

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2010-2011
Submitted by Thomas Hird, Chair

FACULTY AND STAFF – We continue to meet our goals for retreats and regular meetings. The Peer Review Committees visited classes taught by all active lecturers.

In the past two years we revised the Acting, Dance, and Music Theatre Options, as well as the Dance Minor. This year we updated the BA Theatre Arts roadmap for the revised Beginning Electives, including the revised options and created advising sheets for students in these tracks. In preparation for our upcoming Program Review, we continued our evaluation of all other options. It is likely that we will propose discontinuation of several. We also looked at the viability of a new option in Integrative Interdisciplinary Performance, which would appeal to students involved in the informal, existing, and successful offerings of Professors Fajilan and Kupers. Professor Fajilan has attracted a following for her multicultural and solo performance classes and performances, while Professor Kupers continues to interest students in his All Bodies and Abilities work (mentioned in previous years).

Professor Jones developed a relationship with the exciting new playwright, Nambi E. Kelley, that allowed us to produce a fully mounted workshop production of *Xtigone*, her contemporary reimagining of Antigone. The show was invited to perform at the Region VII Kennedy Center American College Theatre Festival in February. The show helped student Chalia LaTour to get work with the African American Shakespeare Company in San Francisco on their recent production of *Twelfth Night*. Jones has participated in professional readings at Chicago Dramatists and La Mama. He will direct the initial professional production of the show for AASC next year. Jacobs' new musical, *All the More to Love*, received its US premiere at the Phoenix Theatre in Arizona. He will be working on his next script during his Fall, 2011 sabbatical, with the intent of producing the show first at CSUEB. Professors Haft and Kupers both lead busy professional dance companies that perform regularly in the Bay Area. Both companies performed in New York in the past year. Haft's company also toured to the Middle East. It should be noted that our lecturer faculty regularly produce professional work with significant Bay Area professional companies, including Laura Ellis's leadership role in the annual Black Choreographers Festival and Kimi Guthrie, who co-directs the Dandelion Dancetheatre.

To repeat a message from recent years, our most significant, continuing strain remains the lack of tenure-track production and design faculty and full-time theatre staff. We have attempted to keep up by squeezing operating budgets for more student assistants and part-time technicians to aid the lecturers in charge of the theatre and shops. We continue to share a sound and light technician and bookkeeper/ box office manager with Music. These two shared positions are examples of creative solutions we have implemented to sustain our campus mission related contributions at reduced cost to the college. We were forced to reduce lecturers in Spring, 2010, which in turn forced us to reduce summer production to a minimum. Reductions in production faculty or staff result in reduced safety and service in the Theatre for our program, University events, and revenue earning community rentals.

PROGRAM – While budget cuts have hurt and the budget situation continues to look bleak, we have implemented successful strategies to sustain us in difficult times. We have revised the most popular options for both efficiency and progress to degree. With these plans the tenure-track faculty remains committed to teaching cluster and service courses. In the latest cycle, we have proposed participation in three first-year clusters. We offer PACE courses, Liberal Studies courses, courses for Concord, and quarterly sections of Dance for Children (meets Theatre Arts option requirements, state mandates for KPE majors, LBST electives, and needs of future teachers).

Our S&S budget has now been cut past the bone. The production faculty have used amazing creativity to provide substantial scenery and costumes. We have shifted IRA funds to keep up with the strain on the production aspect of the S&S budget, but also suffered a cut in IRA with the promise of more cuts.

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2010-2011
Submitted by Thomas Hird, Chair

Even with budget strains and cuts, we managed to produce last summer to give the campus some cultural life. We have asked for a definitive decision on summer production, which the faculty budget imperils.

FACILITIES – We continue to maintain the University Theatre, not only for our own use, but also for the campus and community. Our technical students successfully operate most theatre events for a range of users that book speakers and performances. This provides them with ideal practical experience that makes them all the more employable. (Several design students and alumni received regional and international recognition this year.) We were provided with substantial equipment funding that will replace an aging light control board, update lighting instruments to reduce operating costs, provide improved media access in specialized classrooms, replace aging equipment in the shops, and replace missing or ruined drapery in the Dance Studio. We still have substantial projects remaining, including Dance Studio lighting, University Theatre sound system replacement, and theatre video documentation system.

INITIATIVES – Probably our most significant current initiative is the draft proposal for a School of Arts and Media that would create closer cooperation between Art, Communication, Music, and Theatre and Dance. Expensive programs always stick out in difficult budget times, but in reality the departments have the same problems as any other. All these programs are running at basic staffing and funding levels for the programming offered, so one aspect of cooperation will involve adapting to future realities. Foremost in the minds of faculty is the potential for synergy in curricular offerings. Cooperating in curriculum development should provide opportunities for students to learn more and to develop the broader range of skills that result from working across standard disciplinary boundaries. Range proves useful in today's evolving job market and provides a foundation for creative leaps that take society and culture to new levels of understanding and accomplishment.

As mentioned in previous years, Eric Kupers and Ann Fajilan continue to develop an Inclusive Interdisciplinary Performance program, probably as an option or revision of an option. We continue to develop additional Lower Division GE courses for second year students, including both Theatre and Dance courses, as well as cooperative courses with other arts and media departments. We also hope for the Dance and Musical Theatre programs to conduct recruiting tours soon. Overall recruiting continues to be difficult issue for an already busy faculty who are here days, nights, and weekends whether for coursework, production, hosting guest artists, advising student clubs, or national/ international tours. We continue to write grants and promote donations. See Assessment.

CURRICULUM – Updates accomplished this year and those being planned are covered in the narrative above and Assessment section below.

ASSESSMENT – Through our portfolio process and the culminating production program (Fusion), we continue to notice that performance students lack depth in technique. While we have revised the Acting and Dance options to provide more technique, we are frustrated by the current budgetary environment that recently forced us, for example, to cancel almost all dance technique courses in Spring, 2010. In response, we are looking for creative ways for the tenure-track faculty to take more responsibility for technique. In musical theatre we have already created applied singing classes for improving vocal skills, but we must limit enrollment due to the course classification and realities of course load. The dance faculty are making advanced technique a more significant aspect of Dance Ensemble courses.

Portfolios have shown that while students' technique is weak, they do develop some skills in each of our emphasis areas--acting, dance, and technology/design. The improvement from first portfolio to final submission continues to indicate that the Core courses appear to be doing their job

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2010-2011
 Submitted by Thomas Hird, Chair

on a basic level, but that students need more technique at the advanced level. We have addressed this lack in the recent Option modifications. More technique, a greater range, and more specific advanced courses have been developed and are already being offered with some success. Budget will have an effect on our ability to deliver in the needed technique components.

This year we are devoting effort to evaluate and collect data on a specific outcome: “[Solving] production problems to support art and function.” This outcome is crucial to our performance-based curriculum. We prepare students not only to solve, but also to pose interesting artistic problems. Students with these skills are able to transition from school to careers in the arts because they know how to keep asking fruitful questions. They also learn how to leverage their strengths, compensate for weaknesses, measure their own growth, and to make meaningful contributions in the arts, culture and community. One of our key objectives is therefore to teach critical thinking skills across the Theatre and Dance curriculum. This mini-assessment project differs from the overall portfolio based approach of the past. Professor Haft started by creating a streamlined rubric for assessing student progress in learning problem solving and critical thinking during rehearsal/design and performance activities. Her results should be available for review at the next department retreat.

As reported in past years, we are revising our assessment plan to make it less cumbersome and easier to evaluate. Using portfolios as an assessment tool meant concentrated effort on the part of students to create a record twice vs. maintaining a document continuously. Similarly, faculty had to evaluate a large amount of data in two large gulps at the busiest times of the year. Outcomes were also too complicated and neither students nor faculty knew which artifacts should be included. New outcomes on a reduced scale will have been offered in our upcoming Program Review. For the new approach we are identifying specific artifacts that will be collected by the students, evaluated under a standard rubric by the regular advisers, tracked throughout the college career, and sampled annually by a faculty committee for program improvement.

California State University, East Bay
APR Summary Data
Fall 2005 - 2009

Theatre Arts & Dance					
	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	46	54	60	72	64
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	1	0	0	3
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	46	55	60	72	67
	College Years				
	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
B. Degrees Awarded					
1. Undergraduate	7	9	6	15	14
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total	7	9	6	15	14
	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
C. Faculty					

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2010-2011
 Submitted by Thomas Hird, Chair

Tenured/Track Headcount						
1. Full-Time	5	8	7	7	7	
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0	
3a. Total Tenure Track	5	8	7	7	7	
3b. % Tenure Track	38.5%	53.3%	43.8%	35.0%	35.0%	
Lecturer Headcount						
4. Full-Time	1	1	2	2	2	
5. Part-Time	7	6	7	11	11	
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	8	7	9	13	13	
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	61.5%	46.7%	56.3%	65.0%	65.0%	
7. Grand Total All Faculty	13	15	16	20	20	
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)						
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	4.9	7.0	7.0	6.5	6.9	
9. Lecturer FTEF	5.3	4.8	8.9	3.9	3.3	
10. Total Instructional FTEF	10.2	11.8	15.9	10.3	10.2	
Lecturer Teaching						
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	37.9	69.9	100.4	90.7	114.9	
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	34.5%	54.1%	66.4%	58.0%	63.4%	
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	71.9	59.3	50.9	65.8	66.4	
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	65.5%	45.9%	33.6%	42.0%	36.6%	
13. Total FTES taught	109.9	129.3	151.3	156.5	181.3	
14. Total SCU taught	1648.0	1939.0	2269.0	2348.0	2720.0	
D. Student Faculty Ratios						
1. Tenured/Track	7.7	10.0	14.4	14.0	16.7	
2. Lecturer	13.5	12.3	5.7	17.1	19.9	
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	10.7	10.9	9.5	15.2	17.8	
4. Lower Division	11.5	12.9	9.8	17.8	18.6	
5. Upper Division	10.3	9.5	9.0	12.8	16.6	
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
E. Section Size						
1. Number of Sections Offered	52.0	60.0	72.0	69.0	65.0	
2. Average Section Size	8.2	9.6	10.4	13.3	13.4	
3. Average Section Size for LD	9.2	10.7	10.8	13.9	13.9	
4. Average Section Size for UD	7.6	8.5	9.8	12.7	12.9	
5. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	8	17	27	15	19	
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	8	15	13	16	15	
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0	
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	25	30	34	34	26	
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	19	10	14	19	15	
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0	
D. Student Faculty Ratios		DANC				
1. Tenured/Track	0.0	7.6	17.5	23.0	25.4	
2. Lecturer	21.9	21.0	4.1	17.9	23.0	
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	21.9	14.6	7.3	20.4	24.0	
4. Lower Division	24.9	22.1	7.3	22.5	25.6	
5. Upper Division	18.8	7.8	7.4	15.5	19.2	
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Theatre and Dance Annual Report 2010-2011
 Submitted by Thomas Hird, Chair

<i>E. Section Size</i>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	13.0	20.0	24.0	25.0	15.0
2. Average Section Size	501.0	609.0	813.0	816.0	732.0
3. Average Section Size for LD	13.9	12.4	13.2	16.7	21.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	16.0	23.0	14.1	16.9	20.6
5. Average Section Size for GD	12.5	7.1	11.9	16.5	22.0
<i>6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	7	8	5	3
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	4	3	4	2
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	20	22	24	26	16
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	3	2	4	4	2
<i>D. Student Faculty Ratios</i>	THEA				
1. Tenured/Track	7.7	10.6	13.4	11.8	15.5
2. Lecturer	10.1	8.6	8.5	16.7	18.3
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	8.8	9.8	11.5	13.4	16.2
4. Lower Division	8.2	9.7	13.0	14.9	16.1
5. Upper Division	9.1	9.9	9.7	12.3	16.3
6. Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>E. Section Size</i>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	39.0	40.0	48.0	44.0	50.0
2. Average Section Size	1147.0	1330.0	1456.0	1532.0	1988.0
3. Average Section Size for LD	7.3	8.7	9.4	12.0	11.8
4. Average Section Size for UD	8.1	8.4	9.7	12.4	11.9
5. Average Section Size for GD	6.9	9.1	9.1	11.7	11.7
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	8	10	19	10	16
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	8	11	10	12	13
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	5	8	10	8	10
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	16	8	10	15	13