



ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

College	CLASS
Department	Theatre and Dance
Program	BA Theatre Arts
Reporting for Academic Year	2016-17
Last 5-Year Review	2012, CAPR response 10/2013
Next 5-Year Review	2018-19
Department Chair	Darryl V. Jones
Date Submitted	10/20/17

I. SELF-STUDY (suggested length of 1-3 pages)

A. Five-Year Review Planning Goals

The goals for our 43 Action items can be summarized as follows:

(LEGEND: ~~Done or abandoned.~~ Still in progress. *Continuous efforts.*)

- ~~1. Reconsider low-enrolled options.~~
- ~~2. Revise the Technology and Design Option.~~
- ~~3. Develop cooperative degree within School of Arts and Media.~~
4. *Continue participation in GE and service courses.*
- ~~5. Develop online teaching and large enrollment course opportunities.~~
- ~~6. Review summer theatre program(s).~~
7. Create recruiting committee and program.
8. Improve assessment and advising programs.
- ~~9. Create a modular schedule that avoids conflicts in teaching major courses.~~
10. Increase student performance opportunities.
- ~~11. Review opportunities for increasing international student enrollment.~~
- ~~12. Formalize career advising and reporting.~~
- ~~13. Determine minimum need and priorities for lecturers.~~
- ~~14. Address production workload issues.~~
15. *Contribute to developing campus diversity.*
- ~~16. Secure a regular scenery technician, a regular costume technician, and separate box office manager.~~
- ~~17. Secure travel for professional and mandatory travel.~~
18. Develop support of alumni and community groups, including a fundraising plan.
19. *Continue developing Theatre facilities and equipment.*

PROGRESS TOWARD FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PLANNING GOALS

We've essentially met or eliminated 12 of our 19 goals as reported in past reports. We made new or continuing progress on the following in the past year:

- 2) We revised Technology and Design program for semesters and consider this objective complete.
- 4) We continued to participate in four clusters; offered special GE sections for international students; offered courses for both the GANAS and APIA programs; and, offered service courses for Liberal Studies, Kinesiology, and at Concord.
- 5) Online Teaching: Two faculty offer courses. Three more Theatre colleagues are planning to develop semester courses for online instruction, while Dance colleagues decline to develop such courses. Objective considered complete.
- 6) Given the lack of summer teaching allocation, we have abandoned the Summer Theatre program, which was curricular.
- 7) Recruiting: Having assigned a committee, we still do not have a written plan. We continued to invite school to attend rehearsals and shows. We continue to discuss opportunities and to implement ad hoc activities.
- 8) Assessment/Advising: All TT faculty have now supervised assessment for at least one year. Mission and Outcomes have been rewritten for semesters. Five faculty have drafted a major check for at least one student. All faculty took training in the use of DAR for major checks.
- 9) We drafted a two-year class schedule rotation for semesters, but course conflicts for majors are still not assured.
- 10) Increase performance opportunities: Dance, acting, and musical theatre ensemble classes now hold quarterly recitals with invited audiences. We adapted this approach in our semester conversion to assure that students continue to have performance opportunities.
- 12) Career Advising: Students continue to produce a career plan in a culmination class where 5 to 10 professionals come to speak to students. We have implemented a system for asking graduating students for permanent contact information and posting their accomplishments on our Webpage. Agreed to a semester plan for concentrations to handle career advising in specific culmination courses.
- 13) Being met by virtue of how CLASS is handling allocations.
- 14) CLASS imposed workload restrictions during semester planning that some believe will negatively affect the production focus of our program. We plan to address this issue in our next Program Plan and future curriculum proposals, but will consider the issue closed until we have some semester experience.
- 15) We continued to address diversity in production selection, courses, participation in campus programs, and sponsoring guest presenters.
- 17) Travel: CLASS folded funding for mandatory Travel into our S&S, so we have greater control about decisions. Professional travel is still handled by CLASS and appears to be meet faculty goals.

18) Alumni and community outreach: Our alumni engagement efforts continue. We distribute a digital newsletter 2-4 times per year and maintain alumni oriented features on our Webpage. We are trying to provide Web access to our digital photo archive. Our alumni perform on Broadway; design in the film industry; and, direct and perform at the community and professional nonprofit levels. While we host alumni events that do produce modest financial support, we do not have a written plan.

19) Equipment funding continues to be sufficient, but we have a continuing concern about the larger issues in section C.

B. Program Changes and Needs

Overview: Q2S conversion continued to consume significant effort this past year. However, in planning our conversion we addressed many goals from the Strategic Plan and find ourselves in a good position for the upcoming review. The program faces continued resource pressures.

Curriculum: Due to the modifications, we made to our semester plan to satisfy the college, some semester courses and a significant number of GE proposals are likely stuck somewhere in the system. Faculty has been having trouble producing overlay proposals on the first try. The semester GE program eliminates Area F in favor of a “creative component” requirement in Area C3. This change will have, at best, unknown and more likely difficult consequences for the major, developing cultural capital of non-majors, faculty workload, and SFR. Most faculty have little understanding of SB1440 issues, but we have planned a program that should be compatible. It is generally agreed that we need to put increased effort into developing skills and technique, which was a challenge we hope to have built into our semester curriculum.

Students: Current and recently graduated students are generally satisfied with the opportunities we provide. Nearly all get the chance to perform for a paid audience with full production support. Our support for sending students to college festivals and producing touring opportunities has proven to be useful to students. These experiences introduce them to their likely career competitors, raising their standards and commitment to classes and production. The senior production project courses reveal that students have learned what they need to know and need a culminating project to synthesize and integrate their new skills and knowledge.

Faculty: One professor in the stage technology and design area retired to FERP through 2018-19, but is not teaching. However, our advocacy for a TT search in the same area finally proved successful and we are searching in 2017-18. Lecturer funding seems to have leveled off this year, but we remain concerned for semesters. The production faculty all have professional credits

Staff: The office we share with AGES is now fully staffed. The admins will be cross trained for most tasks. There is still no permanent staff in the Costume Shop, but the Scenery Shop is working reasonably well with one 10-month, 80% performing arts technician (four-day week).

Resources: *Funding:* The A2E2 process is proving more and more difficult each year. We continue to worry about severe cuts that will cut into the program and coursework without any planning or consideration. The current system is dysfunctional. We are asked to justify everything annually to a committee that is reformulated annually and makes conflicting judgments from year

to year based on vaguely defined EIRA and ECL programs. Our proposals are complete, but the committee makes cuts without even asking questions. During the summer, we received an allocation 35% less than requested. *Facilities:* Our three major facility and equipment issues remain unresolved:

- 1) The video monitoring system in the Theatre is on life support.
- 2) Lighting in the Dance Studio had asbestos insulation and it was all removed several years ago. The dance faculty has a new vision that still needs to be drafted and estimated. The new lighting should be LED to save energy and avoid the need to run new power to the room that lacks sufficient power for incandescent stage lighting.
- 3) The backstage dressing rooms still need accessible showers. We'd recommend that the two single showers be turned into a common shower with two heads. We face several minor issues related to facility and equipment for which planning and funding remain unresolved:
 - 1) Wooden shelving in the prop room and a wood frame cage around the lighting maintenance shop should be replaced with metal materials.
 - 2) The Theatre stage floor protective layer should be replaced.
 - 3) The Costume Shop needs a proper dye vat.
 - 4) Contemporary stagecraft is moving from wood to metal construction. We need a dedicated metal work area with ventilation. On the positive side, with our new staff person and recent equipment allocations we can begin to teach at least some professional metal framing practices.

Assessment: By the time we addressed semester programming, all faculty had served as assessment coordinator for one year. So, we began our semester planning with a department discussion of mission and outcomes and made decisions. These are covered in the Assessment Report, below. We plan to phase in new outcomes and assessment as soon as possible. Due to the last-minute changes to our semester proposal in response to CLASS concerns, the draft assessment plan is being revised. In the meantime, we are drawing near to agreement on a standard performance rubric which can be used to assess both classroom and production activities. Recent key findings indicate 1) the success that culminating performance projects have with helping students to synthesize and integrate their undergraduate studies; and, only a few students reach a high level of technique by the time they begin their culminating projects.

Other: While we've made progress in communicating with alumni. Few appear to be able to contribute financially. The next step will be finding potential alumni leaders from each decade to help us focus on small gifts to larger scholarship funds, possibly with the Forever Pioneer events. We continue to work with Friends of the Arts and hope for School of Arts & Media to share the workload of fundraising. This is not a plan, but a direction for achieving a plan in the future.

The EIRA process is proving more and more difficult each year. We worry about severe cuts that will cut into the program and coursework without any planning or consideration. The current system is dysfunctional. We are asked to justify everything annually to a committee that is

reformulated annually and makes conflicting judgments from year to year. We've responded to all questions by the college and CAPR about our operations, but the committee makes cuts without even asking questions.

II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (suggested length of 1-2 pages)

A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

OUTCOMES: Students who graduate with a B.A. in Theatre Arts will be able to:

- A. communicate in writing, orally, non-verbally, and visually in their area of emphasis; (ILO 2,6)
- B. conduct background research, evaluate scripts, and analyze performance for use in scholarly and performance applications; (ILO 1)
- C. employ historical, contemporary, and cultural performance techniques and production technology appropriate to their area of emphasis; (ILO 1,4,6)
- D. reflect on performance techniques and concepts of other performers and apply high standards of reflection to their own production work; (ILO 2,3,4,5)
- E. solve problems of production by creating roles, dancing, designing, managing, building, directing, or choreographing performances that address issues of life in striking and remarkable ways. (ILO 1,4)

B. Program Learning Outcome(S) Assessed

PLO E. In each of the last five years a tenure-track faculty member assessed one outcome, but we transitioned to the current outcomes in 2014. So, officially this outcome has not been assessed. However, Professor Haft assessed a similar outcome in 2012 and Kupers in 2013. Kupers focused on technique to confirm that students need regular technique. Haft focused on self-criticism to show that when challenged, students are learning this skill. The culmination production experience is effective at pushing students at the mastery level to integrate self-criticism into their regular practice. In both cases we agreed to find ways to increase the kind of production assignments that help students see the value of and begin to implement a regimen of technique and practice of self-criticism.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Instrument(s): student reflective writing journals; student critical writing about performances attended; student self-assessment and peer-feedback during in-class showings of works in progress and at student or faculty directed rehearsals; faculty assessment of student performances using rubrics.

Sampling Procedure: all students in each of the courses was included in the sample, with patterns determined by instructor observation and by student self-reporting.

Sample Characteristics: Introductory courses range from first year students (DANC 1202 – sample of 70) to sophomores and juniors (THEA 1494, 2494 and 2055 – average sample of 12 each). Practice courses were juniors and seniors (DANC 3454 – sample of 18) (THEA 3494 – sample of 8). Mastery courses were either entirely graduating seniors (THEA 4152 – sample of 12) or a combination of sophomores to seniors (DANC 3456 – sample of 18.)

Data Collection: *(include when, who, and how collected)*

Data was collected from students by instructors of record during the courses surveyed, then collected by Haft for analysis in Spring 2017.

Data Analysis: Quantitative statistical methods to analyze median scores is not applicable to this type of assessment. Also, the sample sizes for each course would not have statistical significance in such an analysis. The results below were drawn by Haft from correlations in comments that revealed progress in performance skills, as well as from instructor assessment of student work in the context of a course or activity assignment.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Main Findings: Based on surveys from the Festival Activity, Dance Ensemble and Senior Festival Performance courses, it is clear that our students are being challenged to create innovative and stirring performances that are relevant to people who share the world around them.

Recommendations for Program Improvement:

1. Faculty will use more specific writing assignments to support creative problem-solving and intrapersonal artistic growth.
2. Faculty will offer more frequent opportunities for Practice level students both to lead their peers in short-term projects and to assist faculty and Mastery level student choreographers and directors in rehearsal.
3. Faculty will integrate more career exploration into syllabi for Practice and Mastery level courses (beyond our Career Issues course) to support student goal setting and strategic planning for careers.
4. Students need to see more live performances off campus to fully understand both where innovation is needed and where their contributions to the fields of theatre and dance might make an impact. We are concerned about funding issues. We probably can make assignments that require students to attend and pay for shows.
5. Students need to work with more guest artist directors/choreographers in preparation for transitioning from Mastery Level student to Novice Professional.

Next Step(s) for Closing the Loop:

1. Thea 2055 and Thea 1494 (introductory); Danc 3454 and Thea 3494 [practice]; Thea 4152 and Danc 3456 [mastery] will include more reflective assignments as part of production related activity exercises.
2. Thea 2055, Thea 2494 and Danc 1202 [introductory]; and Thea 3494 and Danc 3454 [practice] will include leadership assignments as part of production related activity exercises.
3. We are already planning to integrate career exploration with the semester capstone curriculum.
4. We won't be able to fund field trips for all courses and students won't be able to afford shows in every class. We therefore need to discuss, identify and prioritize courses for such assignments.
5. We are concerned about funding issues. We have limited funds for production now. Should we redirect some to increase guest artist opportunities? Will existing funding hold steady or be decreased?

Other Reflections:

Next Step #5, above, was written before the unexplainable 35% cut in our EIRA allocation that funds the majority of our production program. Other Arts and Media departments were similarly crippled. The school chairs met with a sympathetic and understanding Provost and Dean. Our plan is to present a suggestion for resolving the misunderstandings that we believe have led to this difficult situation. The point here is that resolving assessment issues often depends on the resources available to a program.

E. Assessment Plans for Next Year

We planned for semesters to coincide with new outcomes and assessment. In the coming year we will roll out the revised plan for testing. Below see the four outcomes. One appealing aspect of our program is the opportunity to perform. So, we continue to plan for assessment that concentrates on performance have written outcomes that all relate to production competency. Eventually mastery will be assessed in separate Theatre and Dance capstone courses using a common department rubric being devised to track all four outcomes. In even years faculty will assess at least 20% of student portfolios (a journal and evidence based record of producing and performing a work) and in odd years at least 20% of actual performances. The performance rubric also will be used to assess a selection of native and transfer students in the third year and students who attend regional performance festivals (all years). The artifact will be a journal-style assignment. We continue to discuss GE and ILO specific assessment. Individual instructors will be responsible for Overlay assessment of their own courses.

Students will be able to:
PLO 1 Perform for audiences, on stage or in other arenas and careers.
PLO 2 Create performance that presents human issues in inclusive, exciting, original ways.
PLO 3 Reflect on historical and contemporary works of theatre and dance from diverse cultures.
PLO 4 Engage individuals and build community through meaningful theatre and dance experiences.

III. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

A. Discussion of Trends & Reflections

Notable Trends:

included in our Reflection response below

Reflections on Trends and Program Statistics:

STUDENT DATA: Headcount, first-year recruits, and transfers are lower than the previous five years. As stated in our previous review, in previous reports, and above, we know that we have work to do on creating and implementing a recruiting plan. We are concerned that students select other institutions based on the number of shows we produce, so we created a

semester program with increased opportunity to perform (however, in low budget shows). Our mix of ethnicity and gender allows us to produce creative and socially conscious shows. While our shows often appeal to the campus community and offer students a good range of experience, we might not have the local and regional community behind us when it comes to filling seats or recommending us to prospective students. We also believe that our current search for a tenure-track Design and Stage Technology colleague will rebuild the related concentration, critical to all production, to the stature it needs to attract more students. A longer timeline would also reveal the seesaw nature of our student data over time. Our semester program should meet the requirements of SB1440. Dance is concerned that they can only grow with more resources for more technique options, more guest artists, more travel, a regular team of lecturers, and funding for recruitment.

DEGREE DATA: This data is new to us. Last year data implied that we were doing very well in progress toward degree compared to other CLASS programs. Now that we see the data, it looks more middling. We need experience with the data to know how to best respond. We can say two things. 1) Our transfers are often not of a mindset to progress quickly. Many come from a community college with a 3-5-year transcript. 2) Possibly due to the number of fully produced shows we can mount these days, students often delay graduation at least one quarter to be able to perform a significant role or design a full show. We do work to undo the mindset described in #1 and we can discourage students from #2.

FACULTY/COURSE DATA:

Overall: For the number of faculty and majors, we are still a small department. Small changes in numbers cause very noticeable changes that probably obscure trends.

Headcount/FTEF: TT faculty are all tenured and progressing to final promotion. Full-time lecturers are dedicated to running production departments (sets, lights, sound, props, effects, costume, makeup) and operating the Theatre. Part-timers are now mostly dance related (technique and LBST/teacher related service courses) and other courses funded by release-time replacement of TT faculty. Now searching for design/production colleague who will replace one of the full-timers. Notice under % Breakdown that TT faculty now represent 60-70% of manpower.

FTES: TT faculty are teaching $\frac{3}{4}$ of students 2016 vs. $\frac{1}{3}$ in 2012. Upward changes in lecturer service mostly represents teaching TT release time replacement courses. Overall the “real” decrease relates to ability to offer dance courses mentioned above. Notice substantial commitment of faculty to GE. Why? Theatre Arts is a program of distinct expertise (acting and directing, dance, and stage technology/design) and specialized facilities. The college recognizes the distinctions and the faculty accept their role by contributing to GE. We don’t argue that our program isn’t costly as structured. What we argue for is equally important--our quality, value and contributions to the culture and climate of the campus and the surrounding community.

SFR: To define a trend here is as difficult as those discussed above. The reasons for the lecturer bubble 2013-15 is mentioned above. So, comparing 2012 to 2016, there is a slight increase in Overall SFR and a decrease in Instructional SFR explainable by the trend to limit our use of part-time lecturers. Concerning Course Level, notice the trend to offer less Upper Division in favor of Lower, which is probably explained competition for and following the GE audience. Regarding course type, this breakdown is new to us. We are not sure that there is a report for conveniently reviewing course classifications, so analysis would require sifting through PeopleSoft course by course. And, for courses with two classifications, drilling down to both. So, we can't offer a ready analysis this year. It would be helpful to have the tools next year and for Chairs and Admins to be trained on them. Also, our semester course list probably doesn't have as much complication as exists not. We certainly are not purposely trying to reduce enrollments, so we suspect that some of our subtle changes in course offerings, including those recommended by the college, will eventually explain the course information tables. Do notice that we have reduced sections (we also closed options). We also can't account for the Supervision numbers. The Enrollment Count percentages seem strange. Should we assume that they refer to courses with mixed enrollment? We have been attempting to increase enrollment in major courses and have had to reduce GE offerings. However, we have noticed that the competition for GE seats is becoming more and more fierce by the year. And, when we provide service to Concord, PACE and others, we are sometimes forced to live with less than full sections.

B. Request For Resources

Request For Tenure-Track Hires:

None requested at this time. We are currently in the process of conducting a Tenure Track Search that if successful, will fill one of the positions requested in the last Program Review Plan.

Request for Other Resources:

Our biggest issue at this time is mentioned above, EIRA (student fees). CAPR probably can't help us deal with this issue. We would like CLASS to keep in mind that it would be helpful to the production if our Production Assistant in the Scene Shop could work five days for 10 months (vs. four days). To be clear, we continue to build most scenery and all costumes with faculty and intermittent shop leaders funded by fees. Otherwise, special funding in recent years has updated sound, lighting, rigging, and other technical equipment. Whether we can depend on such funding to continue remains a touchy issue. Many people do comment on the "state of the Theatre," which means they see problems with which we have learned to live.

Occasionally we are asked to list such issues on capital improvement submissions, but what we say about regular maintenance and even ADA issues doesn't find it way to a list. And, our suggestions clearly exceed the funding available. Admittedly, when funding becomes available, we are occasionally asked to help prioritize. Occasionally, Facilities does something without any consultation at all.

College (All)
Major Theatre Arts

Undergraduate Students

		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
B1.1. Freshmen Cohort Headcount						
	NonURM	4	2	12	6	4
	URM	2	6	5	5	3
B1.1. Freshmen Cohort Headcount Total		6	8	17	11	7
B1.2. Freshmen Degree in 4 Years						
	NonURM	1	0	2	1	3
	URM	1	0	0	0	1
B1.2. Freshmen Degree in 4 Years Total		2	0	2	1	4
B1.3. Freshmen Degree in 6 Years						
	NonURM	3	0	4	3	3
	URM	1	0	1	2	2
B1.3. Freshmen Degree in 6 Years Total		4	0	5	5	5
B2.1. Transfer Cohort Headcount						
	NonURM	3	4	7	4	3
	URM	3	3	2	1	5
B2.1. Transfer Cohort Headcount Total		6	7	9	5	8
B2.2. Transfer Degree in 2 Years						
	NonURM	1	3	1	1	1
	URM	0	1	0	0	1
B2.2. Transfer Degree in 2 Years Total		1	4	1	1	2
B2.3. Transfer Degree in 4 Years						
	NonURM	2	3	3	1	2
	URM	2	1	0	1	3
B2.3. Transfer Degree in 4 Years Total		4	4	3	2	5
C1.1. Freshmen Headcount						
	Freshmen	6	8	17	11	7
C1.1. Freshmen Headcount Total		6	8	17	11	7
C1.2. Freshmen Degree in 4 Years						
	In Major	2	0	2	1	1
	Other Major	0	0	0	0	3
C1.2. Freshmen Degree in 4 Years Total		2	0	2	1	4
C1.3. Freshmen Degree in 6 Years						

	In Major	2	0	3	4	1
	Other Major	2	0	2	1	4
C1.3. Freshmen Degree in 6 Years Total		4	0	5	5	5
C2.1. Transfer Headcount						
	Transfer	6	7	9	5	8
C2.1. Transfer Headcount Total		6	7	9	5	8
C2.2. Transfer Degree in 2 Years						
	In Major	1	4	1	1	2
	Other Major	0	0	0	0	0
C2.2. Transfer Degree in 2 Years Total		1	4	1	1	2
C2.3. Transfer Degree in 4 Years						
	In Major	4	4	3	2	4
	Other Major	0	0	0	0	1
C2.3. Transfer Degree in 4 Years Total		4	4	3	2	5
Undergraduate Achievement Gap: Degree Rate						
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
B1.4. Freshmen Grad Rate 4 Years						
	NonURM	25.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	75.0%
	URM	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
B1.4. Freshmen Grad Rate 4 Years Total		33.3%	0.0%	11.8%	9.1%	57.1%
B1.5. Freshmen Grad Rate 6 Years						
	NonURM	75.0%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	75.0%
	URM	50.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	66.7%
B1.5. Freshmen Grad Rate 6 Years Total		66.7%	0.0%	29.4%	45.5%	71.4%
B2.4. Transfer Grad Rate 2 Years						
	NonURM	33.3%	75.0%	14.3%	25.0%	33.3%
	URM	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
BC2.4. Transfer Grad Rate 2 Years Total		16.7%	57.1%	11.1%	20.0%	25.0%
BC2.5. Transfer Grad Rate 4 Years						
	NonURM	66.7%	75.0%	42.9%	25.0%	66.7%
	URM	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	60.0%
BC2.5. Transfer Grad Rate 4 Years Total		66.7%	57.1%	33.3%	40.0%	62.5%
Undergraduate Major Change: Degree Rate						
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
C1.4. Freshmen Grad Rate 4 Years						
	In Major	33.3%	0.0%	11.8%	9.1%	14.3%

	Other Major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%
C1.4. Freshmen Grad Rate 4 Years Total		33.3%	0.0%	11.8%	9.1%	57.1%
C1.5. Freshmen Grad Rate 6 Years						
	In Major	33.3%	0.0%	17.6%	36.4%	14.3%
	Other Major	33.3%	0.0%	11.8%	9.1%	57.1%
C1.5. Freshmen Grad Rate 6 Years Total		66.7%	0.0%	29.4%	45.5%	71.4%
C2.4. Transfer Grad Rate 2 Years						
	In Major	16.7%	57.1%	11.1%	20.0%	25.0%
	Other Major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
C2.4. Transfer Grad Rate 2 Years Total		16.7%	57.1%	11.1%	20.0%	25.0%
C2.5. Transfer Grad Rate 4 Years						
	In Major	66.7%	57.1%	33.3%	40.0%	50.0%
	Other Major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
C2.5. Transfer Grad Rate 4 Years Total		66.7%	57.1%	33.3%	40.0%	62.5%