

National Association of Schools of Theatre

Survey of Unaccredited Theatre Programs
at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Samuel A. Hay
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
Principal Investigator

Executive Summary, Final Report, Data, List of Respondents

April 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since its founding in 1898 at North Carolina A&T State University, theatre at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) has proved to be an effective tool for recruiting students (e.g., Florida A&M, among others), for raising money (Spelman College), and attracting national attention (Alabama State). Theatre might be under-utilized; nevertheless, it continues as a full partner in institutional efforts to fulfill missions, fill classrooms, and increase budgets.

The National Association of Schools of Theatre's (NAST) survey of HBCU unaccredited theatre programs in 2001, for example, revealed that although 30% of the schools responding had a major and 14% only a minor, 55% had no theatre program or activity whatsoever. This meant not only that a fertile resource was being ignored but also that the great majority of students at HBCUs were denied structured opportunities, led by those who had studied theatre, to increase emotional quotients and to sharpen their abilities to market their skills.

The survey, which had a 69% response rate, addressed theatre personnel, students, curricula, facilities, productions, and budgets. The results were instructive. In institutions with theatre degrees, the average size was twenty majors or less. Among the striking exceptions were the 8% that consisted of seventy-to-ninety majors. Although the theatre major and minor populations in theatre degree-granting schools were 69% African American, the minority presence at the HBCU matched that on predominantly White campuses. The ethnic diversity of the HBCU faculty far exceeded that on White campuses.

The theatre activity at the 29 schools without degree programs was robust. Thirty-one percent of those institutions had student-run theatre organizations. Even the 69% of these schools without theatre clubs produced student-directed plays, skits, poetry slams, show choirs, dances, and spoken-word sessions.

In schools offering theatre majors or minors, the number of full time faculty was low. Although 3% of these programs had seven full-time faculty members, 32% had only one, 19% two, and 17% none. Theatre curricula prepared majors for the BA or BS. (Only Howard and NCA&T, two accredited programs, offered the BFA. NC Central and Grambling were the only other programs holding NAST accreditation.) The production activity at degree-granting institutions matched that of national programs of similar size and scope.

The theatre budgets in HBCUs offering majors and minors in theatre fell far below the national average. Fifty-two percent of the programs had a total production budget that was \$47,811 lower than the national norm. Yet, Prairie View was among those institutions that repeatedly won the American College Theatre Festival national competition and an invitation to appear at the Kennedy Center. Such accomplishments saluted the hard work and determination of dedicated teachers. That dedication, hopefully, might motivate more college and university administrators to utilize theatre more fully to assist their institutions.

FINAL REPORT

Introduction

The Board of the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), in April 2001, commissioned a task force to survey unaccredited theatre programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The members of the task force were Samuel A. Hay, chair, formerly of North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University; Donald Drapeau, Virginia Tech; Robert Hansen, University of North Carolina, Greensboro; and Terrell Finney Jr., University of Cincinnati. Professor Carole Singleton, Howard University, later advised the group. The survey was conducted during September 1 – December 1, 2001, by North Carolina A&T State University.

The purpose of the study was to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of HBCU theatre programs in order to determine the availability of theatre education at the institutions and to evaluate the quality of the programs by comparing them to national norms.

The methodology of the study included developing sixty-one questions concerning issues about faculties, students, academics, facilities, productions, and budgets. Only ninety-seven of the 118 HBCUs were sent surveys because four of the institutions were already accredited by NAST, and the other seventeen were exclusively or predominantly business-and-professional schools. Sixty-nine percent of the schools responded. (See page 19 for list of respondents.) Thirty percent of these schools had a major in theatre, 13% a minor, and 57% neither major nor minor. This meant that the great majority of students attending HBCUs were denied structured opportunities, led by those who had studied theatre, to increase emotional quotients and to sharpen their abilities to market their skills.

Size and Ethnic Profile of Programs

Institutions Offering Degrees in Theatre

(*N = 38 institutions with majors or minors in theatre*)

The size of the theatre degree programs was generally small, with less than twenty majors. Thirty-one percent had ten or fewer students, and 43% had between eleven and twenty majors. There were, however, some striking exceptions. Four percent of the programs had between seventy-one and eighty majors, and 4% had between eighty-one and ninety majors. The numbers of minors, too, were small. Ninety-one percent of the schools had fewer than twenty students enrolled as minors in theatre. One advantage of the small numbers is that students can be given attention that is as individualized as that in a conservatory. A major weakness produced by low numbers is the lack of a critical mass needed for some theatre courses. Small enrollments also cause programs to fall far below state and institutional requirements for maintaining a major, or resulting in their being classified as low-producing. Under-funding followed both such designations.

The ethnic characteristics of theatre majors were largely African American (69%). The minority presence on the HBCU campus, however, matched that presence on predominantly white campuses. The percentage of Native Americans at HBCUs, for example, were two, as compared to .6 on predominantly white campuses, according to the Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS) report, which was used throughout to determine national norms in theatre programs. There was a 6% Hispanic presence at HBCUs and a 4.1% at predominantly white schools. The percentage of Asians was about the same: 2% at HBCUs and 2.1% at predominantly white schools. Regarding black and white comparisons: six percent of the HBCU students were White, although Blacks made up 7.1% of theatre at predominantly white schools. Nine percent of the students in HBCU programs were African and 6% were Caribbean, categories that were not listed in HEADS.

The significance of these ethnic-characteristics data is that the HBCU, like its predominantly white counterpart, needs to do much more to attract minorities. Global issues and multi-national institutions require that theatre diversify its training and application in order to tell accurate stories and portray complex multicultural situations.

Institutions Not Offering Degrees in Theatre

(N = 29 institutions with neither majors nor minors in theatre)

Theatre activity at schools without theatre degree programs was robust. Thirty-one percent of the responding institutions had organizations that produced plays. The plays were as likely to have been directed by a student as by a faculty member (36% for each). The theatre organizations were small, each consisting of fewer than thirty students. One quarter of the organizations consisted of ten or fewer students and one quarter was made up of twenty-one to thirty members. Although the groups produced plays, they most frequently presented show choirs (39%), poetry slams (25%), dance theatre (11%) and performance art (11%). These forms were equally as popular among students at institutions that offered a theatre curriculum.

Schools without even theatre clubs reported high aspirations and demands. Sixty-nine percent of institutions without a theatre major or minor did not have a student organization that produced plays. All of these schools, however, indicated that the students wanted a group, that the students would attend productions, and that a majority of students even wanted a curriculum in theatre. An overwhelming majority (65%) of institutions not offering degrees said that the students would be interested in majoring or minoring in theatre. Even greater majorities said that they would attend an off-campus theatre workshop (77%) or join a theatre group (87%), and that they would register for entry-level courses in Theatre Appreciation (82%) and Theatre Practice (85%).

The outlook is most encouraging. The data show that if given the opportunity to participate in theatre, students would. This might be verified by the fact that the theatre organizations produced plays even if the students themselves had to direct them. And when there was no one on campus to direct, several institutions (10%) invited guest directors or college staff (18%) to direct. When the groups did not feel competent enough to produce plays, they presented theatrical activities that did not require so much specialized training (poetry slams, show choirs, dance theatres, and performance arts). With even a modicum of University assistance and funding, theatre programs and activities would thrive.

Faculties

(N = 38 institutions offering majors or minors in theatre)

Statistics regarding full time faculty indicate a national resource problem. Almost a third of the theatre programs in this group (32%) had only one full-time faculty member. Nineteen percent had two and 17% none. The bright spot in this somewhat dismal picture was that 3% of the programs had seven full-time faculty. There are two principal concerns about these data. The first is that the 17% of programs without any full-time faculty might not be offering the kind of quality education that comes, in part, from charting students' growth and development over successive years and from filling in any obvious gaps. Adjunct faculty generally do not have the time and longevity to accomplish such a comprehensive longitudinal program of supervision. Although it is commendable that institutions relying on adjuncts understand and answer the need for theatre training, it is probably delusional to believe that adjuncts alone can provide significant instruction and guidance. The second concern is that 68% of the programs do not have a sufficient number of full-time faculty to meet the minimum eligibility standards for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Theatre.

Faculty rank data were very encouraging. Twenty-one percent of the HBCU faculty were full professors, as compared to 24% nationally. Fifteen percent of the faculty were associate professors--32% nationally—and 27% were assistant professors, which matched the national norm. The HBCU had 11% of full-time lecturers compared to 5% nationally, and 13% visiting versus 5% nationwide.

The principal question about these data is why is there a seventeen-point difference at the associate level between HBCUs and the national norm? Does this mean that considerably more assistant professors at HBCUs fail to get promoted and tenured or that the assistant professor resigns before going up for consideration? Either answer is somewhat troubling.

The ethnic diversity of the HBCU faculty far exceeded the national norms. The 39% White and Hispanic full-time faculty at the HBCU was a significant contrast to the 7% Black and Hispanic national norms on predominantly White campuses.

Facilities, Curricula, and Administrations

The theatre facilities reported by all 67 respondents were quite varied and included auditoriums, theatres, multipurpose rooms, and ballrooms. A majority (64%) appeared to have such performance spaces as auditoriums and theatres. A small number (6) had studio theaters. It was impossible to assess the quality of these facilities because the survey contained only one question devoted to the subject. More data need to be gathered and analyzed before any conclusions can be drawn. One red flag might be the 62% who appear to share their performance space with other units. National norms dictate that theatre performance spaces be used solely by the theatre unit as its laboratory.

The curricula surveyed were limited to undergraduate education in the 38 institutions offering majors and minors, principally the BA and BS. (Only North Carolina A&T and Howard University, two NAST accredited schools, offer the BFA. The other NAST accredited schools are Grambling and North Carolina Central.) The distribution of students within areas of specialization (acting, design etc.) appeared to be typical (i.e., far more students [81%] were interested in acting than in technical theatre). Thirty-six percent of the 38 respondents offered minors. The 43% with majors or minors offered a wide array of theatre/performance courses, the most of which appeared to be “Introduction to Theatre” surveys (11%), Speech/Theatre classes (16%), and Performance offerings (i.e., acting [10%], dance [10%], etc.) This distribution followed the national norm, including the 7% of courses in film/video production. The apparent need is to boost the number of offerings in technical theatre. When compared to these offerings nationally, the HBCU courses are too few: 6% production, 3% costume design, and 1% each for lighting design, scenic design, technical production, and stage management. Increasing these numbers is so important because great employment opportunities exist in technical theatre, especially when coupled with such allied areas as film, video, television, as well as concerts, festivals, recitals, exhibits, etc.

The administration of theatre programs in the 38 institutions offering majors and minors was usually combined with several other disciplines. Only 11% were organized as independent theatre departments. The majority was part of units that combined two units (18%), three disciplines (26%), or four areas (21%). The areas included speech communication, mass communication, visual arts, music, dance, English, foreign languages, etc. Consolidated departments that included theatre appear to provide opportunities for administrative economies, as well as cooperation among the different units. Combining small units into a single department is frequently determined by resource and enrollment issues.

Productions and Theatrical Activities

The production activity at the 29 responding institutions that do not offer theatre degrees was very encouraging. Sixty percent of these schools produced a play at least once during a one to three year period. Of these, most produced no more than two other kinds of events. No school produced more than three plays a year. The remaining 40% of the schools produced theatre projects much more infrequently, only every four-to-ten years. Of the non-play activities produced, the most popular by far was the oral histories (80%), followed by show choirs (39%) and poetry slams (25%). Of note were presentations of dance theatre and performance art (11% each), story telling (6%), and musical revues (5%). The significance of the large presence of these theatrical activities might be that students greatly desire outlets for their creativity in the performing and performance arts, even when formal instruction in these areas is not available.

The production activity at the 38 theatre degree-granting institutions was typical of national programs of similar size and scope. Thirty-five percent of the schools produced two main-stage productions per year, 20% gave three, 29% four, and 8% five. Although 56% offered some level of studio productions, the remaining 44% had no “second stage” performances at all. Fifty-seven percent of the schools reported having no touring

productions. When asked about non-theatre events that were sponsored on campus, the institutions reported that the two most popular activities were performance art and poetry slams, with nearly equal degrees of interest in both. These kinds of performances were closely followed by spoken word presentations, suggesting a slightly higher interest in spoken events than in musical events on campuses where theatre was offered as a major or minor.

Budgets

The budgets of the 38 theatre programs offering majors or minors fell far below the national average. Fifty-five percent of these programs, for example, reported that the money spent on faculty development and professional travel was less than \$1,000, which was at least \$2,430 below the average. This disparity might explain, in part, the 12% loss of assistant professors within seven years. Sixty-four percent of the programs said that they spent less than \$1,000 for awards and scholarships, which were \$16,185 below the national norm. The \$865 difference in money spent on recruitment, as reported by 85% of the programs, coupled with the \$16,185 discrepancy in scholarships and awards, indicated by 64% of the programs, might be contributing causes for the low enrollments reported by most institutions.

Figures regarding other budget disparities indicate difficulties but also salute hardworking faculties and staffs. Forty percent of the 38 programs offering majors or minors reported that they spent less than \$1,000 on instructional supplies, which was at least \$2,962 below the average, and 61% of the schools averaged at least \$1,897 below the norm for books, scripts, periodicals, etc. Even with such limitations, however, HBCU theatre graduates still competed successfully for positions in prestigious graduate schools and at national competitions. The greatest tribute to the faculties and staffs, however, might be seen in the production areas. An average of 53% of the programs reported at least a \$40,000 difference in money spent for technical supplies and expenses and at least a \$47,811 discrepancy in the total production budget when compared to national norms. Yet, such schools as Prairie View, among others, repeatedly win the American College Theatre Festival national competition to appear at the Kennedy Center.

Conclusions

The survey revealed several pluses and minuses in theatre programs not accredited by NAST. Among their strengths were (a) satisfying student needs to cultivate and express their creativity, even when formal instruction, led by a person trained in the area, was unavailable; (b) raising emotional quotients and increasing student morale; (c) already having in place quite a number of performance spaces; (d) having an ethnically diverse faculty; and (e) enjoying high levels of student support for adding theatre programs and activities.

Among the issues that might need attention were the programs' (a) having so few majors and minors, which, considering the popularity of theatre and performance arts on campus, might be caused in part by the very low budgets for recruitment, as well as for scholarships; (b) being generally and severely under-funded, probably caused by the low enrollments; (c) having so few full-time faculty members—17% of the schools offering theatre majors or minors had none, which might stem from their losing assistant professors within seven years; and (d) having limited ethnic diversity among majors.

The general conclusion might be that low enrollments contributed greatly to most of the other concerns. Until the theatre programs can considerably increase their student numbers, they might develop and execute plans and programs that assist the institution with its initiatives for recruitment, fundraising, and public relations. Once administrations see undeniable proof that theatre can be a powerful and reliable partner, then the institutions might increase the budget, the lifeblood of any academic program. The study shows enormous potential for theatre developments in HBCUs. We hope that this study can play a catalytic role in enlarging the possibilities of reaching this potential.

DATA: THEATRE IN HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES NOT ACCREDITED BY NAST

Task Force

The Board of the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), in April 2001, commissioned a task force to survey theatre programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The members of the task force were Samuel A. Hay, Chair, formerly of North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University; Donald Drapeau, Virginia Tech; Robert Hansen, University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Terrell Finney, Jr., University of Cincinnati; and Carole Singleton, Howard University. The survey was conducted during September 1 – December 1, 2001, by North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University.

Purpose

The purpose of the survey was to obtain a national picture of theatre in HBCUs and to use this information in ways that would serve the development of theatre in HBCUs.

Definitions

The HBCUs are those institutions that hold membership in the National Association for Economic Opportunity (NAFEO), an organization of chief administrators aiming to implement strategies and programs to increase Black and minority enrollment at member institutions. NAFEO has 118 public and private two-year, four-year, graduate, and professional member institutions. These institutions are located throughout the country, including fourteen southern, six northern, three midwestern states, as well as one western state, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands. The institutions are noted for their excellence in educating African Americans. The schools' strength and stability account for the perpetual rise of intellectuals, professionals, and creative artists.

Procedures, Activities, and Responses

Drafts of the proposed survey were mailed to every major national African American theatre organization. Each provided valuable input. With the assistance of the NAST National Office, the task force finalized the survey. The Chair decided to concentrate on ninety-seven of the 118 institutions because four were already NAST accredited and the other seventeen were exclusively or predominantly business and professions schools. Each of the ninety-seven schools received a survey with the request to return it by September 15. Each school that did not return the survey by the deadline received a plethora of calls, resulting in a response rate of 67 institutions, or 69%.

Unless indicated otherwise, figures represent percentages of the institutional respondents indicated for each section.

Part A: Basic Information

(N = 67 institutions)

1. Is your institution private or public? (Please check only one.)

41% a. Private.

59 b. Public.

2. What was the total institutional enrollment during spring semester/quarter 2001? Include only local campus, not branch-campus enrollment. (Please check only one.)

6 % a. 1-500
28 b. 501-1,000
24 c. 1,001-2,500
22 d. 2,501-5,000
15 e. 5,001-10,000
5 f. 10,001-15,000

3. What is the highest program level offered in any unit at your institution? (Please check only one.)

20 % a. Associate Degree
44 b. Baccalaureate Degree
14 c. Master's Degree (non-MFA)
3 d. Master of Fine Arts Degree
19 e. Doctoral Degree

4. How many of the following Theatre performance spaces does your institution own? (Please check all that apply.)

Answers to question 4 indicate the number of responses.

6 a. Studio Theatre (25-89 Seating Capacity).
24 b. Theatre (90-700 Seating Capacity)
8 c. Theatre (700-or more Seating Capacity)
32 d. Auditorium
14 e. Multi-Purpose Room
2 f. Outdoor Theatre
14 g. Student Union Ballroom

5. Does your institution offer a major or minor in Theatre Arts or Drama? (Please check only one.)

43 % a. No (**Please answer only questions 6-24**)
57 b. Yes (**Please skip to questions 25-61**)

Part B: Institutions Not Offering Degrees in Theatre

(N = 29 institutions without majors or minors answering questions 6 through 24)

6. Does any member of the faculty have academic preparation and/or experience in Theatre and/or Dance? (Please check only one.)

65 % a. Yes
27 b. No
8 c. Not known

7. How long has it been since your institution produced a play? (Please check only one)

60 % a. 1-3 Years.
22 b. 4-5 Years.
18 c. 6-10 Years.

8. Are any of the following undergraduate courses currently being taught? (Please check all that apply.)

Answers to question 8 indicate the number of responses.

- 10 a. Acting
- 7 b. Acting/Directing
- 10 c. Dance
- 3 d. Directing
- 1 e. Musical Theatre
- 0 f. Children's Theatre
- 3 g. Costume Design
- 1 h. Lighting Design
- 1 i. Scenic Design
- 6 j. Production
- 1 k. Technical Direction
- 4 l. Theatre Management
- 1 m. Stage Management
- 7 n. Film/Video Production
- 3 o. Introduction to Drama
- 11 p. Introduction to Theatre
- 4 q. Theatre Appreciation
- 3 r. Theatre History
- 4 s. Drama/Dramatic Literature/Modern Drama
- 1 t. Playwriting/Screen writing
- 6 u. Shakespeare
- 16 v. Speech/Theatre

9. Is there a student organization that produces plays? (Please check only one.)

- 31 % a. Yes **(Please answer questions 10-15 and 17-24)**
- 69 b. No **(Please skip to questions 16-24)**

10. How is the student Theatre organization funded? (Please check all that apply.)

- 9 % a. Student Government Association
- 18 b. Office of Student Affairs
- 28 c. Line-Item Budget from Academic Affairs
- 9 d. Receipts
- 0 e. Grants and Sponsored Programs
- 18 f. Advertisements
- 18 g. Patrons
- 0 h. Corporate Sponsorships

11. How many plays does the student organization perform annually? (Please check only one.)

- 11 % a. 0
- 45 b. 1
- 33 c. 2
- 11 d. 3
- 0 e. 4
- 0 f. Other (Please indicate the number ____)

12. Who directs the plays? (Please check all that apply.)

- 36 % a. Faculty
- 36 % b. Students
- 18 % c. Staff
- 10 % d. Guests

13. Approximately how many students belong to the student Theatre organization?

(Please check only one.)

- 25 % a. 1-10
- 50 % b. 11-20
- 25 % c. 21-30
- 0 % d. 31-50

14. Approximately how many of the following events/activities does the organization annually sponsor or support: (Please check all that apply.)

- 11 % a. Dance Theatre
- 6 % b. Story Telling
- 11 % c. Performance Art
- 0 % d. Spoken Word
- 25 % e. Poetry Recital/Slam
- 5 % f. Musical Revues
- 3 % g. Historical Representations
- 39 % h. Show Choir

15. Indicate which of the following workshops or events are annually sponsored or co-sponsored by the student Theatre organization? (Please check all that apply)

- 0 % a. Creative writing
- 20 % b. Script writing for film, television, and/or video
- 80 % c. Oral histories

16. Since there is no student Theatre organization, do you believe that students, if given the chance, would be interested in developing such a group and in producing plays? (Please check only one.)

Please note: for question 16 only, N = 20

- 100 % a. Yes
- 0 % b. No

17. If given the opportunity, do you believe that students would be interested in majoring or minoring in Theatre? (Please check only one.)

- 65 % a. Yes
- 35 % b. No

18. If given the chance, do you believe that students would go to see off-campus productions? (Please check only one.)

- 100 % a. Yes
- 0 % b. No

19. If a local community theatre offered a Theatre Workshop, do you believe that students would attend?
(Please check only one.)

77 % a. Yes
23 b. No

20. If a local church or campus chaplain started a theatre group, do you believe that students would participate? (Please check only one.)

87 % a. Yes
13 b. No

21. If a professor offered a Theatre Appreciation course, do you believe that students would enroll? (Please check only one.)

82 % a. Yes
18 b. No

22. If a professor offered a Theatre Practice course, do you believe that students would enroll? (Please check only one.)

85 % a. Yes
15 b. No

23. How many of the following events/activities does a campus organization annually sponsor or support:
(Please check all that apply.)

14 % a. Dance Theatre
15 b. Story Telling
15 c. Performance Art
6 d. Spoken Word
27 e. Poetry Recital/Slam
14 f. Musical Revues
9 g. Historical Representations

24. Indicate how many workshops or events are annually sponsored or co-sponsored by a campus student organization (Please check all that apply):

61 % a. Creative writing
17 b. Script writing for film, television, and/or video
22 c. Oral histories

Part C: Institutions Offering Degrees in Theatre Arts

(N = 38 institutions offering majors or minors answering questions 25 through 61))

25. Which of the following degrees does your institution offer in *Theatre Arts* (Please check all that apply)?

9 % a. Associate Degree
41 b. B.A.
9 d. B.S.
5 d. BFA.
36 e. Minor

26. Approximately how many of the following events/activities does the Theatre annually sponsor or support: (Please check all that apply)

- 8 % a. Dance Theatre
- 9 b. Story Telling
- 24 c. Performance Art
- 17 d. Spoken Word
- 23 e. Poetry Slams
- 10 f. Musical Revues
- 9 e. Historical Representations

27. Indicate which of the following classes, workshops, or events are annually sponsored or co-sponsored by the Theatre? (Please check all that apply).

- 31 % a. Creative writing
- 52 b. Script writing for film, television, and/or video
- 17 c. Oral histories

28. How many students are majoring in Theatre Arts? (Please check only one)

- 31 % a. 1-10
- 43 b. 11-20
- 7 c. 21-30
- 7 d. 31-40
- 0 e. 41-50
- 4 f. 51-60
- 0 g. 61-70
- 4 h. 71-80
- 4 i. 81-90
- 0 j. 91-100
- 0 k. 101-125
- 0 l. 126-150
- 0 m. 151 or more

29. How many students are minoring in Theatre Arts? (Please check only one)

- 69 % a. 0-10
- 22 b. 11-20
- 6 c. 21-30
- 0 d. 31-40
- 0 e. 41-50
- 3 f. 51-60
- 0 g. 61-70
- 0 h. 71-80
- 0 i. 81-90
- 0 j. 91-100
- 0 k. 101-125
- 0 l. 126-150
- 0 m. 151 or more

30. How many of the *majors* are concentrating in Acting or Directing? (Please check only one)

- 55 % a. 0-10
- 26 b. 11-20
- 11 c. 21-30
- 0 d. 31-40
- 4 e. 41-50
- 4 f. 51-60
- 0 g. 61-70
- 0 h. 71-80
- 0 i. 81-90
- 0 j. 91-100
- 0 k. 101-125
- 0 l. 126-150
- 0 m. 151 or more

31. How many of the *majors* are concentrating in Technical Theatre (e.g., scenic design, lighting design, technical direction, stage management, theatre management, and costume)? (Please check only one.)

- 96 % a. 0-10
- 0 b. 11-20
- 0 c. 21-30
- 0 d. 31-40
- 0 e. 41-50
- 0 f. 51-60
- 0 g. 61-70
- 0 h. 71-80
- 4 i. 81-90
- 0 j. 91-100
- 0 k. 101-125
- 0 l. 126-150
- 0 m. 151 or more

32. What is the total number of *majors* who belong to the indicated groups?

Answers to question 32 indicate percentage of all majors reported.

- 9 % a. African
- 69 b. African American
- 2 c. Asian
- 6 d. Caribbean
- 6 e. Hispanic
- 2 f. Native American
- 6 g. White (Non-Hispanic)

33. What is the total number of *full-time* Theatre Arts faculty? (Please check only one)

- 17 % a. 0
- 32 b. 1
- 19 c. 2
- 8 d. 3
- 8 e. 4
- 8 f. 5
- 5 g. 6
- 3 h. 7
- 0 i. 8
- 0 j. 9
- 0 k. 10

34. Please write below the total number of Theatre faculty members who held the indicated rank during the last semester:

Answers to question 34 indicate percentage of all theatre faculty reported.

- 21 % a. Full Professor (Full Time)
- 15 b. Associate Professor (F/T)
- 27 c. Assistant Professor (F/T)
- 11 d. Lecturer (F/T)
- 13 e. Visiting Professor (Part Time)
- 0 f. Visiting Associate Professor (P/T)
- 1 g. Visiting Assistant Professor (P/T)
- 4 h. Visiting Lecturer (P/T)
- 0 i. Guest Artist (P/T)

35. What is the total number of *part-time and/or full-time* faculty who are housed in other departments but who teach Theatre Arts or Theatre-related courses? (Please check only one)

- 50 % a. 0
- 23 b. 1
- 18 c. 2
- 3 d. 3
- 6 e. 4
- 0 f. 5
- 0 g. 6
- 0 h. 7
- 0 i. 8
- 0 j. 9
- 0 k. 10

36. What is the total number of *full-time* faculty members who belong to the indicated groups?

Answers to question 36 indicate percentage of all full-time faculty reported.

- 6 % a. African
- 52 b. African American
- 0 c. Asian
- 3 d. Caribbean
- 2 e. Hispanic
- 0 f. Native American
- 37 g. White (Non-Hispanic)

37. What is the total number of *part-time* faculty members who belong to the indicated groups?

Answers to question 37 indicate percentage of all part-time faculty reported.

- 17 % a. African
- 53 b. African American
- 0 c. Asian
- 0 d. Caribbean
- 3 e. Hispanic
- 0 f. Native American
- 27 g. White (Non-Hispanic)

38. Please write below the total number of full-time faculty who are of the indicated gender:

Answers to question 38 indicate percentage of all full-time faculty reported.

- 54 % a. Men
- 46 b. Women

39. Is the theatre executive appointed by the administration? (Please check only one)

- 66 % a. Yes
- 34 b. No

40. Is the theatre executive elected by the faculty? (Please check only one)

- 11 % a. Yes
- 89 b. No

41. Is the theatre executive subject to formal review by the faculty? (Please check only one)

- 49 % a. Yes
- 51 b. No

42. How many courses does the theatre executive teach each semester? (Please check only one)

- 10 % a. 0
- 12 b. 1
- 15 c. 2
- 39 d. 3
- 15 e. 4
- 9 f. 5

43. How many productions does the theatre executive annually direct or design? (Please check only one)

- 17 % a. 0
- 14 b. 1
- 46 c. 2
- 14 d. 3
- 9 e. 4
- 0 f. 5

44. For how many months is the theatre executive paid to work? (Please check only one)

- 39 % a. 9
- 39 b. 10
- 6 c. 11
- 16 d. 12

45. How much money is spent on faculty-and-professional travel (to meetings, etc.)? (Please check only one.)

- 55 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 27 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 9 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 6 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 3 e. \$10,001 or more

46. How much money is spent on instructional supplies? (Please check only one)

- 40 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 38 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 13 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 3 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 0 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 6 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

47. How much money is spent on books, periodicals, scripts, films, and videos? (Please check only one)

- 61 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 24 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 6 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 3 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 6 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 0 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

48. How much money is spent on student recruitment by the Theatre unit? (Please check only one)

- 85 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 6 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 0 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 3 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 3 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 0 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 3 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

49. How much money is spent on scholarships that are administered by the Theatre unit? (Please check only one)

- 64 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 24 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 0 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 0 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 3 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 6 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 3 h. \$25,001 or more

50. How much money is spent on Theatre public relations and fundraising? (Please check only one)

- 75 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 13 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 3 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 6 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 3 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 0 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

51. How many main-stage shows are produced each year? (Please check only one)

- 8 % a. 0
- 0 b. 1
- 35 c. 2
- 20 d. 3
- 29 e. 4
- 8 f. 5

52. How many studio shows are produced each year? (Please check only one.)

- 44 % a. 0
- 9 b. 1
- 32 c. 2
- 9 d. 3
- 3 e. 4
- 3 f. 5

53. How many touring shows are produced each year? (Please check only one)

- 57 % a. 0
- 31 b. 1
- 6 c. 2
- 3 d. 3
- 0 e. 4
- 3 f. 5

54. How much money is spent annually on makeup, costume construction, cleaning, and repair? (Please check only one)

- 46 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 18 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 18 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 11 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 7 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 0 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

55. How much money is spent annually on equipment rental? (Please check only one)

- 66 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 25 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 3 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 6 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 0 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 0 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

56. How much money is spent annually on lighting, scenery, properties, and sound? (Please check only one)

- 48 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 19 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 9 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 9 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 9 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 6 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

57. How much money is spent annually on programs, scripts, publicity, royalties, and tickets? (Please check only one)

- 67 % a. \$0 - \$1,000
- 12 b. \$1,001 - \$5,000
- 12 c. \$5,001 - \$7,000
- 3 d. \$7,001 - \$10,000
- 6 e. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 0 f. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 0 g. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 h. \$25,001 or more

58. What is the total production budget? (Please check only one)

- 52 % a. \$100 - \$5,000
- 8 b. \$5,001 – \$10,000
- 10 c. \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 7 d. \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 3 e. \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 0 f. \$25,001 - \$30,000
- 4 g. \$30,001 - \$35,000
- 0 h. \$35,001 - \$40,000
- 3 i. \$40,001 - \$45,000
- 0 j. \$45,001 – \$50,000
- 3 k. \$50,001 - \$60,000
- 10 l. \$60,001 or more

59. What are the sources of this money? (Please check all that apply)

Answers to question 59 indicate the number of responses.

- 13 a. Student Government Association
- 14 b. Office of Student Affairs
- 26 c. Line-Item Budget from Academic Affairs
- 15 d. Receipts
- 10 e. Grants and Sponsored Programs
- 3 f. Advertisements
- 8 g. Patrons
- 3 h. Corporate Sponsorships
- 8 i. Other

60. Do the majors have opportunities to work with a professional theatre company as part of an internship program or of another class(es)? (Please answer only once)

- 76 % a. Yes
- 24 b. No

61. Please indicate below how the Theatre Program is administered in the institution's flow chart (Please answer only once)

- 11 % a. As a separate department
- 18 b. As one of *two* disciplines in a department (e.g., Dance and Theatre)
- 26 c. As one of *three* disciplines in a department (e.g., Speech, Drama, & Dance)
- 21 d. As one of *four* disciplines in a department
- 0 e. As one of *five* disciplines in a department
- 0 f. As one of *six* disciplines in a department
- 12 g. As one of *seven* disciplines in a department
- 12 h. Other _____ (*Please list*)

LIST OF RESPONDENTS

Alabama State University	Lane College
Albany State University	Lawson State Community College
Alcorn State University	Lewis College of Business
Arkansas Baptist College	Lincoln University of Missouri
Atlanta Metropolitan College	Mary Holmes College
Barber-Scotia College	Medgar Evers College
Benedict College	Mississippi Valley State University
Bennett College	Morris Brown College
Bethune-Cookman College	New York City Technical College
Bluefield State College	Norfolk State University
Bowie State University	Oakwood College
Central State University	Paul Quinn College
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Prairie View A&M University
Chicago State University	Rust College
Claflin College	Saint Augustine's College
Clark Atlanta University	Saint Paul's College
Compton Community College	Southern University and A&M College
Concordia College	Southern University at Shreveport
Cuyahoga Community College	Spelman College
Denmark Technical College	Talladega College
Dillard University	Tennessee State University
J. F. Drake State Technical College	Texas Southern University
Edward Waters College	Trenholm State Technical College
Elizabeth City State University	Tuskegee University
Fayetteville State University	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Florida A&M University	University of the District of Columbia
Florida Memorial College	University of the Virgin Islands
Hampton University	Virginia Union University
Hinds Community College - Utica Campus	Voorhees College
Huston-Tillotson College	West Virginia State College
Jackson State University	Wiley College
Kennedy-King College	Winston-Salem State University
Knoxville College	Xavier University
Fiorello LaGuardia Community College	

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NAST is grateful for the leadership of Samuel A. Hay of North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University who created, led, and was principal writer for this project from its beginnings to a successful conclusion, and to the Board committee that worked with him. NAST expresses deep appreciation to the following students at North Carolina A&T who conducted telephone surveys and otherwise assisted in the compilation of the data: Monique Augustine, Sultan O. El-Amin, Sunshyne S. Gay, Shemida J. Gill, Joseph Hairston, Zonya L. Johnson, Morgan E. Jones, Diatra T. Longford, Eric L. McBroom, Myneesha E. Miller, Jonathan Mosley-Perry, Michael R. Norton, Damian D. Phillips, Christopher Robinson, Jae F. Sims, Keon M. Speller, LeLund D. Thompson, Shayla R. Thompson, Booker T. Washington, David Watkins, Trevonda C. Weathers, Jerome Williams, Jr., and Michael A. Williams.

