1. **Student Learning Outcomes for the program.** List the Student Learning Outcomes for the program. *Number for later reference.*

1.) Collaboration – The ability to direct a theatrical production by working with a team that includes actors, designers, stage manager, and all attendant areas.
2.) Knowledge of Dramatic Literature – An understanding of the basic world canon of dramatic literature including emphasis on Shakespeare, Restoration, Eighteenth Century, Modern, and Contemporary plays.
3.) Directing of plays/productions – students will be able to direct plays in all theatrical genres. Ability to utilize the basics (staging, blocking, composition, pace, tempo, rehearsal scheduling, working with actors, etc.) in directing.
4.) Theatre History – knowledge of the progression of Theatre from the Greeks to the present.
5.) Play structure and analysis – ability to analyze plays. Understanding of various genres. Understanding of major theories and criticism.  
6.) Professional Preparation – Ability to present themselves as prepared professionals through an understanding of producing, budget planning, union requirements, reality of the workplace, and adjunct areas (media) in which directors might find employment.  
7.) Research – Ability to research specific plays and historical eras. Ability to determine reasons for successes and failures of past productions. A sense of a play’s importance to the era in which it was written and in a contemporary context.  
8.) Acting methods/techniques – Ability to work with actors trained in a variety of acting training methods.  
9.) Visualization and setting – Understanding of the effect and contributions visual climate and sound make to a production.  

2. Planned assessments: Methods, Instruments and Analysis. According to the Assessment Plan for this program, what were the planned assessments to be conducted during the Spring & Fall 2011 Academic Semesters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument (e.g., survey, exit exam)</th>
<th>Learning outcome(s) assessed (list by #)</th>
<th>Expected Measures (results that would indicate success)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for Each Directing Assignment</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>Each student submits proposals for plays they wish to direct. Proposals include: Historical background; concept for production; “fit” within a season; how the production benefits them, specifically as a director. Proposals are evaluated by: the Advisor, Artistic Director; Producing Director; Season selection committee (faculty); and, Directing committee. The proposals require research and effort. The proposal demonstrates the students understanding, or lack thereof, of the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Productions Directed/Directing Assignments</td>
<td>All outcomes</td>
<td>During the production process the student meets weekly with their production (directing) advisor to discuss progress. The student also meets with discrete design/technical faculty. Following the close of a production each student organizes an open forum to which all faculty are invited. The student receives feedback directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Semester Review</td>
<td>All outcomes</td>
<td>Each student meets for evaluation by the Directing Faculty. Their progress in actual directing, as well as, their growth as directors in classes which they are enrolled is discussed to assist in identifying areas which need attention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rehearsal Visitation/Directing Assignments | 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 | The faculty member assigned to advise a specific production attends rehearsals at least weekly. The faculty member offers immediate feedback on the director’s progress.  
The student must report in a weekly meeting with the Directing Coordinator (who also attends rehearsals) to determine if the production is progressing as planned. All elements are discussed.  
Design Faculty visit rehearsals to determine the student’s use of scenic elements. |
| Weekly Meetings with Directing Coordinator | All outcomes | Students and the coordinator meet to discuss courses and any directing assignment. This provides up to the date information on how all outcomes are being achieved. One student, for example, in Fall 2011, changed a directing proposal to a different play which would offer them experience in new/uncomfortable genre. |
| Outside Employment/Opportunities | All outcomes with emphasis on 6. | Students are expected to pursue directorial assignments outside of the University.  
Both students found such opportunities. One served as an Assistant Director for a professional production. The other directed an original play for an out of state playwright who wished their work viewed in Las Vegas.  
In both cases the outside persons reported the students were professional, knowledgeable, and assisted the quality of the work. |

### 3. Results, conclusions and discoveries.
What are the results of each planned assessment listed above? Is the outcome at, above, or below what was expected? What conclusions or discoveries do you draw from the results? Describe below or attach to the form.

Both students in this program completed directing two fully realized productions in 2011. The emphasis in this first year was on exposure to directing plays in genres/era they were not accustomed to working.

One student directed Miss Julie, a most difficult play for even advanced directors. This required a tremendous amount of research and thorough investigation of ways actors approach character. The production was judged by an overall success by most faculty. However, it was noted the Director needed more self-confidence in actually staging and working with actors.
The second student directed The Taming of the Shrew. This forced this director to deal with “style” in a period piece and the use of verse. As a piece of entertainment it was reported the play “worked.” However, the student was encouraged to seek additional training in use of verse. As a consequence the student enrolled in the graduate acting (Shakespeare) course.

The faculty agreed that both were outstanding graduate directing students. So much so that both were invited to direct two productions in the 2012-2013 season.

It is also evident that the requirement that these students enroll in graduate Dramatic Literature courses and Design courses is providing benefits. Both are much more conversant in those areas than in their first year.

4. Use of results. What program changes are indicated, and how will they be implemented? Include a description of who will review and act on the findings. If none, describe why changes are not needed.

Unlike some areas a director cannot “re” direct a play. Thus, immediate feedback prior to, and during, rehearsals has proved most valuable. Students are advised by faculty prior to rehearsals what areas might be of most concern to a director. Most of the time the advice is heeded/taken. When a student makes as artistic course contrary to advice they are not stopped. However, students, during the postproduction critique, are questioned on their choices. This has proven very helpful.

There is also an increased emphasis on preparation. The students routinely begin work on the script six months prior to production. They are aware this is a luxury not often afforded in the professional world and treat this as a true learning experience.

We have also learned it is very important that faculty members/advisors be involved in the developmental stage, particularly when other graduate students may be serving as designers/technicians on their MFA projects. This does away with “ego” problems and stresses the importance of collaboration.

5. Progress. Describe program changes that have been recommended in past reports. What progress has been made since the recommendation?

The MFA in Directing has undergone significant change in the past two years including the rewriting of the suggested course of study. The new Coordinator wrote a new curriculum that is significantly more detailed than the previous. The previous curriculum was ambiguous as to required course work, awarding of directing assignments, and assessment of students. Faculty were critical of the previous MFA students. It was felt they were not well advised or supervised.
The new procedures requires feedback to students each week. Students share, with the Coordinator and each other, the work they are doing in other courses. Each student has an assigned faculty advisor for each production. Students are strongly encouraged to propose plays, as already noted, in areas where their talent, skill, and expertise has yet to be tested. Students are now required to enroll in design/technical courses so that they better understand the artists with whom they must collaborate with.

Faculty are generally pleased, now, with the two students as evidenced by their directing assignments.

The assessment process has changed in that the students are assessed nearly weekly on all areas. Given the nature of “directing” input from all faculty is sought. However, given the load that many faculty carry not all are as involved as they might be.