Unanimously approved with the following contingencies:

* Overall, the proposal would benefit from being more reader-friendly for an audience of non-experts (i.e., an audience that is not already very familiar with the Theatre program). Specific details are provided below:
	+ P. 3 Suggestion to provide more context in the rationale. Talk a bit further about feedback from NAST review & the faculty input. Fleshing out the rationale would not only provide additional context for the committees reviewing the current proposed MFA revision but might also be beneficial for the department itself to consult in years to come as a record of why changes were desirable in 2020.
	+ Pp. 3-4: Present information in a clearer way. For example, it might be useful to unpack the explanation of the different goals so that the goals will be in order.
	+ P. 4, top of page: “The remaining goals and more advanced graphics techniques are covered in existing discipline-specific design courses.” It might be useful to explain what courses are meant in this sentence.
	+ P. 4, second paragraph: A fourth discipline area is created in Media but no rationale is provided at all. Explain what prompted the creation of this new area.
	+ P. 4: Add more information to the transition plan. How many students will be affected by the transition?
	+ The proposal should include a summary of all the administrative course number changes/title changes that clearly lists the old numbers/titles vs new numbers/titles. This is particularly useful when readers who are not part of the Dept of Theatre try to compare how the courses in the current curriculum compare to the courses listed under the new curriculum. In practical terms, without a detailed list of what course number becomes what number, it is all but impossible to figure out what courses in the new curriculum were part of the old curriculum (under another number or title) as opposed to being totally new or recreated.
	+ Curriculum sheets: Some courses disappear in the revised curriculum & some courses are added. These changes are not explained in the proposal. Supply explanations for all such changes in the text of the proposal. There are also some number typos. Here are examples of issues (list might not be exhaustive):
		- Current curriculum sheet:
			* Skills-Scenery: “Graphics 3: Scenery” should be 5263.*01* (not 5263.03).
			* Studio: For all three areas, what happens to 5211 and 5212? Those courses are nowhere to be seen on the revised curriculum sheet. Why have they been removed?
			* Studio-Lighting: 6651 “Dig/Phys Lighting” disappears in new curriculum. That change is not explained.
		- Proposed curriculum sheet:
			* Skills-Costumes: 5261 (now 5210) has been removed.
			* Skills-Costumes: 5501 (previously 5531) has been added.
			* Studio: 7613 (previously 8611), 7413 (previously 8411), and 7513 (previously 7511) used to be repeated 2-3 times. This is no longer the case.
			* Production: 7000.06 and 7000.04 used to be taken for 10 credits but now only for 9 credits. Any reason?
			* Last course in list of media electives: 7312 “Advanced Moving Image Art.” Number matches the wrong course title. If the course is meant to be “Advanced Moving Image Art,” then the number should be 7311. However, since 7311 is already a required course for Media Studio, it is likely 7312 “Screen Media” that may be intended here.
	+ Detailed advising sheets for each area: Whereas for the first one (Lighting), the theatre history elective is correctly identified as 3-4 credits, there is a mistake on the other three sheets (do not acknowledge the range but only identify 3 credits).
	+ The Media advising sheet indicates that 5210 is offered every Autumn. However, in the sample curriculum sheet for that area, the course is taken in the Spring of the first year.
* Assessment plan indicates that the data will be reviewed every five years. Panel believes that every three years would be better.