CTVA 437-439 have been denied a total of \$465,00 in grant money they have been awarded. That number includes \$270,000 in IRA funds and \$120,000 in Golden Globe Foundation grants allocated over the years 2022-2025 for the production of the third feature project, and \$75,000 of Hollywood Foreign Press Association grants allocated for the completion of the first feature project. It should be stressed that 100% of production and 90% of post-production on that first project have been completed – only visual effects work and a final sound mix are still required – and that by delaying access to the completion funds, the University is denying over a hundred students and actors a marketable IMDB credit on a feature film. All this represents an unmitigated failure to serve our students.

CTVA faculty outside of the production sequence report that they hear students in their courses this semester “regularly complain about the lack of access to equipment and high-impact production courses” and that students even express the wish that they had chosen to attend

another CSU because of the lack of administrative support for our program. One faculty tells of a student, a veteran with limited time to complete his VA-funded studies, who has been “very discouraged by the lack of full-time production faculty and of the advanced courses he had been led to believe would be available.”

Given all this, the CTVA faculty feel revitalizing its production sequence by adding full-time faculty, establishing workable ways of funding its capstone classes, and upgrading its facilities are its highest priorities. Details concerning facilities needs will be given in section VI.B below, but as one faculty member summarized them: the department needs to “relocate all of our production-related classes to a new campus location to provide classroom space, studios for single camera production, complete post-production facilities and a stockroom with a full-time technician who is a member of the CTVA staff”. Several others also note the need for additional production and post-production equipment, in order to mitigate student out-of-pocket rental costs, and for a state-of-the-art motion picture theater space with a 250-person or greater seating capacity. The current facilities are unquestionably inadequate for a program as large as ours.

**Publicity.** It is perhaps surprising that the CSUF CTVA program is not more widely known than it is. Its screenwriting faculty include prize-winning showrunners and veteran sitcom writers; its critical studies sequence, acclaimed cinema scholars and media authorities; and its production program, a unique series of courses in feature film production. Obviously, we need to do a better job drawing attention to this talent and these opportunities.

How we raise CTVA’s profile requires consideration. Hiring a PR firm that could use its expertise to advertise our strengths and trumpet our former and current students’ successes would be ideal. Offering one of CTVA’s faculty a course release to shepherd our current students’ best work into the public eye via festival placements, to create a space for helping budding scholars apply to graduate programs, and the like could enhance our reputation and generate additional excitement about the program among our students. Of course, establishing a separate School of Cinema and Television Arts would automatically increase our profile.

**Alumni Tracking.** Since the department does not currently have the resources to collect data with respect to our students’ post-graduation careers, evidence of CTVA students’ success is limited to that posted by alums on social media accounts and the self-reports individual students send to 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 became Head of Post-Production at Amazon Studios, or that Donald Li premiered his recent feature at the Shanghai Film Festival, or that Gavin Wynn, a camera operator on *It’s Always Sunny in Philadelphia* and (until its final season) *Modern Family*, had yet another feature film he shot accepted into Sundance, or that recent graduate Andrew Ducote directed a popular Taco Bell commercial ... or that ...

The CSUF CTVA department has placed grads in every Hollywood studio and television network, but it has not had the resources to keep track of them systematically. Providing the department with the means to contract a specialist in this area would allow us to more carefully follow our alumni’s careers and would likely also be a boon for fundraising for the department.

**Workload and Administrative Bloat.** As will be detailed below, faculty workload continues to rise. The College of Communications, unlike some of its sister Colleges in University, has not managed to reduce its faculty’s 4:4 teaching load, but rather, the eight sections most CTVA

faculty teach each year have increased in average size, resulting in concomitant increases in the amounts of time faculty must spend advising students and evaluating their work.

While student numbers have increased by 25% over the past fifteen years, CTVA faculty numbers have contracted. But more shockingly, according to recent *Orange County Register* and *San Diego Union-Tribune* reports, the number of administrators throughout the CSU system has sky-rocketed by over 33% during that time.

Ironically, the result of this administrative bloat has been, *not* the facilitation of the faculty's teaching mission, but additional work required of faculty members. Newly established administrative offices seem to justify their existence by requiring faculty complete a multitude of "trainings". The University's focus on assessment has necessitated the formation of faculty committees, attendance of their members at College- and University-wide assemblies, and the generation of pages and pages of plans, reports, and other documentation. And tasks that were formerly done by administrative staff members, like the completion of travel reimbursement forms and "absence reporting" and justification of grant expenditures and the like, are now tasked to faculty unfamiliar with the accounting acronyms and the constantly changing software programs required to complete them. One CTVA faculty member, for example, in order to report her conference travel expenses – a process that "previously involved my simply forwarding a couple of receipts to the CTVA Office" – re-counts sitting through a Concur training video, grappling for hours with the technical jargon of the various Concur forms she had to submit, responding days later to requests for corrections which necessitated re-watching the training video and re-submitting the forms, revising the forms a third time because the administrators who sent them back to her the first time noticed another problem they hadn't detected in their first review, and then waiting several months for her reimbursement.

In sum, faculty feel that a "corporate mentality" has set in in the University. They believe that "numbers are prioritized over students", that valuable resources are used to support a ballooning administration that too often serves itself rather than our students.

***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 Session self-support programs.

## **II. Description and Analysis**

***A. Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs and 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 and alignment of the requirements with the department's resources. In particular, please discuss how the curriculum and/or programming reflects the University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.***

The **Bachelor of Arts in Cinema and Television Arts** remains a 48-unit degree program, as it was in 2016. Eight years ago, however, 12 of those 48 units could be taken – but need not

necessarily be taken – outside the department, from a list of approved collateral courses in related fields of study. Today, all 48 units (16 3-unit classes) must be chosen from among the Department of Cinema and Television Arts' diverse range of 66 individual courses.

Since 2016 the department has added two courses to its “core” requirements, making a total of seven, and replaced a screenwriting workshop requirement with a broader narrative analysis course requirement. As before, CTVA 100 (Introduction to Cinema and Television Arts) gives students an overview of the discipline; CTVA 300 (Language of Film) introduces them to visual and aural design concepts and provides a gateway into more advanced production courses; students elect either CTVA 301 or 302 (Critical Studies: Film or Critical Studies: Television) to explore ways in which media make meaning; and in CTVA 495 (Internship), they develop their skills and understanding of industry operations through hands-on experience and networking. One of the two new core courses, CTVA 341 (Business of Television), introduces students to a series of industry professionals who elucidate the structure, function, and economy of the institutions that create and distribute narrative content. The other, CTVA 349 (Writing about the Moving Image), addresses, in relatively small, 20-or-fewer-person sections, concerns about the quality of student writing. And in place of the formerly required screenwriting workshop (CTVA 350, Story Structure), students now take a large-lecture course on the fundamentals of storytelling (CTVA 304, Film and Television Narrative: The Writer's Perspective).

In sum, the core requirements now consist of a broad introduction, a critical writing requirement, a capstone internship, and four courses, each designed to be large-lecture format, in each of the major areas of exploration within the department – production, critical studies, screenwriting, and business. CTVA 300 and 301 or 302 function as the pre-requisites to all more advanced production and critical studies courses, respectively. Students are encouraged to take those courses early in their academic careers, ideally before the end of their sophomore years, in order to take full advantage of the wide range of further offerings in those areas.

The department's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion is evident in both specific course offerings focused on DEI issues and in its re-tooling of other courses to raise awareness of this commitment. As mentioned above, courses like CTVA 305 (Diversity in Television), CTVA 369 (Border Cinema), CTVA 382 (Queer Film and Television), and 471T (Topics in Film Theory: Race) directly confront DEI issues. But faculty report that virtually all their courses, from cinema and television studies courses (CTVA 271, 272, 273, 361, 365, 372, 373, 374, 375, 377T, 512) to our core production requirement (CTVA 300) either include specific units on DEI-related topics or are broadly suffused with a concern to grapple with social justice questions.

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 other narrative-based industries. Students enter as “cohorts” and progress through a series of course offerings together. Of the fourteen required courses, twelve are devoted to screenwriting, one to theory and criticism, and one to history. All those are CTVA offerings. Students who earn an MFA in this program graduate with a portfolio of quality scripts and significant contacts in the professional screening community.

No new CTVA programs have been implemented since the last Program Performance Review, and no CTVA programs have been discontinued.

***C. Using data provided by the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, discuss student demand for the unit's offerings. Discuss topics such as over/under enrollment (applications, admissions, and enrollments), retention,***

***graduation rates for majors (FTF and transfer), and time to degree. Address equity gaps in retention and graduation rates.***

According to the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (OIEP) included in Appendix A, applications for admission to the CTVA program from would-be freshmen averaged 584 between 2017 and 2022, fluctuating from a high of 660 in 2018 to a low of 480 in 2021. Typically, just over half of the applicants were offered places in the freshman class, and 20-25% of those admitted chose to enroll. Perhaps the exigencies of the COVID pandemic are reflected in the low Fall 2021 applications number. If so, the movement towards recovery seen in the 2022 number is encouraging.

A similar trend is indicated in the numbers for upper-division transfer students. Applications for admission in this group averaged 380 between 2017 and 2022, fluctuating from a high of 472 in 2020 to a low of 347 in 2021. Half of the applicants were offered admission, and 30-35% of those admitted chose to enroll.

The application-per-year numbers seen in the last departmental Program Performance Review (2010-2014) were 47% higher than those in the first review (2003-2007). The most recent numbers, in Appendix A, suggest that, except for the COVID-year anomalies mentioned above, high demand for admission in the CTVA program has remained steady.

The ratio of freshmen-to-transfer-student enrollment is currently very near 1:1, again steady compared to the 2010-2014 numbers, and an improvement over the 2:3 ratio between 2003 and 2007.

According to the data provided by the OIEP and included in Appendix A, Table 3-A, departmental graduation rates for *freshmen* who entered the system between 2016 and 2019 were as follows: 46% graduated in four years or fewer; 68% graduated in 5 years or fewer; and 71% in six years or fewer. These numbers, especially the first, are significantly better than those reported in the last departmental PPR (26%, 51%, and 61% respectively) and those of the University as a whole between 2016 and 2019 (36%, 61%, 69%).

Aside: It is impossible, given the paucity of data so far, to interpret the “Equity Gap” numbers provided in Table 3-A. The OIEP has tracked information for only two freshmen cohorts so far (the entering classes of 2016 and 2017) and the result are mixed: the 2016 cohort’s gap was positive, and the 2017 cohort’s, negative. The University as a whole reported an equity gap of about 8% for all Pell grant recipients and Under-Represented students in 2018. The average equity gap of the two years of OIEP-provided data for CTVA majors was only 4%. So again, the department seems to have outperformed the University, but the numbers bear watching given how few data points we have at present.

As Table 3-B of Appendix A indicates, except for the years COVID most dramatically affected (2020 and 2021), graduation rates for CTVA *transfer students* were even higher than those for first-time freshmen: 49% graduated in two years or fewer, 76% graduated in three years or fewer; and 83% graduated in four years or fewer. As with first-time freshmen graduation rates, these numbers are significantly better than those reported in the last departmental PPR (with 63% and 73% graduating in three and four years, respectively; there were no numbers for two-year graduates during those years) and those of the University as a whole between 2016 and 2019 (40%, 72%, 81%).

All this clearly indicates that, despite its high-unit degree plan and its high number of upper-division pre-requisite courses, the CTVA department is successfully shepherding its majors through the requirements of their program and is a leader in student success for both first-time freshmen and transfer students.

While applications to the department's MFA program in Screenwriting have dipped a bit since the last Program Performance Review – between 2010 and 2014, the MFA program typically received about 35 applications per year, compared to an average of 29 per year between 2016 and 2022 – admission and enrollment numbers have remained steady, at 18 and 12 per year, respectively. See Appendix B, Table 5, for year-by-year details. Screenwriting faculty indicate that a cohort of 12 is optimal for the graduate writing workshops they teach.

Appendix B, Table 7 presents graduation rates for our MFA students. Typically, at least 80% graduate the two-year program in two years – again, the cohort most impacted by the COVID pandemic was the exception.

***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 A, Table 2-A shows that undergraduate FTES increased slightly (just over 3%) between the 2016-2017 and 2022-2023 academic years, from 378.8 to 390.7.

Student-faculty ratios, however, continue to climb upward dramatically. They ranged between 26.3:1 and 31.6:1 during the years under review and averaged 29.2:1. These numbers are somewhat misleading, however, since the OIEP statistics include in the FTEF one CTVA faculty member who taught no classes between 2016 and 2023. So, real student-faculty ratios over this period are just over 32:1. Distressingly, that is up 20% over the ratio in 2014-2015 (26.7:1) and a stunning 44% over the 2009-2010 ratio (22.3:1).

And despite the call (ACR 73) issued in 2002 jointly by the Office of the Chancellor, the Academic Senate of the CSU, and the California Faculty Association, for the CSU system to achieve its goal of 75% tenured/tenure-track faculty to 25% lecturer faculty by 2010, permanent-to-temporary faculty ratios during the period under review remained similar to the ratios throughout the department's history, about 60:40.

Graduate FTES, presented in Appendix B, Table 6, tends to be more erratic, fluctuating between a high of 53.75 FTES (2016-2017) and a low of 35.25 (2022-2023). The high number for 2016-2017 seems to be the anomaly, as all other years reported FTES of between 35 and 45. These numbers on average, however, are significantly higher than they were in the previous Program Performance Review (the *high* then was 21.375 FTES, in 2011-2012) and suggest that there is more than sufficient enrollment to “constitute a community of scholars” and to justify the continuation of the program.

***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.***

No major curricular changes are in the works in the department. But studies faculty report they hope to soon add courses with such topics as interactive media (including videogames), global

popular culture (television, but also music and social media cultures), animation, AI and cinema, and ecology and cinema. The MFA program, likewise, is considering adding advanced courses that engage "Narrative in Videogames and Interactive Media" and "World Building for Film, Television, and Other Media".

Production faculty are considering re-tooling the sequencing of their advanced courses. Currently, CTVA 325 (Motion Picture Production I) is the only pre-requisite for all further advanced production classes, including the capstone classes CTVA 425 (Motion Picture Production I) and CTVA 437-439 (Feature Film Pre-Production, Production, and Post-Production). Discussions about whether the skills-specific courses (Directing, Producing, Cinematography, Editing, Sound) should *also* be pre-requisites for holding skills-specific crew positions in CTVA 425 and 437-439 are in progress.

***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, timetable, etc.) and structure (e.g. committee, coordinator, etc.).***

In response to the continuing university-wide emphasis on data-based assessment, the CTVA faculty elected an Assessment Coordinator (Professor Osborne-Thompson) and an Assessment Committee (Professor Osborne-Thompson plus one or two rotating members each academic year) charged with collecting the data required to assess the degree to which the program 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 Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Since all departments are required to assess at least one learning outcome per assessment cycle, the Committee identifies a faculty member in both the BA and the MFA programs who is willing to assess one of their courses (usually in the Spring semester). The assessment chair works with them to put together a plan for assessing some aspect of the class (usually an embedded assignment) vis-à-vis the most appropriate student learning outcome.

Historically, faculty members have used direct assessment measures to determine how well the course is meeting the outcome. Once the assessment is complete, the chair works with the faculty member to report the data to the AMS database. The department receives feedback on this report from the OIEP Faculty Assessment Liaisons, feedback designed to help it improve its assessment practice for the next cycle.

***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 in 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 knowledge of historical, business, and cultural issues that inform current and future media environments;

apply theoretical and/or ethical concepts in a practical media environment;

understand the role of diversity throughout all aspects of American and global media environments;

write well-executed treatments, scripts, critical essays, and/or research papers, employing information literacy in the process; and

analyze and/or execute key elements of production.

A preliminary departmental assessment plan identified several courses through which each of these SLOs could be directly measured and suggested methods of assessment.

From among the nearly two dozen CTVA courses that support the first SLO – “demonstrate knowledge of historical, business, and cultural issues that inform current and future media environments” – CTVA 341 (Business of Television) was selected for assessment. Student learning was assessed by including 29 questions from a 50-question “pre-test” given on the first day of class on a 100-question final exam.

From among the nearly two dozen CTVA courses that support the fourth SLO – “write well-executed treatments, scripts, critical essays, and/or research papers, employing information literacy in the process” – the department’s UDW (Upper Division Writing) course, CTVA 349 (Writing about the Moving Image) was selected. Materials collected include 20 representative essays and the grading rubrics for each of the multiple semesters the course was assessed.

From among the CTVA production courses that support the fifth SLO – “analyze and/or execute key elements of production” – the department’s core requirement in production, CTVA 300 (The Language of Film), was chosen. In CTVA 300, SLO 5 was directly assessed by three photo assignments that require students illustrate design concepts introduced in the course (manipulation of space, tone, orientation of line, quality of line, tone, color, frame divisions, etc.) and conform to certain basic strategies of conventional image-making (focused shots, normal angles, level camera, consistent aspect ratio, etc). Data was collected on over 10,200 photos taken over four semesters, data that was analyzed in relation to the assignments’ grading rubrics. 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 like focus, camera levelness, angle, aspect ratio, and the like in the creation and organization of moving images.

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

demonstrate improvement in screenwriting fundamentals of story structure, dialogue, and character development;

increase knowledge of how role(s) of the writer have evolved over time in film and television; and

demonstrate the ability to create a plan for successful entry into the profession as a writer for television and/or motion pictures.

The first SLO – “demonstrate improvement in screenwriting fundamentals of story structure, dialogue, and character development” – was assessed in two courses between 2019 and 2023. Adjunct faculty member and director of the MFA program, Ben Sztajnkrzyer developed rubrics with respect to “narrative clarity” and “character development” and scored three different assignments in the two courses, one (CTVA 550: Story Structure) taken by students early in the program; the other (CTVA 580: Writing Project 1), the next year. Data suggest that 88% of students saw improvement in both areas, but that development was uneven and most students still struggled with one or more elements gauged by the rubrics.

***C. Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices, inform faculty professional development, and/or [support] overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.***

Assessment has resulted in adjustments to instruction. The data collected for CTVA 300 referred to above, for example, has been instrumental in the revision of the course’s teaching materials on frame and aspect ratio and on camera height, angle, and levelness. Where persistent student difficulties were identified, the instructor created supplementary modules that address them, with positive results. And according to Professor Sztajnkrzyer, screenwriting faculty are making substantial changes to the CTVA 550 syllabus as a result of the multi-year study referred to above that assessed their students’ mastery of “narrative clarity” and “character development”.

The recent focus on assessment standards has also influenced the evaluation of student work in classes that have not yet been subject to the formal assessment process compiled by the OIEP. 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 Assessment Committee, 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 G, sets out expectations for student projects in the areas of process, image production, sound, editing, and production design, 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 student learning and effectiveness/success (e.g. graduation rate, number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, community engagement/leadership.).***

As indicated in section II.C above, departmental graduation rates included in Table 3-A of Appendix A for freshmen who entered the system between 2016 and 2019 were significantly higher than graduation rates for freshmen university-wide – 46%, for example, of CTVA majors graduated in four years or fewer, compared to 26% of students University-wide. Similarly, graduation rates for CTVA transfer students exceeded the university averages by about 10 percentage points. MFA graduation rates are even higher (over 80%). All these are indirect indicators of departmental effectiveness.

And 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) or at off campus sites and in compressed schedules. How is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?***

Several of the department's core courses (300, 301, 302, 349, 350) are taught in both online and in-person modalities. And these same courses, since there is always student demand for them, have been taught through Extended Education in compressed Summer and Winter sessions. The department's Assessment Committee has done no formal assessment of either online or compressed schedule courses, but a couple of Professors offered their observations about the differences.

Analysis of student performance on two exams and two photo assignments in-person and online sections of CTVA 300 over a three-year period suggests a few divergences. On the creative projects (the photo assignments), the students in in-person sections performed, on average, appreciably better than the students in online sections, with a median score of "B" compared to a median score of "C". This was attributed to the greater ease of "back-and-forth" in the in-person setting, where students can interact with their instructor in real-time. On the other hand, the average online student scored appreciably better on the exam that tested familiarity with the dozen 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 scores of in-person vs. online students with respect to exams on lectures and textbook readings. But by far the most striking difference between the two modes of instruction was that fully 25% of the students enrolled in the online course did not even turn in the first two photo assignments! And 15% did not attempt the online exams. Only 5% of the students in the in-person section failed to complete those assignments.

Faculty report that student performance in Summer and Winter sessions, which require students do a regular semester's 15 weeks of work in just four or five weeks, tends, on average, to be *better* than that of the average student during the regular semester, presumably because those students take special session classes in order to speed completion of their degree requirements and therefore are motivated to get value from the relatively high Extended Education tuition rates.

**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 and the department's long-term goals. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor).***

In 2017, the first year considered in this Program Performance Review, the CTVA department consisted, according to the numbers provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and

Planning (OIEP) in Appendix C, of 15 full-time members: ten tenured professors, three tenure-track professors, and two lecturers, none of whom were in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). So, for 2017, the department's "Actual FTEF" (Full-Time Equivalent Faculty) was 15.

Currently, in Spring 2024, the department consists of 13 full-time members: eleven tenured professors and two lecturers. One of the tenured professors is on FERP, so the current "Actual FTEF" is 12.5.

Two more tenured professors will retire at the end of the 2023-2024 academic year and begin their FERPS, and a new hire in Latin American Cinema will assume his assistant professorship in Fall 2024. All that means that, both now and at the start of the Fall 2024 semester, the department will have 2.5 fewer (17% fewer) full-time faculty in its ranks than it did in 2017. Faculty report three major concerns about these numbers.

First, the decrease in FTEF while, at the same time, FTES is growing, is a major workload concern. Fewer full-time faculty are being asked to teach, and to shepherd in many other ways, more and more students. This problem is exacerbated by the onerous increase in non-classroom work administrators burden faculty with, including: a multitude of trainings; bombardments of emails, many of which are laden with technical language that requires time-consuming deciphering in order only to discover that they don't particularly concern the addressed CTVA faculty; accounting requirements previously tasked to administrative assistants (travel documentation and absence reporting among many others); etc. etc. As a result, faculty report significantly increased stress and burn-out, less time for their classes and scholarly or creative work, and a general fear of, distrust of, and antagonism towards administration.

Second, departmental tenure density is a concern. Currently, there are no tenure-track faculty. Everyone in the department is tenured. Faculty complain that the lack of "new blood" leads to stagnation. The failure to convert high adjunct faculty numbers into tenure track lines or even to maintain FTEF over the past seven years, despite increasing FTES, is debilitating.

Third, the CTVA production faculty, the faculty who teach the courses that most attract students to our major, has been decimated. As mentioned above, six of the 15 full-time CTVA faculty members in 2017 taught in the production program. At the start of the 2024-2025 academic year, the production faculty will be reduced to one full-time professor. Even if the search for a new tenure-track production faculty we hope to conclude before January 2025 is successful, the department will be working with fewer than half the number of production faculty it had during the first two decades of its existence.

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

CTVA needs additional full-time faculty in order to reduce class size, to meet permanent-to-temporary-faculty ratio goals, and to revive its production program.

The department has, as was addressed in section II.D above, an effective student-faculty ratio of 32:1. That is a staggering 33% higher than the University average class size of 24.1 reported in *U.S. News and World Report*. To reduce class size to the levels of the previous review period,

CTVA would need to hire an additional 1.5 full-time faculty; and to reduce it to 2010 levels, the department would need an additional four new faculty.

Currently about 40% of our courses are taught by part-time faculty. Just to meet the ACR 73 goal (see above, section II.D) of reducing courses taught by adjuncts to 25%, the department would need to convert adjunct lines into three new full-time faculty lines.

All this indicates the department needs three or four additional full-time faculty members.

Our top priority for new hires is, as indicated above, production faculty. Again, at the start of this review period, the full-time CTVA department consisted of four studies, four screenwriting, six production, and one business/industry full-time faculty. In Fall 2024, the department will consist of seven studies, two screenwriting, one business/industry, and only one production full-time faculty.

Low numbers of full-time production faculty are detrimental to our curriculum and to our students' successful acquisition of the skills and portfolio pieces that will enhance their career prospects. In Spring 2024, two-thirds of our production workshops (10 out of 15 sections) were taught by part-time faculty, several of them new to CSUF and teaching their courses for the first time; and in Fall 2024, a full three-quarters of our production workshops (9 out of 12 sections) will be taught by adjuncts. Because these production courses are tied together in a system of pre-requisites, it's important that the core among them be taught by faculty who know well the curriculum's organization and can prepare students for the more advanced courses. This is best done by a group of full-time faculty who have carefully plotted each class's goals.

So, though one new production hire is on the horizon, another two or three full-time production faculty are departmental priorities. Again, it is important to emphasize that CSUF is in a unique position to contribute to positive change in one of Southern California's biggest industries. As Hollywood institutions work towards greater diversity in front of the camera, behind the camera, in writers' rooms, in production offices, etc. CTVA's majority-minority student body, properly trained, can serve in media industries' equitable representation goals.

Secondarily, faculty report that other areas of teaching need include interactive media (videogames), global popular culture, and AI. A new hire who can contribute to covering these needs is also desirable.

***C. Describe the role of tenure line faculty, lecturers, and graduate/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 solely or primarily the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.***

Curricular decisions in the CTVA department are taken by the faculty as a whole, which meets regularly to discuss, review, and recommend adjustments to its academic offerings and to task the Departmental Curriculum Committee (DCC) with research on and deliberation of curricular questions. Individual full-time faculty may also propose new courses to the department's DCC, which then vets the courses and makes recommendations to the full faculty. But the decision about whether to send a course through the university approval system, *curriculog*, is taken only after all full-time faculty have had their says. While such discussions welcome input from part-time faculty, no curricular decisions are their responsibility.

As noted in Section II.D, permanent-to-temporary-faculty ratios during the period under review remain about 60:40, despite the aforementioned system-wide goal of 75:25. In 2024, full-time faculty taught 57 CTVA sections, and adjunct faculty taught 39 CTVA sections for a 60:40 ratio, equaling the review period averages.

It is worth noting, however, that all areas of CTVA are not equal with respect to permanent-to-temporary instructor ratios. In 2024, 89% of Critical Studies sections were taught by full-time faculty; 50% of Screenwriting sections were taught by full-time faculty; but only 29% of Production sections were taught by full-time faculty. This underlines the urgent need, elaborated in section IV.B directly above, for additional full-time production faculty.

No CTVA classes are taught by student assistants.

Short bios and a partial list of the truly remarkable scholarly and creative work accomplished by CTVA faculty since the last Program Performance Review are included in Appendix D.

***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 and the effectiveness of this advising structure. Describe the support from outside the department that is necessary for students to receive additional information they need.***

CTVA majors and minors have two avenues for advisement. The College of Communications' Student Success Center (formerly, the Advisement Center) provides virtual and in-person services to all undergraduates within the College. In addition to offering academic advising for General Education, major, and minor requirements, the Student Success Center conducts TDA (Titan Degree Audit) reviews, facilitates scholarships applications, performs career advising, and refers students to other advising resources and support services on campus.

CTVA students are also encouraged to consult any full-time CTVA faculty – and particularly those faculty with whom they share specific interests (sitcom writing, cinematography, Reality TV, etc.) – regarding the specific requirements of the degree program. Taking up the recommendation of the last set of external reviewers, the department, between 2017 and 2022, maintained its own advising office, staffed by Professor Monti, former and long-time Departmental Curriculum Committee chair. For a single course release, she assisted all CTVA majors and minors in planning their courses of study. The department's relatively high graduation rates (see section II.C) indicate that her advising proved successful. Recently, however, the course release that allowed her to function as the departmental advisor has been withdrawn, leaving students to rely increasingly on the Success Center.

Both Professor Monti and the department's internship coordinator, Professor Murray, point to problems with the current structure. The Student Success Center offers CTVA students advising "in the major" despite little knowledge of either the details of CTVA courses or, apparently, the best methods of navigating the system of pre-requisites in the major. Both faculty report that

students regularly indicate that Success Center advisors recommend they “*not* take 300-level courses until their junior year” or that they “complete their GE requirements before diving into advanced CTVA courses”, both of which strategies would slow student progress towards graduation. Faculty knowledgeable about the CTVA system of pre-requisites might recommend that even freshmen who are interested in pursuing production, for example, take CTVA 300, so they can then take CTVA 325 (the pre-requisite for all further production courses) in their sophomore year, leaving them four semesters to sample the department’s numerous advanced production workshops. It is important, according to Professors Monti and Murray, that a clear division of labor – CTVA faculty advise students regarding the major; the Success center, GE and general graduation requirements – be instituted and then well-communicated to students. Re-establishing the course release for a dedicated CTVA faculty advisor would also likely further improve graduation rates.

The current advising structure points, again, to a kind of institutional “corporate mentality” that consolidates personnel and decision-making in administration, away from faculty ... to the detriment of our students. Not only is advice about the major best given by faculty in the major, *but encouraging students to interact with faculty in their area of interest builds relationships that inspire further contact and collaboration and that effect an esprit de corps in the department and help faculty serve the needs of their students*, because they better know them.

The department also participates in annual, mandatory orientation sessions for freshmen and transfer students at which new majors are introduced to the CTVA course requirements and guided through the initial steps of the department’s informal production, screenwriting, and studies roadmaps.

All MFA students are advised by the program’s designated director, currently, long-time Adjunct Professor Ben Sztajnkrzyer.

***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 made available and accessible to students? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate any plans the department has for increasing these activities.***

*Internships.* All CTVA majors are required to complete at least one 150-hour internship during their junior or senior year. Because of CSUF’s 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, or on individual film and television productions. The list of regular internship sites includes Disney/ABC, Paramount, NBC/Universal, Warner Bros. Discovery, Sony Pictures Television, Creative Artists Agency, ESPN, the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Bunim-Murray Productions, Image Movers (Robert Zemeckis), and many others. Three recent CTVA students – Alana Delostrino, Amir Hajirnia, and Citlali Vazquez – have won prestigious Television Academy Foundation Internships, working in Unscripted TV, on “Star Trek”, and at Scanline VFX, respectively.

Sometimes, however, costs prohibit students from pursuing specific internship opportunities. The CTVA internship coordinator reports that some of her students get chosen for prestigious internships but then can’t afford the commute. And others, for example, were chosen for the American Pavilion at Cannes, but couldn’t afford the international travel expenses.

*Honors.* CTVA has no departmental honors courses, but, each year, CTVA majors include a dozen or more students who are participants in the University Honors Program, a program in which Professors Davis, Hargraves, Maloney, Monti, Osborne-Thompson, Selbo, and Sheehan have taught sections of their courses and advised Honors students' theses. One of Professor Hargraves' 2017 Honors mentees, Victoria Serafini, to cite just one recent success story, has just received her PhD in Media Studies from Cornell University. And Professor Osborne-Thompson has regularly served as a judge in the program's Outstanding Student Scholarly and Creative Arts (OSSCA) Awards.

*Other Opportunities.* CTVA students' interactions with film and television practitioners are not limited to their internships. CTVA faculty regularly convince notable industry professionals to make the 40- or 50-mile journey to Fullerton to guest lecture. Professors Hart's sections of CTVA 341 (Business of Television) are treated to weekly panels of distinguished industry practitioners who have been instrumental in the creation and distribution of narrative programming. And Adjunct Lecturer Mike Dillon's sections of the CTVA 102 (Inside the Movies) feature weekly guest filmmakers who present and discuss their recent work.

As mentioned multiple times above, three new high-impact courses in Feature Film Production (CTVA 437, 438, 439) offer students unparalleled levels of mentorship in production. The professional filmmakers who have donated their time or worked with our students for well under scale so far include many CSUF alumni, such as Aaron Lovell, former Head of Post-Production at Amazon Studios; Dylan Kirkland, location manager on dozens of features and television series (*Kill Bill*, *Hail! Caesar*, "Murder in the First", "True Detective"); Min-hsu Wang, winner of Taiwan's Golden Bell award in sound; and Gavin Wynn, a cinematographer whose credits include "Modern Family" and "It's Always Sunny in Philadelphia." Others – friends and former colleagues of CTVA faculty – who have worked with our students include Marissa Leguizamon, production designer on the 2018 big-budget series "Miracle Workers" starring Daniel Radcliffe and Steve Buscemi; Laurie Shearing, producer of a recent international co-production directed by Oscar-winner Bille August and starring Oscar-winner Hilary Swank, Helena Bonham Carter, and Jeffrey Tambor; and Emmy-winning sound designer Cormac Funge ("Breaking Bad", "Better Call Saul", "The Romanoffs", the *Star Trek* movies).

These courses give advanced CTVA production students the chance 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 significantly increased post-graduation career opportunities.

Projects recently produced by students in CTVA 425 (Motion Picture Production II) and 427 (Documentary Production) continue to play in national and international film festivals. "Matty Groves" (2021), for example, screened at the Hollywood Film Festival and the Newport Beach Film Festival and won a "Special Merit Prize" at the International New York Film Festival; "When a Honey Bee Stings" (2021) screened at the Paris Shorts Film Festival, the Santa Monica Shorts Festivals, and the Newport Beach Film Festival; "The Two Amys" (2023) played in several AMC theaters as part of the travelling DaVinci Documentary Festival; etc. And Chase Johnson, a recent CTVA graduate, won the 2020 ACE (American Cinema Editors) national student editing competition.

MFA graduates too, according to Professor Sztajnkrzyer, have gone on to win prestigious screenwriting contests, earn jobs in the entertainment industry, option and sell scripts, join television writers' rooms, enter PhD programs, and even teach screenwriting at the university

level.

## **VI. Resources and Facilities**

### ***A. Itemize the state support and non-state resources the program/department received during the last seven years (see instructions, Appendix E)***

Appendix E, Table 10 tabulates state budgetary support for the department during the past seven years. Budget allocations increased only 10% over that period, from to \$2,588,761 to \$2,861.977, after increasing 20% over the previous five years. Faculty/Chair salary numbers, Support Staff salary numbers, Part-time Faculty costs, and Benefits costs all rose at about the same rate, 10%, even though inflation over that seven-year period was 21%. Together those costs consume over 95% of the department's operating budget.

The appended budget figures do not include technology expenses since they, unfortunately, are processed at the College and University levels. Indeed, much of the small amount of discretionary money the Department ends up spending is not allocated directly to the Department, but to the College, which then directs it to the various departments only at the end of the fiscal year, contingent on the amount of leftovers in the College budget. This means that CTVA faculty never know how much equipment money (if any) they will have to spend, making planning impossible. Typically, production faculty are told in the last weeks of the 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 seven years and prioritize needs for the future.***

The external reviewers who evaluated our program in 2017 summarized their concerns about CTVA facilities this way:

Inadequate facilities is an item which was addressed extensively in the previous review conducted in 2009 and has only seemed to have become exacerbated since that time. ... The faculty are very aware of the limitations within which they must work and have committed significant sweat equity and their own time to addressing the limitations of the facilities as best they can, but there is only so much they can do to address the shortcomings of the current facilities without further resources and commitment from the College and University. ... [There exists] a repeated expression of frustration ... that resources and funding are not allocated to the CTVA department proportionate to their need.

Unfortunately, none of the concerns about production facilities, lab and stockroom personnel, and organizational bureaucracies that limited the growth of CTVA production offerings outlined in the last Program Performance Review have been sufficiently addressed over the past seven years. Acquisition of advanced production equipment continues to be a bright spot, but the maintenance of that equipment needs improvement.

As indicated by the list of departmental goals (see section I.C, above), replacing the inadequate facilities CTVA students work in continues to be a priority for the department. What thirty years ago was a small production-focused program now serves more than five times as many

students but controls no more space in which to train them. Equally distressing is that CTVA now has two *fewer* (which is to say, zero) dedicated technicians than it did thirty years ago.

The current production facilities consist of a small stage and adjacent control room (formerly, the CTVA “TV studio”), a 30-seat classroom, a 20-seat classroom, an equipment stockroom (shared with the Department of Communications), an office that has been converted into an audio mixing room, a 20-seat editing lab, and three small rooms off the editing lab used for sound recording and color grading and storage. All of these are housed in the *basement* of the Pollak Library, approximately 10-minutes’ walk from the 6<sup>th</sup> floor of College Park, where department offices and other classrooms are located.

**Stage and control room** (PLS, room 49). This space formerly housed TV studio equipment (three pedestal cameras, control room switchers, a post-production graphics computing system, etc.). It was, however, completely inadequate for studio work. Ceilings are significantly too low for overhead studio lighting, and noise from both the hallway outside the studio and the library above it *far* exceeds studio specifications. The space is also too small for a proper set or for a normal disposition of cameras in front of a set. So, as the department’s focus evolved away from broadcast and towards narrative, documentary, and experimental production, faculty decided to decommission the TV Studio and to use the space as a classroom – particularly for the Cinematography and Directing classes (CTVA 431 and 435) – and as an equipment demonstration area. The space is largely inadequate for those functions too. Significant ambient noise spoils directing exercises and makes sound recording in the space during normal operating hours impossible. The former control room adjacent to the stage is not currently used for any purpose.

**Classrooms** (PLS, rooms 61 and 68). Teaching space has been a continual frustration for our department. CTVA controls two classrooms in the library basement and has attempted to convert them into functional spaces, but they are regularly met with frustration – renovations are either said to be “structurally impossible” or the simplest ones can only be done, they are told, by University contractors at exorbitant rates.

Around the time of the last review, Professor Maloney spent weekends and evenings installing sound proofing and a surround sound system in PLS 61. This, along with an HD projector, has made it an adequate 30-seat space in which advanced video and audio production classes’ projects can be “screened”. These classes get priority access to the room, and then as many introductory CTVA 325 (Motion Picture Production I) sections as fit into its remaining available hours are slotted into PLS 61 as well.

Still, as a place to screen video projects, the room is not ideal. The large screen extends from the top of the wall down to a foot or so off the floor, making it impossible for those who are not sitting on the front row of desks to see the projected image without several classmates’ heads obstructing their views. The lack of sound isolation mentioned in relation to the former studio space above also renders *most* rooms in the library basement inadequate. In both the 30-seat classroom (PLS 61) and its 20-seat sibling (PLS 68), one can hear the stockroom manager on the telephone next door, the rumbling of carts in the library above, the instructor lecturing in the catty-corner classroom, and students shuffling down the halls.

PLS 68, home to our 20-seat classroom, is a decently sized space whose utility is completely ruined by a large support column in middle of it. The column awkwardly divides the space, so that all 20 desks are crammed into one half of the room. The other half, though technically also CTVA-controlled space, is currently being used to store overflow Communications Department

equipment and their stockroom's technological detritus. Polite requests that the space be vacated have so far been ignored.

Considering CTVA offers about 50 sections of courses each semester, having just three dedicated classrooms (PLS 61 and 68 and CP 126) is problematic. Since the HD-projection room in the library basement is 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" classroom on the first floor of College Park the department controls (CP 126) has been outfitted like most other smart classrooms on campus; it may be serviceable for projecting PowerPoint presentations but is wholly inadequate to screen materials for classes in film history or aesthetics. Our purposes require state-of-the-art projectors, control of ambient light, and proper speakers. Again, the University's one-size-fits-all mentality hampers CTVA's faculty's mission. Indeed, CTVA faculty were not even approached for their input prior to the IT-coordinated "update" of their classroom tech last year. This failure to consultation meant that all the newly installed equipment had to be removed from CP 126 and replaced at significant cost.

**Post-production labs and stockroom** (PLS, rooms 69 and 78). In 2010, CTVA procured space for contiguous editing and post-production audio labs. Then, in 2013, those labs and the CTVA stockroom and the personnel who oversaw the stockroom and lab, all of which the CTVA 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 production equipment) under the Division of Information Technology (IT).

This corporate-style re-organization meant that IT often "upgrades" computer labs with no warning, much less after consultation with production faculty. The result is that faculty suddenly find their class's computers not only include a bunch of software students do not need (and that some production faculty even actively discourage them from using) but also that carefully coordinated system have been modified in ways that wreak havoc on the programs faculty do require.

Even as the numbers of students using them have increased, resources for stockroom, stage, and lab management and for in-house equipment repair has dwindled. Thirty years ago, two dedicated technicians served the needs of our approximately 50 production students, troubleshooting studios, keeping labs functional, supervising student assistants in the then tiny stockroom, and repairing faulty equipment. Now a single person, assigned to IT rather than CTVA, serves four or five times as many CTVA production students PLUS a similar number of students from the Communications' Department's broadcast journalism sequence. As a result, repairable equipment languishes, and squabbles about who should pay for external repairs (IT or the College) delay the dispatch and return of advanced camera and lighting gear.

For years, students have lobbied for increased access – ideally 24/7 access – to the editing and post-production audio labs. Part of the reason the labs are underused is their uninviting basement location. But the fact that they are open only during limited weekday library hours, hours when most of our students are in class or working, but not after hours or on weekends, means there is little incentive for students to post-produce their projects on campus and thus to develop any *esprit de corps* that could result from working cheek-to-jowl in their own facility. Again, a corporate mentality prioritizes short-term efficiency over our students' learning experience.

**Color Grading Suite** (PLS, 69C). In 2018, Professor Maloney, in consultation with post-production personnel and cinematographers from Amazon Studios and Fox TV, used a one-

time windfall earmarked for equipment and software purchases to outfit a small room off the larger editing lab as a four-seat suite where advanced students in cinematography (CTVA 431), Motion Picture Production II (CTVA 425) and Feature Film Post-Production (CTVA 439) could color grade their projects. This involved licensing specialized software, purchasing and installing an industry-standard color-mixing board, calibrating specialized monitors, connecting all these to an array of high-capacity drives, and creating industry standard ambient lighting for the space. As a result, students can now post-produce their projects in a much finer way than they could using only their editing software's rudimentary color correction applications. Current production faculty, still, need to find ways to get their advanced students the kind of professional training with this system that would not only improve the look of their projects but also give them marketable skills. Professor Yong, when she teaches CTVA 425 (Motion Picture Production II), introduces her camera and lighting crews to color grading before they shoot, so they can make decisions on set that will facilitate the look they desire for the final product. But training in – or better, an entire course on – color grading from a more experienced practitioner would be preferred.

**Reames Family Mix Room** (PLS, room 62). In 2019, when Professor Maloney, along with adjunct lecturer John Hoffhines, convinced them that no advanced CTVA production could be taken seriously without a proper mix, the chair and the College's then Director of Development, Katie McGill, in turn convinced the family of a recent graduate to finance the transformation of an unused office space between the stockroom and the 30-seat classroom into an audio mixing room. On weekends, Professors Maloney and Hoffhines applied sound treatment to the walls and floor, installed a 5.1 mixing system, and calibrated the room. The next semester, the first CTVA 425 projects to boast a 5.1 surround mix were completed, and, in 2022, the second feature film project performed pre-mixes there. Students in the advanced audio production course (CTVA 410) also mix their projects in the space.

**Equipment.** CTVA production faculty understand that equipment and facilities are expensive. Though equipment funds for the department appear in a maddeningly sporadic fashion that discourages planning, production faculty believe they have been good stewards of the small sums granted them. For years, Professor Maloney, perennial chair of the Equipment and Facilities Committee, and the stockroom manager maintained a "shopping list" of the department's most needed resources. Presumably the new Equipment and Facilities Committee chair will continue that tradition. The current philosophy of the committee, and of the department as a whole, is to use whatever funds may come its way to purchase professional-quality gear for our advanced classes and to train introductory students on the previous generation's formerly "advanced" gear. So now, for example, CTVA 325 students light with our serviceable assortment of KinoFlo and first-gen LED fixtures; but only more advanced students can access state-of-the art Astera Pixeltubes and similar items. Indeed, since the last Program Performance Review, the department has expanded its collection of industry-standard LED lights, and we now have enough light heads to support a couple of modest capstone productions concurrently.

Standards in professional video cameras are constantly evolving. To facilitate advanced production courses (425, 431, 438) the department invested in, first, BlackMagic 2.5K cameras, then 4K cameras, and then the Arri Alexa Mini LF, with which the second feature project was shot. [The first was also shot with a high-end Arri camera, one donated to the production by Panavision.] Since the Alexa Mini was stuck in repair cost negotiation limbo last semester, Professor Yong, the new Equipment and Facilities Committee chair, organized a loan from Sony of their Venice camera – in fact, the same camera *Top Gun: Maverick* used on its production – for the Fall 2023 CTVA 425 class.

Currently, Sony cameras like the FX9 (6K) dominate non-fiction production, and Professor Yong was able to negotiate a loan of 12 Sony cameras – including several FX30s (“Super 35mm”, an entry level version of the FX9) and popular Alpha 7 IVs – as a kind of “pilot program” for use in CTVA 325 and 437 (Documentary Production). She reports that the CTVA 325 students easily adapted to working with Sony’s higher-end cameras and hopes to institutionalize this practice.

In sum, however, given the size of its production-emphasis student body, the CTVA equipment inventory is still rather meager. If loaners should dry up, crews in CTVA 425 have access to a maximum of two high-end cameras. This limits the number of projects that can be produced in that class and may have severe budgetary implications should one of those cameras go down. Also, when 425 students are shooting, other production students in 400-level courses may have access to *no* professional cameras and are either left with the functional but outdated equipment the department owns or are forced to rent. And CTVA camera kits do not always include the accessories – such as handheld rigs, external monitors, follow focus controls, etc. – considered essential by professional standards, making even the department’s best cameras difficult to operate without additional rental expenditures.

**Other.** Even though the last set of external reviewers “strongly recommended that the University invest in the program commensurate with the promise of high-caliber faculty and significant student interest”, none of the spaces the last Program Performance Review indicated were necessary to the proper functioning of a CTVA program have been acquired. So, we will simply re-print here those 2017 recommendations:

It may be useful also to consider what facilities CTVA needs, but does not currently have, in order to support our students properly. 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 capability. There is nowhere in CTVA-controlled space to store flats, set furnishings, and props, for example, and so we have none. And the CTVA equipment manager regularly navigates a maze of old, broken, and depreciated equipment piled to the ceiling in the small offices he also 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 critical studies classes. Top film schools like USC, UCLA, and NYU have their own theaters, but such

spaces are not particularly a luxury feature. [In 2016] CSU Northridge has two: the 130-seat Cinematheque and the 130-seat Arner Screening Room.

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 seven years and any specialized needs such as collections, databases, etc.**

CSUF's Pollak Library has a significant collection of CTVA-related materials, including over 2000 books and e-books on screenwriting – up from 800 just eight years ago, according to statistics tabulated for the MFA Screenwriting program. The library has also always maintained a sizeable collection of films on video. In 2016, the collection comprised of over 5000 films. The 800-plus DVDs purchased for use in CTVA 377T New Asian Cinema (CTVA 377T) represent one of the largest collections of contemporary Asian films on disc in the country.

Of course, the distribution of creative content has since transitioned from physical media to high-quality streaming video that gives students remote access to the library's "holdings". CTVA faculty praise librarians John Hickok, Keri Prelitz, and Lorraine Madrigal for managing that transition by maintaining a variety of streaming subscriptions (Kanopy, Alexander Street, others) and other offerings that allow them to deliver no cost materials to their students.

Still, faculty, especially those who teach popular media, regret that the University has not figured out how to get students permission to access the most subscribed-to streaming services (Netflix, Hulu, Disney+, HBO, etc.) for educational purposes. Some also lament the unpredictable availability of content on the streaming services to which students *do* have access. Films offered on X platform one semester often disappear in the middle of the next, leaving faculty to scramble to find ways to make assigned screening materials available to students.

## **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 instructions, Appendix F).**

*Student Success.* Aside from the data-based assessment of the CTVA department's student learning goals outlined above (see section III), indicators of the quality of student learning include their matriculation to graduate schools, their acquisition of jobs in the film and television industry, placement of projects in regional, national, and international festivals, awards, etc. It is important to implement the alumni tracking plans listed among the department's priorities above (section II.C) in order to properly assess the degree to which the program is achieving its mission of "preparing students for meaningful careers in film and television."

Though the department will continue to hone its curriculum and advising to assure timely student graduation, graduation rates in CTVA already exceed those of the University as a whole (see section II.C above). More pressing is the need to deflate the current 32:1 student-to-faculty

ratio in CTVA classes (see section II.D above), in order to give students a learning experience more tailored to their needs.

*Faculty Excellence.* The rigorous scholarly and/or creative productivity requirements faculty must meet for tenure and promotion are codified in the department's Personnel document. The fact that the vast majority of CTVA faculty have been rated not just "satisfactory" (meeting the requirements) but "excellent" in this area indicates that their work has had significant impact in the field. See Appendix D for a list of faculty scholarly and creative achievements.

Of course, the likelihood of a meaningful student-faculty mentor relationship is enhanced by a lower student-to-full-time-faculty ratio. So, converting part-time faculty lines to full-time ones and lowering the overall student-faculty ratio is imperative ... and is easily assessable. The near-term priority is for multiple additional full-time production faculty, but full-time screenwriting faculty are also needed.

*Goal Assessment.* The production concerns summarized above (section I.C) as the department's principal priority directly affect student learning. Student achievement in motion picture production is contingent on the students' ability to learn and practice their chosen crafts, which in turn requires they have access to quality mentors, equipment, and facilities. It will be easy to assess whether our capstone production classes (CTVA 425 and 437-439) have been adequately funded and whether state-of-the-art equipment and facilities are available to students. Without this funding and infrastructure, students will find it more difficult to acquire the skills that might make them marketable or to create the projects that could enhance the reputation of the CTVA program and improve the morale of both students and faculty.

***B. Explain how each long-term plan implements the University mission, goals, and strategies, as well as the unit's mission and goals.***

The priorities listed in section I.C above support the University Mission, Goals, and Strategies (UMGS) in several important ways.

**Revitalizing the production program** by assuring adequate capstone funding and securing professional quality facilities will

"foster [students'] development of durable skills [and] facilitate student mastery of program learning outcomes" (University Objective 1.2.1),

"create high-impact experiential learning opportunities that enhance student learning experiences and outcomes, and prepare them beyond degree completion" (University Objective 1.2.3),

"expand early and ongoing career guidance and support to enhance student post-graduation success" (University Objective 1.3.5),

allow students to "work with ... community partners, including alumni, to develop and implement signature experiences" (University Objective 2.1.1),

"expand and enhance student engagement opportunities to foster a sense of belonging and "Titan Pride"" (University Objective 2.1.2), and

“implement the necessary infrastructure, including resource and staffing support, to facilitate the increase of [creative] research capacity” (University Objective 4.3.1).

**Boosting departmental publicity will**

“increase [the likelihood of] fundraising at all levels of the university (university, division, college, and department)” (University Objective 4.2.2) and

“establish Cal State Fullerton as a champion for at least one major issue facing the region” [specifically, equal access in the film and television industry] (University Objective 4.4.4).

**And initiating an alumni tracking program will**

“improve the alumni tracking database to facilitate targeted alumni outreach for appropriate university units” (University Objective 4.4.1) and

“increase accessible alumni mentoring and networking opportunities for students” (University Objective 4.4.2).

***C. Explain what kinds of evidence will be used to measure the unit’s results in pursuit of its goals, how it will collect and analyze such evidence, and the timeline against which progress toward those goals will be measured.***

The evidence required to measure the department’s progress towards its goals, like those extremely practical goals themselves, is rather straightforward.

The *revitalization of the production program* will be measured by progress made in addressing the concerns mentioned in section I.C above.

First, the number of full-time production faculty should be increased from one (at the start of the 2024-2025 academic year) to at least four (by the start of the 2027-2028 academic year). Ideally, the department will be able to identify and appoint two quality faculty at the end of the current search and to make another hire no less than two years later. Achievement of this goal will be measured by counting the number of production faculty.

Second, current levels of funding for Motion Picture Production II (CTVA 425, \$40,000 per year) and the Feature Film Program (CTVA 437-439, \$250,000 every two years) should be, at minimum, maintained, and a viable (viable for production students and faculty) method of accessing those funds must be implemented. Achievement of this goal will be assessed by totaling the funds spent by (and not just allocated to) students in these courses.

*Securing state-of-the-art facilities* is one of the department’s perennial goals. Measurable steps towards realizing this need were outlined in the last Program Performance Review: 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. The first four steps have been largely achieved – Professor Hart commissioned plans and a budget for the build and identified a possible space for it – but the exigencies of COVID derailed fundraising efforts.

A successful *boosting of departmental publicity* requires identifying and funding a departmental outreach point-person, someone who can work in collaboration with University Public Relations specialists to advertise our students' and our faculty's strengths and to place our students' best work in festivals and other distribution streams.

The goal of *initiating an alumni tracking program* includes the following measurable steps: appointing and funding a departmental alumni tracking coordinator; working with faculty, staff, and 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; and organizing and periodically sending all graduates a CTVA newsletter.

***D. Describe the resources (internal and external) that may be necessary, available, and/or attainable to meet the unit's priorities. Describe new funding that may be needed to maintain educational quality. Discuss the appropriate balance between state-supported and external funding. Discussion in this section should address the needs identified in areas I-VI above, with the understanding that the ability to meet strategic goals depends on available resources.***

Since over 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 sizeable chunk of the remainder, it is difficult to fund any project that requires moneys in excess of \$10,000 through internal reallocations, as there are simply too few discretionary dollars.

The team of external reviewers who conducted the last PPR "strongly recommended that the University invest in the program commensurate with the promise of the high caliber faculty and significant student interest." They reminded administration that "Film and TV production are SoCal-based industries the University is well placed to participate in serving. Faculty and students are here, but the University has failed to follow through in providing the minimum required resources and facilities necessary to support the program. Significant capital investment and ongoing support is required and appropriate."

Some of the departmental priorities listed above require no additional funds. Financing the Feature Film Production Program, for example, is possible using annual grants from the Golden Globe Foundation and the IRA Fund. All that is required in this instance is the will on the part of the University to make those funds accessible to the production.

And our goal of reducing workload could be speeded along by giving the department autonomy to determine that workload. Allowing the CTVA chair, in consultation with the faculty as whole, to negotiate class size would, we believe, allow him or her the chance of effecting a 3:4 workload for his studies and screenwriting faculty without reducing FTES.

Other goals require University resources. Hiring consultants to boost our regional and national profile or to professionally track our students in their post-graduation careers entails costs, but it also likely leads to increased access to funding from both grants and donations.

Adding full-time production (and eventually other) faculty to mitigate rising student-faculty ratios and to re-balance the distribution of faculty among the various CTVA subfields will obviously also require state funds. We believe the University should work, however, to re-calibrate its

broad thinking about personnel needs. It should prioritize student learning through more meaningful interaction with faculty who are less distracted by demands from increasing numbers of faceless administrative officers for work faculty are not competent to perform.

Upgrading and maintaining equipment, in order to mitigate student out-of-pocket rental costs, is always a priority for a production program. At present, through aforementioned loan agreements (Professor Yong's deal with Sony), individual faculty sweat and after-hours facilities build-outs (Professor Maloney's outfitting of the Mix Room and Color Grading Suite), and end-of-year allocations, we have been able to provide our advanced production students with access to professional-level gear. We are now working on securing donations from individual alumni who have explicitly expressed a desire that their contributions be targeted to the production program, but state funding needs to reach levels that guarantee students access to functioning equipment and post-production labs.

Of course, the goal of acquiring a new set of facilities, elsewhere on campus, that could serve as a "home" for CTVA is one that would require a great deal of development money. 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 and 100 million dollars today. Professor Hart has worked – with Advisory Board members Kelsey Grammer and others – to put together plans for such a "School of Cinema and Television Arts" and has begun to campaign for extra-institutional financial partners. A willingness on the part of the University-system to participate in financing a School that could help transform Hollywood by giving CSUF's majority-minority student population the training it needs to secure significant roles in the television and film industries should be, we think, a given.

## APPENDICES TO THE SELF-STUDY

### APPENDIX A. UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

TABLE 1-A. First-Time Freshmen:

Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2016	12	11	83
2017	608	267	60
2018	660	252	71
2019	627	304	64
2020	604	403	86
2021	480	293	47
2022	521	373	65

TABLE 1-B. Upper Division Transfers:

Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2016	24	6	64
2017	347	128	59
2018	364	139	56
2019	432	168	51
2020	472	291	92
2021	347	210	53
2022	318	211	78

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

Undergraduate Program Enrollment by Course-Based FTES

Academic Year (Annualized)	Enrollment in FTES		
	Lower-Division FTES <sup>1</sup>	Upper-Division FTES <sup>2</sup>	Total FTES
2016-2017	84.7	294.1	378.8
2017-2018	92.9	319.6	412.5
2018-2019	99.5	301.9	401.3
2019-2020	85.9	302.6	388.5
2020-2021	70.8	319.8	390.6
2021-2022	72.9	295.6	368.6
2022-2023	60.9	329.8	390.7

<sup>1</sup> All students' FTES enrolled in lower-division courses of the program, regardless of student major.

<sup>2</sup> All students' FTES enrolled in upper-division courses of the program, regardless of student major.

TABLE 2-B. Undergraduate Program Enrollment (Headcount &amp; FTES by Major Only)

Academic Year (Annualized)	Majors						
	Lower-Division		Upper-Division (Including Post-Bac & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Bac)		Total		
	Headcount	FTES <sup>1</sup>	Headcount	FTES <sup>2</sup>	Headcount	FTES <sup>3</sup>	FTES per Headcount
2016-2017	200	178.3	442	351.1	642	529.3	0.83
2017-2018	164	152.8	445	363.3	609	516.1	0.85
2018-2019	162	151.7	438	352.4	600	504.2	0.84
2019-2020	149	138.8	432	358.6	580	497.4	0.86
2020-2021	160	148.9	412	338.7	571	487.7	0.85
2021-2022	146	130.3	388	302.0	534	432.3	0.81
2022-2023	137	125.9	400	317.3	536	443.2	0.83

<sup>1</sup> FTES of the lower division students who are majoring in the program.

<sup>2</sup> FTES of the upper division students who are majoring in the program.

<sup>3</sup> FTES of all students who are majoring in the program.

TABLE 3-A. First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen Graduation Rates

Entered in Fall	Cohort	% Graduated			Equity Gap*	
		In 4 Years	In 5 Years	In 6 Years	By Pell Status	By UR Status
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	81	37.0%	61.7%	64.2%	5.3%	9.4%
2017	58	56.9%	75.9%	77.6%	-15.7%	-17.2%
2018	71	43.7%	64.8%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2019	62	46.8%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*Note: Equity gap is calculated as the percentage point difference in six-year graduation rates between two sub-populations of each cohort year (e.g., 2012 non-UR six-year graduation rate – 2012 UR six-year graduation rate). Please consider cohort sizes when interpreting the equity gap data.

TABLE 3-B. Transfer Student Graduation Rates\*

Entered in Fall	Cohort	% Graduated		
		In 2 Years	In 3 Years	In 4 Years
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	64	45.3%	78.1%	84.4%
2017	59	52.5%	81.4%	86.4%
2018	56	48.2%	76.8%	82.1%
2019	51	51.0%	68.6%	78.4%
2020	92	29.3%	53.3%	N/A
2021	54	35.2%	N/A	N/A

\*Note: Starting with the Fall 2019 cohort, both state-support and self-support matriculated students are included in the cohorts.

TABLE 4. Degrees Awarded

College Year	Degrees Awarded
2016-2017	161
2017-2018	163
2018-2019	191
2019-2020	182
2020-2021	174
2021-2022	146
2022-2023	145

## APPENDIX B. GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

TABLE 5. Graduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2016	27	16	15
2017	22	14	10
2018	27	20	12
2019	30	19	12
2020	33	22	13
2021	31	15	10
2022	33	16	11

TABLE 6. Graduate Program Enrollment by Headcount and FTES

Academic Year (Annualized)	Headcount	FTES	FTES per Headcount
2016-2017	63	53.75	0.85
2017-2018	53	45.75	0.86
2018-2019	46	37.50	0.82
2019-2020	48	40.75	0.85
2020-2021	47	40.75	0.87
2021-2022	48	41.75	0.87
2022-2023	40	35.25	0.88

TABLE 7. Graduate Student Graduation Rates

All Master's Entered in Fall:	Cohort	% Graduated		
		In 2 Years	In 3 Years	In 4 Years
2015	17	82.4%	88.2%	88.2%
2016	15	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%
2017	10	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2018	12	75.0%	83.3%	83.3%
2019	12	66.7%	75.0%	75.0%
2020	13	84.6%	84.6%	N/A
2021	10	100.0%	N/A	N/A

TABLE 8. Master's Degrees Awarded

College Year	Degrees Awarded
2016-2017	30
2017-2018	21
2018-2019	35
2019-2020	21
2020-2021	33
2021-2022	31
2022-2023	19

## APPENDIX C. FACULTY

Table 9. Full-Time Instructional Faculty

Faculty Composition<sup>1</sup>

Fall	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Sabbaticals at 0.5	FERP at 0.5	Full-Time Lecturers	Actual FTEF
2016	9	2	0.0	0.0	1	12.0
2017	10	3	0.5	0.0	2	15.0
2018	10	3	0.0	0.5	1	13.5
2019	12	1	0.0	0.5	2	14.5
2020	13	1	0.0	0.5	2	15.3
2021	13	0	1.5	1.0	2	14.2
2022	12	0	0.5	1.0	2	13.2

<sup>1</sup> Headcount of tenured, tenure-track, sabbaticals at 0.5, and FERP at 0.5 includes full-time and part-time faculty. Headcount of lecturers only includes full-time faculty, as consistent with the IPEDS HR definition. It does not represent the number of full-time lecturer lines assigned to the department.

## APPENDIX E. 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.
2017	1,177,644	45,104	17,364	428,325	0	0	839,321
2018	1,178,527	45,948	17,144	489,327	1,200	0	895,020
2019	1,188,167	47,328	14,446	503,441	450	0	950,066
2020	1,311,051	47,923	0	438,766	0	0	975,976
2021	1,232,534	48,802	4,912	494,629	0	0	874,803
2022	1,195,067	46,924	71	451,339	0	0	894,329
2023*	1,379,023	50,744	12,808	466,700	0	0	916,975

→

Fiscal Year	Operating Expenses	Other	Total Budget*	Total Expenditures	Over / Under Budget	Percentage Over / Under Budget
2017	46,254	34,749	2,588,761	2,571,946	16,815	0.6%
2018	23,593	31,838	2,682,597	2,663,138	19,459	0.7%
2019	20,098	17,825	2,741,821	2,730,953	10,868	0.4%
2020	8,009	65,093**	2,846,818	2,927,601	(80,783)	-2.8%
2021	20,321	112,950**	2,788,951	2,693,721	95,230	3.4%
2022	27,396	18,004	2,633,130	2,645,886	(12,756)	-0.5%
2023*	20,457	15,270	2,861,977	2,808,345	53,632	1.9%

\* Total expenditures for 2023 are projections

\*\* COVID Pandemic Relief funds (HEERF)

## APPENDIX F. LONG-TERM PLANNING

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

The data included in the appendices shapes the department's priorities and goals in at least the following ways.

Aside from dips during the COVID years, overall student numbers, both headcount and FTES, suggest the department is still expanding and warrants its own professional facilities and possibly its own "school". Securing professional-quality facilities will undoubtedly further enhance student demand. Indeed, prospective students who visit CSUF now are often put off by production facilities inferior to those they had in high school and community college.

Similarly, increasing publicity for the department and alumni tracking should, in the long-term, bolster both applications to the program and the currently small percentage of admitted students who eventually matriculate.

Since the desire to enroll in its production courses is the principal driver of student interest in the CTVA department, re-vitalizing the production program through additional full-time faculty hires and workable funding strategies for its capstone courses, especially the unique-to-CSUF Feature Film Program, is essential.

The goal of reducing full-time faculty workload from 4:4 to, in the near term, 3:4 and eventually to 3:3 seems within reach, if the University begins to prioritize teaching over administration such that a few additional faculty lines become available.

## APPENDIX G. ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR CTVA 325

Name \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT 1 2 3 Title \_\_\_\_\_

category	pts	basic score		deductions		deductions
<b>process and presentation</b>	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
<b>screen shots</b>	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
<b>image production</b>	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
<b>sound</b>	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		
<b>coverage</b>	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
<b>editing</b>	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		
<b>location</b>	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
<b>production design</b>	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
<b>costume</b>	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
<b>casting and performance</b>	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
<b>tone</b>	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
<b>extra credit</b>		Director shows effort far beyond normal classroom work, stretches his or her ability.				
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>out of 200</b>				