

## **Cyclical Program Review of Drama One Year Progress Report on Implementation Plan**

**Date: 12 April 2016**

At the conclusion of the cyclical program review, a final assessment report and implementation plan was agreed by the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) and the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science. The Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science is responsible for monitoring the implementation plan.

Please complete the table below to report on progress made in the past year against the implementation plan. Add further explanation if necessary in the *additional notes* section. The table is to be completed by the academic unit and reviewed by the relevant deans/associate deans.

Please complete this report and return it to [quqap@queensu.ca](mailto:quqap@queensu.ca) by 2 May 2016. The Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) will review this progress report. It will then be appended to the Dean's annual report for the 2015-16 academic year, filed in the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). Please note that monitoring reports will be posted on the university web site.

**ONE YEAR FOLLOW UP**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proposed Follow-up</b>	<b>Responsibility for Leading Follow-up</b>	<b>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</b>	<b>Please indicate whether the implementation is on target and on time, and provide a brief description.</b>
<p>1. As noted in the Review Team recommendations, the department of drama should institute and formalize a rolling three-year season selection process to ensure cumulative diversity, representation, variation of style, and opportunities for department artists (faculty, staff and students).</p>	<p>Initiate discussions with relevant faculty, staff and students within the department</p>	<p>Head, Department of Drama</p>	<p>Dean of arts and science's <i>annual report</i> to the provost 2016</p>	<p>We have set in place a three-year, rolling season selection, but almost immediately, it ran into difficulties. Part of the problem is that directing of major productions is a voluntary overload service assignment, so we are in no position to assign plays or the schedule of duties; we can only make requests and encourage a co-operative discussion. The first year of the three year schedule was 2015-16. We had decided to program one quite recent play for Winter 2016 that a faculty member was keen to direct. But, after first tentatively agreeing to the production, the playwright announced that, because he had a professional offer, the play would not be available until Fall 2016. So we moved that proposed production to Fall 2016, thus disrupting the second year of the schedule and forcing us to replace both play and director for Winter 2016. A faculty member volunteered to be replacement director. But, because she had last directed</p>

				<p>a new play, she preferred to direct a canonical work rather than something new. Also, she was next scheduled to direct in 2017-18, the third year, so she is no longer scheduled to direct then, thus disrupting the third year of the schedule. The new play was again withdrawn from availability in fall 2017, so the faculty member agreed to choose another play, and instead of a new play, chose a canonical work that seemed congenial. In Winter 2017, we have hired a professional playwright / director who plans to only write the work when she arrives. Although this was part of our plans, but if we had been unable to secure external funding, this would have been yet another disruption to the schedule. In short, there are simply too many moving parts to make a three-year schedule feasible or useful. While it is possible to have a rough schedule in mind, in practice we will seldom be able to guarantee a plan much more than one year in advance, because our programming needs to be responsive to events in the world as well as to practical opportunities and exigencies. This is the way that almost all theatre companies work, with the exception of a few theatre</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>companies that are rigidly devoted to, say, the works of Shakespeare. Because the basic repertoire is unchanging, they can decide how to rotate the works. Clearly, we could follow that method if we stuck to only canonical works, but that would in fact run contrary to the whole spirit of the recommendation, which was to ensure that there be some variety in our programming such that students would not encounter too much of the same thing during their career at Queen's.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

**Additional Notes:**

Please note any additional issues affecting progress, if necessary.