

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2011-12 (BA, Theatre Arts)

We completed and submitted our five-year self-study and plan on time.

Professor Regina Cate will finish her FERP this year. Professor Marc Jacobs took a sabbatical during the Fall Quarter to work on a new play that will have a reading on campus in May. It is possible that reduced resources related to sabbaticals and retirement will adversely affect enrollment targets in future years, as well as our ability to offer both major and service sections. Professor Kaufman seamlessly took over the Ancient World cluster. Professors Kupers and Haft continued to teach in two other clusters. We have reduced our commitment to other clusters, in order to reassign resources to support the needs of majors, option students, and other service courses.

Our biggest tenure-track needs continue to be in the production areas of design and technology. Our contribution to the campus and community, as well as one third of the major, is related to production involving design and technology faculty.

We continue to pursue new avenues of recruitment, especially for musical theatre and design/technology.

Faculty continued to make impressive professional contributions. Kupers and Haft produced major dance concerts locally to which they made important artistic contributions. Kupers has visited Ireland twice this year to choreograph for the country's only physically integrated dance company. His work will be performed in June at a national performance festival in Cork. Haft has been offered a commission to present her choreography at the prestigious Montalvo Arts Center in Saratoga, CA for their New Directions Series in 2013. Jones was invited to direct a major professional work for a San Francisco company that ran out of funding. Hird made another presentation to the education program of his national professional organization. Fajilan, with more time since the demise of our children's theatre, began to direct off campus and to investigate how solo and devised theatre techniques are being used as pedagogy. She also joined the board of a statewide educational theatre organization. Alcalá will design for the SF Opera again. One of Olmsted's professional set designs was nominated for a major Bay Area award.

While we produced another reduced summer theatre program in 2011, the program offered challenging productions that offered needed creative challenges to students and added to the summer cultural life for which student pay fees. In the fall Professor Fajilan directed *The Laramie Project* in a touching production featuring a multicultural cast, Professor Jones directed his original compilation of musical theatre work entitled, *That's Life, That's Love, That's Broadway*, and the dance faculty offered the annual dance extravaganza, *ICE*. Our winter musical, *I Love You, You're Perfect, Now Change*, demonstrated that our musical theatre students' voices are improving. The faculty choreographed spring dance concert, *Refractions*, will feature new works developed in collaboration with students. Our annual culmination festival, *Performance Fusion*, will feature 15 performances including dance, theatre, and video. Over 17 students are serving in leadership roles in Fusion and/or completing independent culmination projects.

Professors Jones, Haft, and Kupers led the way in our initiative to provide more performance opportunities for students off campus. Jones conceived the fall musical theatre tour which travelled to 11 Northern California schools in the Bay Area, Sacramento and Santa Rosa. Besides selecting literature, directing and choreographing the presentation, Jones organized and booked the tour. Haft started the CSUEB Dance Touring Company, which performed extensively off campus as well as for department and university events. The touring company had its professional debut in March 2012 at ODC Theater, performing "Let You Go", an original piece made in collaboration with the dancers. Haft's professional company received funding from the New Stages for Dance Initiative, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Theatre Bay Area and CSUEB (Faculty Support Grant) for this project. Kupers' students perform in several public venues. We hope these efforts also have an effect on recruitment.

Last summer Olmsted was able to rebuild the Theatre lighting system, including new contemporary instrumentation and an up-to-date control board purchased with increased equipment

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2011-12 (BA, Theatre Arts)

funding. This year the department successfully proposed equipment improvements for the Theatre sound system. In March a new control console and replacement speakers were approved. We were also able to upgrade our teaching and production technology. It appears that the roof finally will be replaced this summer.

ASSESSMENT

Recent assessments have identified performance technique as a major issue for our dance majors. Due to the need to reduce lecturers, we created a schedule that enable us to meet minimal needs. Unless additional cuts are necessary, we can offer Hip Hop, Jazz, Tap, Musical Theatre, and Ballet techniques for majors and non-majors, taught by lecturers Laura Ellis and Anne-Lise Reusswig. Kupers and Haft will take over responsibility for beginning and add advanced Modern technique.

Last year Professor Haft completed an assessment of our previous SLO #9, regarding problem solving in a creative performance environment. She participated in a CLASS cohort of Assessment Fellows, presenting findings both to her cohort and our department. Her goals for the project were to correlate student awareness of problem-solving with effectiveness of faculty rubrics in production courses and to help us understand how we enhance student creativity.

Her project consisted of conducting student and faculty surveys through a combination of questionnaires, one-on-one conversations, and a department discussion of the production outcomes of our Capstone program. She compared student and faculty responses about creative problem solving, correlating them to the clarity of rubrics and number of teaching strategies used to implement them. 74 students and six faculty completed questionnaires that consisted of identifying a problem or challenge in a production environment (performance) and listing questions that students asked (of themselves or others) in the process of solving the problem creatively.

In courses taken primarily by majors and minors, she found a higher number of questions (averaging 1.8 with a range of 1.5-2.2 questions per student). Majors and minors generally asked a higher level of question (primarily intermediate level) vs. non-majors. There was a surprising correlation of the level of complexity of questions, not to a level of schooling (seniors vs. juniors), but to the degree that faculty rubrics asked students to see things from other people's points of view. Also, greater responsibility (i.e. directing a senior project) did not correlate with asking either a greater number of questions or a higher level of questions. For example, capstone students reported an average of 1.5 questions per student, and NO advanced level questions.

Haft's results provided important information for our future curriculum planning and for preparing assignments. Seniors will probably need more time and professional experience to recognize any paradigm shifts that their culminating projects engender. To support future students in creating and evaluating their own work from multiple perspectives, we should require students to be more versatile in their approaches to creative problem solving. For example, in addition to asking students to prepare design drafts, choreography and monologues, we ought also to ask them to change a significant parameter (such as budget, venue, time limits or recent current events) and address how their current solutions might be impacted or even improved by mastery of these parameters. Concerning problem-solving skills training, the faculty has discussed how to create a unified rubric for the Capstone program. Haft will continue to pursue a rubric that includes the number and types of questions posed by students about artistic assignments and ranks questions by complexity (for example: a- beginning level = yes or no questions; b- intermediate level = questions reference interdependent issues; and c- advanced level = questions imply paradigm or perspective shifts). She will recruit several faculty to implement or adjust assignments in performance classes, in order to collect data continuously. She believes that surveys of alumni could enhance our understanding of the success of the developing rubric, but we don't have funds to survey alumni.

Kupers is serving as a CLASS Assessment Fellow this year. Working with Haft, he is piloting

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2011-12 (BA, Theatre Arts)

an assessment project related to a new department SLO, "Students will have a foundation in performance techniques and production technology of theatre and dance, especially those appropriate to their area of emphasis." The goal is to assess the educational growth that our students experience through participation in department productions using pre- and post-project instruments that include both self-assessment and professor assessment. The pilot will examine the changes students experience through their participation in the spring dance production *Refractions*. After Kupers analyzes the results, he will present them to the faculty at our fall retreat with recommendations about how to utilize the instruments in the future.

As reported last year, we have reviewed our initial Assessment Plan. A revised Assessment Plan is included as part of our five year self-study, including both a reduced number of outcomes (five) and new methodology. However, the Assessment Fellows program appears to be so practical that we might adopt the proposed Outcomes and develop methodology around the Fellows program. The fellows program provides flexibility for an annual assessor to develop their own pilot assessment instrument. The revised plan recommends switching to a new methodology that could easily become as cumbersome as that of the former program. Either way we are likely to at least deal with all outcomes, one year at-a-time over five years.

California State University, East Bay
APR Summary Data
Fall 2006 - 2010

Theatre Arts & Dance					
	Fall Quarter				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	54	60	72	64	63
2. Postbaccalaureate	1	0	0	3	0
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	55	60	72	67	63
	College Years				
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
B. Degrees Awarded					
1. Undergraduate	9	6	15	14	7
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total	9	6	15	14	7
	Fall Quarter				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	8	7	7	7	7
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	8	7	7	7	7
3b. % Tenure Track	53.3%	43.8%	35.0%	35.0%	58.3%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	1	2	2	2	2
5. Part-Time	6	7	11	11	3
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	7	9	13	13	5

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2011-12 (BA, Theatre Arts)

6b. % Non-Tenure Track	46.7%	56.3%	65.0%	65.0%	41.7%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	15	16	20	20	12
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	7.0	7.0	6.5	6.9	6.9
9. Lecturer FTEF	4.8	8.9	3.9	3.3	2.4
10. Total Instructional FTEF	11.8	15.9	10.3	10.2	9.3
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	69.9	100.4	90.7	114.9	113.4
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	54.1%	66.4%	58.0%	63.4%	70.6%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	59.3	50.9	65.8	66.4	47.3
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	45.9%	33.6%	42.0%	36.6%	29.4%
13. Total FTES taught	129.3	151.3	156.5	181.3	160.7
14. Total SCU taught	1939.0	2269.0	2348.0	2720.0	2411.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	10.0	14.4	14.0	16.7	16.5
2. Lecturer	12.3	5.7	17.1	19.9	19.7
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	10.9	9.5	15.2	17.8	17.3
4. Lower Division	12.9	9.8	17.8	18.6	17.3
5. Upper Division	9.5	9.0	12.8	16.6	17.3
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	60.0	72.0	69.0	65.0	58.0
2. Average Section Size	9.6	10.4	13.3	13.4	14.0
3. Average Section Size for LD	10.7	10.8	13.9	13.9	12.9
4. Average Section Size for UD	8.5	9.8	12.7	12.9	15.3
5. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	17	27	15	19	18
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	15	13	16	15	20
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	30	34	34	26	23
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	10	14	19	15	8
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0

D. Student Faculty Ratios		DANC				
1. Tenured/Track		7.6	17.5	23.0	25.4	25.1
2. Lecturer		21.0	4.1	17.9	23.0	21.6
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)		14.6	7.3	20.4	24.0	23.8
4. Lower Division		22.1	7.3	22.5	25.6	23.7
5. Upper Division		7.8	7.4	15.5	19.2	24.0
6. Graduate		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
E. Section Size						
1. Number of Sections Offered		20.0	24.0	25.0	15.0	15.0
2. SCU taught		609.0	813.0	816.0	732.0	893.0
3. Average Section Size		12.4	13.2	16.7	21.0	23.9
4. Average Section Size for LD		23.0	14.1	16.9	20.6	21.6

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2011-12 (BA, Theatre Arts)

5. Average Section Size for UD	7.1	11.9	16.5	22.0	26.2
6. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	7	8	5	3	4
8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	4	3	4	2	4
9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
10. LD Section taught by Lecturer	22	24	26	16	14
11. UD Section taught by Lecturer	2	4	4	2	2
12. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
<i>D. Student Faculty Ratios</i>	THEA				
1. Tenured/Track	10.6	13.4	11.8	15.5	13.8
2. Lecturer	8.6	8.5	16.7	18.3	18.5
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	9.8	11.5	13.4	16.2	14.9
4. Lower Division	9.7	13.0	14.9	16.1	14.7
5. Upper Division	9.9	9.7	12.3	16.3	15.1
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>E. Section Size</i>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	40.0	48.0	44.0	50.0	43.0
2. SCU taught	1330.0	1456.0	1532.0	1988.0	1518.0
3. Average Section Size	8.7	9.4	12.0	11.8	11.4
4. Average Section Size for LD	8.4	9.7	12.4	11.9	10.9
5. Average Section Size for UD	9.1	9.1	11.7	11.7	12.1
6. Average Section Size for GD	0	0	0	0	0
7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	10	19	10	16	14
8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	11	10	12	13	16
9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
10. LD Section taught by Lecturer	8	10	8	10	9
11. UD Section taught by Lecturer	8	10	15	13	6
12. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0