

5. Please present concise arguments for the GE principles applicable to this course.

- General Knowledge

This course integrates qualitative research methods (ethnographic interviews, participant observation) with close reading strategies of critical texts to provide undergraduates with a noble introduction to humanities research.

- Integrative Learning

Our consideration of the historical, practical, theoretical, and material politics of the US performing arts infrastructure synthesizes contrasting approaches across the disciplinary domains of art, performance, cultural/social theory, and arts policy.

- Ethical Implications

- Cultural Diversity

- Critical Thinking

- Rhetorical Effectiveness

- Problem-solving

- Library & Information Literacy

(A) STUDENT CONTACT PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)

- 1. Lecture: _____ (hours)
- 2. Discussion Section: _____ (hours)
- 3. labs _____ (hours)
- 4. Experiential (service learning, internships, other): _____ (hours)
- 5. Field Trips: _____ (hours)

(A) TOTAL Student Contact Per Week **(HOURS)**

(B) OUT-OF-CLASS HOURS PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)

- 1. General Review & Preparation: _____ (hours)
- 2. Reading _____ (hours)
- 3. Group Projects: _____ (hours)
- 4. Preparation for Quizzes & Exams: _____ (hours)
- 5. Information Literacy Exercises: _____ (hours)
- 6. Written Assignments: _____ (hours)
- 7. Research Activity: _____ (hours)

(B) TOTAL Out-of-class time per week **(HOURS)**

GRAND TOTAL (A) + (B) must equal at least 15 hours/week **(HOURS)**

World Arts and Cultures/Dance/Arts and Architecture M98TB
Infrastructure and the Performing Arts: Practices, Policies, Politics
Spring 2015

Meeting day/time, place (TBD, Glorja Kaufman Hall)

Course Instructor: Sarah Wilbur, MFA, PhD Candidate World Arts and Cultures/Dance

Contact phone: 414-429-7668 (cell/text)

Office # and hours: GKH 130A (Date/time TBD)

Email: s.wilbur@ucla.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION: As the income gap in the United States has grown, the possibility of a career in the performing arts has become increasingly less viable for a significant percentage of the population. In a country with an almost fifty-year history of partial and highly contingent support for the arts, the US government's strategies of indirection obfuscate understanding around the practices, policies, and politics at play in this highly decentralized field. Today's aspiring artists and arts intermediaries may find themselves wondering why, for example, the ongoing promotion of citizen arts "engagement" by arts policy institutions like the NEA does not necessarily equate with job gains, wage gains, or infrastructural stability for professional artists. To reconcile the offstage co-operation of US arts intermediaries and repair this gap between institutional policies and local practices, this ten-week seminar approaches the infrastructure of the performing arts as an interdependent social performance fuelled by the committed enactments of legislators, funders, administrators, presenters, artists, and scholars, alike. Students need not be artists or own extensive experience in the arts; this GE course is open to all UCLA undergraduate students with an interest in the policies, practices, and politics of the performing arts.

Drawing together literature from the disciplinary domains of US arts policy, cultural theory, and performance studies, our qualitative framework teases apart frequent misconceptions about institutional subsidy and justification with an interest in exposing dominant discourses that partition and privilege particular works, workers, and ways of working. By particularizing the offstage practice of making and sustaining live performance works as a contentious and differentially enacted research problem, we underline what Dwight Conquergood (2002) has described as the "promiscuous traffic between different ways of knowing" that has long left arts policy estranged from the everyday field practices of today's artists and arts intermediaries. Throughout this work we define the "performing arts" to include dance, theatre, music, spoken word, and body-based performance. Weekly writing summaries develop students' capacity to analyze the significance of policy and production narratives, and in class interviews with key agents of production challenge students to understand art making as a context-specific conundrum. Live performance attendance hones students' capacity to observe and critically respond to local production contingencies. The Major Research Paper asks students to identify and conduct an infrastructural historiography of local art group or individual, linking localized production practices to the broader infrastructural legacies that we study in our weekly readings and through outside sources.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Better understand and think critically about the historical support structures, policies and practices that impede and enhance the integration of the performing arts into US cultural life. *Demonstrated through weekly summaries, field research, observations and interviews, and Major Research Paper.*
2. Analyze the differentiated roles, skills, and responsibilities of the many cultural intermediaries whose work supports the staging and resourcing of live performance events across genres and cultural contexts. *Achieved through weekly discussions, in-class interviews, performance observation/attendance, and Major Research Paper.*

3. Hone the ability to describe, analyze, and interpret the connections and contradictions that exist between arts policy and arts production practices using a transdisciplinary research strategy drawing together archival sources and observed practices to underline infrastructural contingencies. *Achieved through Weekly Summaries, practice-oriented class exercises, and Major Research Paper.*
4. Articulate a standpoint-specific written investigation of the US performing arts infrastructure that underlines the differentiated impacts of arts policy programs, resources, and rhetorics on a selected artist/arts group's ground level operations using practice as an analytical referent. *Demonstrated through Major Research Paper.*
5. Develop a reflexive understanding of personal biases that researchers bring to bear on academic analysis within and beyond arts production discourse. *Demonstrated in students' weekly field journal, in-class ethnographic writing exercises, and in Major Research Paper.*

Course Requirements, Assignments, and Evaluative criteria

Class readings, discussions, and activities (20 points): Students are expected to come to class having closely read all required readings using the reading strategies handout distributed by the instructor on the first day of class. Close reading is considered essential to facilitate active in class discussion and debate and will enhance students' capacity to respond in writing to the frequent contradictions we examine throughout the course trajectory. In class writing prompts are designed to hone ethnographic analytical skills and develop a critical awareness of the value of standpoint specificity as an approach to learning about the politics of arts production. Students earn one point per class for active participation. (1 x 20 classes = 20 points)

Weekly Writing Summaries (80 points): Students are expected to write a total of EIGHT close reading responses to the required texts using the Close Reading Strategies handout to guide analysis. These summaries are always due (hard copy) at the start of the class following the assigned texts. See Appendix for Close Reading Strategies. Papers that articulate the criteria in lucid academic prose earn 5 points. (8 x 10 papers = 80 points)

In-class interview prompts and moderator facilitation with invited guest speakers (20 points): Weeks three-six, we are joined in class by key policy makers, funders, arts presenters, and artists who have agreed to participate in student-facilitated conversations about the infrastructural policies, practices, and politics of the performing arts. These discussions are designed to prepare students to conduct the ethnographic interviews required in their Major Paper by rehearsing critical research and interview skills. Student moderator teams are assigned to each speaker during week one and are responsible for editing and organizing interview questions submitted online by class participants in advance of this discussion. Interview guidelines will be discussed in class. (Team grade = up to 10 points)

Field Journal (20 points) a daily field journal is an online or print notebook wherein students are asked to respond to weekly prompts related to issues and concepts addressed in class. Written insights foreground the first hand experience, sociocultural background, and value of the student. One entry per class is required, and students are required to submit (print or copy journal) hard copy along with Major Research Paper during Finals week. (Ten entries x 2 points each = 20 points)

Attendance at UCLA live performance event (5 points) Students will check in with instructor at live event and receive credit for active participation and field note taking, which will be utilized in our subsequent class discussion. (5 points)

Major Research Paper asks students to approach the critical disconnect between infrastructural policies and practices by identifying a local artist/arts group and event and conducting an archival and ethnographic examination of the supports that condition this performance. Using course literature and outside sources successful papers highlight convergences and disjunctures between these local practices and broader historical policies and programs enacted by dominant state and private arts institutions. Designed as a processual writing exercise, the paper develops and students' work is assessed across four areas of activity:

1. Outline (due week two)

(5 points)

2. Draft one (due week seven)

(10 points)

3. Oral Presentation on Major Research Paper (due week ten)

(10 points)

4. Major Research Paper Due (due finals week)

(30 points)

Grading Breakdown

Class readings, discussions, and activities	(20 points)
Weekly Writing Summaries	(80 points)
In-class interview prompts/moderator facilitation	(20 points)
Field Journal	(20 points)
Attendance at UCLA live performance event	(5 points)
Major Research Paper Outline	(5 points)
Major Research Paper Draft one	(10 points)
Major Research Paper Due	(30 points)
Oral Presentation on Major Research Paper	(10 points)
TOTAL	200 points

Major Assignment Due Dates

Weekly Reading Summaries (due weeks two-nine)
Major Research Paper Outline (due week two)
Major Research Paper Draft one (due week seven)
Oral Presentation on Major Research Paper (due week ten)
Major Research Paper Due (due finals week)
Field Journal Submissions (due finals week)

Grading scale

Ranges: A = 184-200 B = 164-183 C = 149-163 D = 124-143 F = 0-123

A (95%+) 190 +
A- (92%+) 184-189
B+ (88%+) 176-183
B (85%+) 170-175
B- (82%+) 164-169

C+ (78%+)	156-163
C (75%+)	150-155
C- (72%+)	144-149
D+ (68%+)	136-143
D (65%+)	130-135
D- (62%+)	124-129
F (<62%)	0-123

Required Texts or other materials

Course reader is available at Westwood Copies (or TBD/online). Additional in-class readings and video hyperlinks will be distributed by the instructor. Some visual materials may be available on reserve in the Instructional Medial Lab at the College Library, in which case, you can arrange a viewing using your Bruin ID card.

Required Ticket Purchase/Attendance

Students are required to attend two live performance events outside of our regularly scheduled seminar time. One is an instructor-selected UCLA Performing Arts Event (week five) and the other is a Student-selected Performance Event (on or before week seven). Events/Dates/Details TBD.

Disability information

Students are invited to discuss their needs with the course instructor with the understanding that all disability-related information will remain confidential. Office hours are: TBD. If you wish to request an accommodation due to a suspected or documented disability, please inform your instructor and contact the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) as soon as possible at A255 Murphy Hall, 310.825.1501, 310.206-6083 (telephone device for the deaf). General support services are also available at the Students with Disabilities website: www.osd.ucla.edu.

Information on Academic Integrity

Students must confirm to UCLA rules on Academic Integrity and will be held accountable for transgressions to this policy. Please familiarize yourself with these policies at the following website: <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/students/integrity/>

The following guidelines assert campus policies and strategies to protect against charges of academic dishonesty:

<http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/assets/documents/StudentGuide.pdf>

Before writing, be reminded of the following stipulations and campus resources:

<http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/assets/documents/paper.pdf>

SAMPLE WEEKLY COURSE OUTLINE

Week One: Exploding the Myths

Goals: Course introduction, identify research problem, in-class close reading strategies rehearsal in preparation for weekly summaries. View case study.

- Self-introductions, group ice breaker (20 minutes)
- Introduce course syllabus, field journal, Major Research Paper, Special Activities, weekly deadlines & class policies) (45 minutes)
- Assign Moderator Teams for five in-class interviews and review criteria (10 minutes)
- Introduce research problem and disciplinary orientations by way of prevailing debates/misconceptions:
 - i. Myths about the US performing arts infrastructure (US arts policy literature)
 - ii. Myths about Artists (sociology of culture, cultural studies literature)
 - iii. Myths about Performance (performance studies literature) (45 minutes)
- Distribute close reading guidelines, practice close reading in preparation for weekly summaries
- In Class Reading: arts policy monograph “The View From Here: A Report from The Brooklyn Commune Project on the State of the Performing Arts From the Perspective of Artists (abridged)”. Brooklyn Commune Project, 2013, 10 pages. (45 minutes)
- Case Study (on Artists): Dr. Julia Bryan Wilson, UC-Berkeley Art History “Should Artists Professionalize?” <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4KbdrK7GQNA> (15 minutes)

Due Next Class:

Required Reading

- Miller, Toby and George Yüdice. “The United States, Cultural Policy, and the National Endowment for the Arts” in *Cultural Policy*. London: Sage, 2000, pp. 35-71
- Toepler, Stefan. “Roles of Foundations and Their Impact in the Arts” in *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions*. Helmut K. Anheier and David C. Hammack, Eds. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010, p. 283-204.
- Taylor, Diana. Chapter One (excerpt #1), “Acts of Transfer” p. 1-15 ONLY. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Required Writing:

- 1-Field Journal Week One online reflection CCLE (due 11:59pm the day before next class session).
Sample prompt #1: expand on Bryan-Wilson’s “YES” questions at the end of the video and pose your own, contingent “answers” at this early stage in our investigation. Consider your response the beginning of a debate you hope to stage as a conversation with yourself over the next ten weeks toward your Major Paper assignment.
- 2-Weekly Summary ((Miller, Toepler, Taylor). Use reading strategies as a guide. Responses should be typed, single-spaced, 11 point Times/Times New Roman Font, 1” margins. Hard copy due at the start of class. Six pages max.
- 3-Brainstorm One page Major Research Paper Outline (due Week Two) (See APPENDIX C)

Required Activity: Purchase and/or Reserve your ticket for two live performance events, including 1) instructor-selected event on the UCLA Center for the Art of Performance season calendar (TBD) and 2) student-selected event linked to the topic of your Major Research Paper.

Week Two: The Leveraging Dance: Institutional Support for the Arts

Goals: discuss course readings/histories of institutional support for performing artists in US culture. Define key policy terms and institutional intermediaries. Discuss Taylor’s concept of performance as a topic, theory, and method, and its utility as a conceptual framework for linking arts policy to art production practices. View interview case study and discuss critical interview skills. Assign moderator teams for in class interviews.

- Warm Up (10)
- Small Group Brainstorm to synthesize and document (on white board) key findings from readings, three groups, one text per group (30)

- Full class discussion of arguments, costs/benefits, significance (60)
- Introduce course CCLE Glossary, where we will input key terms beginning with Taylor's plural definitions of "performance" and work backwards through the policy readings (30)
- Add key terms to Glossary (students take charge of this after week two) (15)
- Artist case study: Lois Welk Interviews Choreographers Bill T Jones/Susan Rethorst (15)
<http://www.pcah.us/the-center/publications-research/bill-t-jones-susan-rethorst-a-conversation-in-five-parts-full-interview/>
- Assign and Review Moderator Team & Student roles/responsibilities for in class interviews (weeks 3-6)(10)
- Collect One Page Major Research Paper Outlines (5)
- Schedule Week Three One-on-One meetings to discuss Major Research Paper Outlines (5)

Due Next Class:

Required Reading

- 1-Reid, Daniel. "An American Vision of Federal Arts Subsidies: Why and How the US Government Should Support Artistic Expression" in *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities*. Vol. 21. Issue 2. 2013.
- 2-Taylor, Diana. Chapter One (excerpt #2), "Acts of Transfer" p. 16-33 ONLY. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- 3-About Douglas Sonntag: <http://arts.gov/NEARTS/2009v2-%EF%BF%BC%EF%BF%BCfirst-steps/thorny-wonderful-problem>

Required Writing:

- 1-Interview Questions: each student submits online three critical questions for Douglas Sonntag (due 48 hours before the start of the next class (CCLE))
- 2-Field Journal Week Two Reflection/online CCLE (due 11:59pm the day before next class session).
Sample Prompt #2: Observe and respond to a daily activity that you perform in a public context and reflect on the number of intermediary individuals (potentially anonymous) that support your enactment and completion of that act. Feel free to reflect on a mundane activity (eating lunch, doing homework) or something fantastical. Use active verbs, name names, and try to spotlight invisible labor and interdependence where it might be taken for granted or forgotten.
- 3- Weekly Summary: (Reid, Taylor) Typed, doubled-spaced, 11 point Times/Times New Roman Font, 1" margins. Due (hard copy) at the start of class. Three pages max.

Required Activities

- 1-Meet with Instructor at designated time for one-on-one discussion of Major Paper Outline
- 2-*Moderator Team Sonntag ONLY: Collect student submissions, organize into core themes, create interview outline designating division of labor amongst the group. (Assign timekeeper, PowerPoint operator, lead moderator, scribe, etc.,).

Week Three: Policing the Field: State Resources, Regulations, and Justifications

Goals: Discuss Federal Justification narratives for arts subsidy, using the Reid critique as a guide. Define key arguments for art's value (Merit good, economic impact, and social externalities). Unpack rhetorical analysis as a writing method. Conduct Interview #1 with Douglas Sonntag led by student Moderator Team. View sample artist statement (video). Discuss Major Research Paper.

- Warm Up (10)
- Class discussion: *How do we justify federal intervention in arts production?* (60)
Using Reid and reading responses as a guide, we will define Reid's project, his arguments for art's value and the significance of rhetorical analysis as a writing method and as an authorizing performance on the part of the US federal government.
- Interview with Douglas Sonntag led by Moderator Team Sonntag (60 minutes)
- Group Reflection (20 minutes)
- View Theater Case Study The Wooster Group, NYC (topic: institutional infrastructures)

About: <http://thewoostergroup.org/twg/twg.php?company>
Production/Strategies: <http://nonprofitfinancefund.org/LFF/Wooster-Group>
(20)

- Discuss Major Research Paper Deadlines & field questions (10)
 - a. Draft One Due week seven
 - b. One on One Instructor meeting to discuss Revisions due week eight
 - c. Oral Presentation due week ten
 - d. Final Paper due Finals Week

Due Next Class:

Required Reading

- Wolff, Janet. "The ideology of autonomous art" in *Music and Society*. Richard Leppert, Susan McClary, Eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987, p. 1-12.
- Taylor, Diana. Chapter One (excerpt #3), READ ONLY: "Acts of Transfer" (p. 33-52) from: *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Maria Rosario Jackson. et. al., (excerpt #1) Introduction (p. i-ii), and CHAPTER I-IV (p. 3-28) from: "Investing In Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for Artists". Urban Institute. 2003.
- Maria Rosario Jackson, "Art and Cultural Participation at the Heart of Community Life" in *Understanding the Arts and Creative Sector in the United States*. Joni M. Cherbo, Ruth A. Steward, and Margaret J. Wyszomirski, Eds. New Jersey: Rutgers, 2008, p. 92-104.

Required Viewing

About our guest: TEDX w/Maria Rosario Jackson <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cJKxvADyvLg>

Required Writing

- Interview Questions: each student submits online three critical questions for Maria Rosario Jackson (due 48 hours before the start of the next class (CCLE))
- Field Journal Week Three Reflection/online CCLE
- Weekly Summary: (Wolff, Jackson, Taylor) Typed, doubled-spaced, 11 point Times/Times New Roman Font, 1" margins. Due (hard copy) at the start of class. Six pages max.

Required Activities

- Moderator Team Jackson ONLY (interview prep see week two)

Week Four: Struggling Between Independence and Community

Goals: Discuss readings that historicize the critique of aesthetic autonomy in Wolff, communitizing discourses in Jackson, drawing Taylor's concept of the scenario and practical enactments as counter-narratives. Conduct Interview #2 with Maria Rosario Jackson led by student Moderator Team.

- Warm up (10)
- Discuss readings (60)
- Interview with Maria Rosario Jackson led by Moderator Team Jackson (60 minutes)
- Reflection (15 minutes)
- Artist case study: (20)
- Research Scavenger Hunt Major Research Paper (topic: locating Primary and Secondary Sources): in class, pair up, screens up, hunt for archival literature pertaining to the institutional, art world, and community networks surrounding your designated case studies. (15)

Due Next Class:

Required Reading

- Maria Rosario Jackson. et. al. (excerpt #2): CHAPTER VI-VII (p. 59-88) from: "Investing In Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for Artists". Urban Institute. 2003.
- Conquergood, Dwight. "Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research" in *The Drama Review* 46, (T174), Summer 2002, p. 145-156.
- About our Guest: Kristy Edmunds (interview). "Our Dreams Motivate Our Realities: A Conversation with Center Visiting Scholar Kristy Edmunds." Pew Center for Arts and Heritage, http://www.pcah.us/posts/our_dreams_motivate_our_realities_a_conversation_with_center_visiting_scholar_kristy_edmunds

Required Writing

- Interview Questions: each student submits online three critical questions for Kristy Edmunds (due 48 hours before the start of the next class (CCLE))
- Field Journal Week Four Reflection/online CCLE
- Weekly Summary: (Jackson, Conquergood) Typed, doubled-spaced, 11 point Times/Times New Roman Font, 1" margins. Due (hard copy) at the start of class. Four pages max.
- Begin Major Research Paper Bibliography and continue to refine outline

Required Activities

- Team Edmunds ONLY*interview prep*

Week Five: Presenting Performance

Discuss pivotal Urban Institute Investing In Creativity Report as a policy pivot point for artist research, regulation, and resourcing. Connect survey to Toepler's thesis (week two) concerning the role of private foundations in fostering cultural democracy. Conduct Interview #3 with Kristy Edmunds led by student Moderator Team. Class activities rehearse ethnographic observation and field note in preparation for attendance at live concert event.

- Walking Tour from Kaufman to Royce Hall/Warm Up (rehearse field observation, participation, documentation, and critical response) (20)
- Interview with Kristy Edmunds led by Moderator Team Edmunds (60 minutes)
- Pair and Share Reflection/walk back to Kaufman (20 minutes)
- Discuss readings (60)
- Artist case study (20)

Due next class:

Required Reading

- Postlewait, Thomas. Brief excerpt from Chapter 4, "The Theatrical Event" in *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Historiography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 117-120.
- McConachie, Bruce. "Historicizing the Relations of Theatrical Production" in *Critical Theory and Performance*, Janelle Reinelt and Joseph Roach, Eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007, p. 284-294.
- Jackson, Shannon. "Everything Counts" Experimental Performance and Performance Historiography, in *Representing the Past: Essays in Performance Historiography*, Charlotte M. Canning and Thomas Postlewait, Eds. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2012, p. 240-260.

-ABOUT THE GUESTS (UCLA graduate performing arts students, TBD) include web links, press links, biographical data &/or brief publications by each member of the group.

Required Writing

- Interview Questions: each student submits online three critical questions for our UCLA artist panel (due 48 hours before the start of the next class (CCLE))
- Field Journal Week Five Reflection/online CCLE

- Weekly Summary: (Postlewait, McConachie, Jackson) Typed, doubled-spaced, 11 point Times/Times New Roman Font, 1" margins. Due (hard copy) at the start of class. Six pages max.
- By now you should have transitioned your Major Research Paper Outline into a Zero Draft (very rough draft). Take note of holes in your evidence base to raise in class as questions.

Required Activities

- ATTEND UCLA live performance (TBD), notebook in hand, and document your experience of the onstage and backstage support structures at play in the presentation of this live event.
- Team UCLA GRADS ONLY*interview prep*

Week Six: Performing Infrastructure, notes on Method

Goals: Discuss methodological readings from theatre and performance studies as examples that frame up the limitations and possibilities of performance as a method of animating the performing arts infrastructure. Conduct final interview panel with UCLA's own graduate arts professionals.

- Warm Up (10)
- Performance De-Brief/UCLA (review field notes, observations) (30)
- Performance Historiography Methods Lab: review three approaches and weigh benefits of a performance and context-specific approach to situated infrastructural histories. (60)
- Interview with UCLA graduate artists led by Moderator Team UCLA GRADS (60 minutes)
- Reflection (10)
- Skip* Artist Case Study this week (since four artists will join us live in class)

Due next class:

Required Reading

- Atlas, Caron et al. "Bridge Conversations: People Who Live and Work in Multiple Worlds". Nathan Cummings Foundation, Open Society Foundations, and The NEA. Arts and Democracy Project, 2011. (excerpts TBD).

Required Writing

- Field Journal Week Six Reflection/online CCLE
- Weekly Summary: (Atlas, NEA Art Works) the start of class. Six pages max.
- Continue working on Major Research Paper Draft One

Required Activities

- Attendance at second student selected performance and ethnographic field notes should be complete by Week Seven.

Week Seven: Traversing Possibilities: Bridges, Works, and Alternate Routes

Goals: Discuss "Bridge" Monograph and the differentiated impacts of socio-cultural factors on the production possibilities of artists and arts intermediaries. Reflexive movement and writing workshop integrates value of embodied practice "itineraries" as a means of intervening in standard or dominant "maps". Major Research Paper Draft One Due. Schedule One-On-One meetings with Instructor to discuss Draft One Revisions.

- Warm Up (10)
- Discuss Readings (60)
- Maps and Itineraries Movement and Writing Workshop *see Appendix E (75)
- Artist Case Study TBD (20)
- Turn in Major Research Paper Draft One, brief reflection on issues & challenges (10)
- Schedule One-On-One Meetings with Instructor to guide editing process (5)

Due next class:

Required Reading:

-Markusen, A., Johnson, A., Levi, T., Martinez, A. "Crossover: How Artists Build Careers across Commercial, Nonprofit, and Community Work". A joint report commissioned by the William and Flora Hewitt Foundation, James Irvine Foundation, and Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC), 2006, 104 pages. Read the following excerpts:

- o 5-20 (summary, theory), 37-58 (How Artists Crossover and Crossover and Artistic Development), skim remaining subsections if time permits

-Bedoya, Roberto. "Creative Placemaking and the Politics of Belonging and Dis-Belonging" (blog) in *Arts in a Changing America*. <http://www.artsinachangingamerica.net/2012/09/01/creative-placemaking-and-the-politics-of-belonging-and-dis-belonging/>

Required Writing

- Field Journal Week Seven Reflection/online CCLE
- Weekly Summary: (Markusen et.al., Bedoya) 4 pages max.
- Draft One Major Research Paper Due TODAY

Required Activities

- One-on-One Meetings to discuss Draft One scheduled by the end of week eight

Week Eight: Counting Performance: Informal Enactments

Goals: Discuss readings and practical vulnerabilities associated with "crossing over" in the contexts outlined in the Markusen Report. Introduce "Informal Arts" paradigm through class as an emergent policy priority in the 21st century and build some context around the challenge of avowing creative expression outside of institutionalized definitions, programs, and rhetorics using in-class reading and critical response. Schedule and discuss student presentation criteria (week ten).

- Warm Up (10)
- Discuss Readings (60)
- Introduce Informal/Participatory Arts Paradigm In Class Reading Executive Summary (p. 7-10) of Alvarez Informal Arts Report, reflecting on the following questions: *What are key messages, themes and attitudes that render these informal experiences meaningful for their practitioners and the communities in which they occur? What Mechanisms and Organizational Dynamics are involved in these flexible fields of creative expression? And what is the relationship of this "independent" field of art making to the predominant mode of artistic delivery today, namely the formally incorporated arts organization model?* (75)
- Artist Case study (20)
- Schedule and discuss criteria for Student presentations week ten (15 minutes)

Due Next Class:

Required Reading

-Review the following Field Publications by Artists, For Artists making a <http://artistsu.com/>

-Brooklyn Commune, "A Handbill To Artists":

<http://brooklyncommune.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/artist-action-flyer1.pdf>

-Andrew Horowitz (Culturebot) "Artist as Entrepreneur: the American Model or Same Old American Dream?" in *The Guardian Culture Professionals Network*. December 5, 2013.

<http://www.theguardian.com/culture-professionals-network/culture-professionals-blog/2013/dec/05/artist-as-entrepreneur-american-dream>

-Barry Schwabsky "Permission to Fail: MASs aren't a problem: it's artists being content with what they know" in *The Nation*. January 21.2014.

<http://www.thenation.com/article/178023/permission-fail?page=0,1#>

Required Writing

- Field Journal Week Eight Reflection/online CCLE
- Weekly Summary: in lieu of a Close Reading Summary, bring to class reflections on the costs and benefits of each of the above listed artist-generated critiques of the present infrastructural structure of the arts, in light of the literature that we've reviewed this quarter. What assumptions and justifications are these artists depending on to evidence their claims? Which works, workers, or ways of working are invited or foreclosed by the paradigm that they reference?
- Major Research Paper (ongoing revisions)
- Outline Oral Presentation

Required Activity

- One-on-One Meetings with Instructor to discuss Draft One complete by end of week eight

Week Nine: Tracking Performance: Maneuvers and Itineraries

Goals: Discuss Field Publications by Artists, For Artists with a glance to institutional policies recently published by the US Federal Government. Course Evaluations.

- Warm Up (10)
- Discuss assigned blogs/infrastructural critiques (75)
- In class redirect to the question of federal subsidy and arts support via new and emergent research initiatives and the NEA's 5-year strategic plan. (75)
 - In class overreview: How Art Works: The National Endowment for the Arts' Five-Year Research Agenda with a System Map and Measurement Model". National Endowment for the Arts Office of Research & Analysis. September 2012. 43 pages.
 - http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/How-Art-Works_0.pdf (last accessed, 2/11/14).
- Course/Instructor Evaluations (20)

Due Next Class:

No Required Reading

Required Writing

- Field Journal Week Nine Reflection/online CCLE
- Major Research Paper (ongoing revisions)
- Script 10-minute Oral Presentations

Required Activity

- Rehearse Oral Presentation (due week ten)

Week Ten: Situating Perspectives on the Infrastructural Practices, Policies, and Politics of the Performing Arts

Goal: Students Perform 10-minute Final Paper Presentations with time for class feedback and discussion to inform Final Paper Revision Process. Review deadlines for paper and field journal submission. Discuss possibilities for future infrastructural research, resourcing and debate.

- Student Paper Presentations
- Class feedback/critical response
- Wrap Up—Next Steps

Finals Week: Final Papers Due

- Papers Due TBD

WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY (2. 22.14 draft)

Atlas, Caron et al. "Bridge Conversations: People Who Live and Work in Multiple Worlds". Nathan Cummings Foundation, Open Society Foundations, and The NEA. Arts and Democracy Project, 2011.

Brooklyn Commune. "The View From Here: A Report from The Brooklyn Commune Project on the State of the Performing Arts From the Perspective of Artists (abridged)". Brooklyn Commune Project, 2013, 10 pages.

Bryan-Wilson, Julia. "Introduction" p. 1-12 and "Chapter One: From Artists to Art Workers" p. 13-40 in *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Conquergood, Dwight. "Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research" in *The Drama Review* 46, (T174), Summer 2002, p. 145-156.

Davis, Tracy C. *The Economics of the British Stage 1800-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Foster, Susan Leigh. Chapter Four: Economies of Community" in *Dances That Describe Themselves: The Improvised Choreography of Richard Bull*. Bloomington: Wesleyan University Press. p.121-169. 2003.

Garafola, Lynn. *Diaghilev's Ballets Russes*. Oxford: de Capo Press, 1998.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, Trans. New York: International Publishers, First Edition, 1971.

Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," in *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 183-202.

Jackson, Maria Rosario, et. al. "Investing In Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for Artists". Urban Institute. 2003. 107 pages.

Jackson, Maria Rosario. "Art and Cultural Participation at the Heart of Community Life" in *Understanding the Arts and Creative Sector in the United States*. Joni M. Cherbo, Ruth A. Steward, and Margaret J. Wyszomirski, Eds. New Jersey: Rutgers, 2008, p. 92-104.

Jackson, Shannon. "Everything Counts" Experimental Performance and Performance Historiography, in *Representing the Past: Essays in Performance Historiography*, Charlotte M. Canning and Thomas Postlewait, Eds. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2012, p. 240-260.

Jackson, Shannon. *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Kester, Grant. *The One and the Many: Collaborative Art in a Global Context*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.

John Kreidler. "Leverage Lost: Evolution in the Nonprofit Arts Ecosystem" in *The Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions, and Communities*. G. Bradford, M. Gary, G. Wallach, eds. New York: The New Press, 2000, p. 147-168.

Kwon, Miwon. Chapter 4 “Siting Community” in *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.

Markusen, A., Johnson, A., Levi, T., Martinez, A. “Crossover: How Artists Build Careers across Commercial, Nonprofit, and Community Work”. A joint report commissioned by the Wm/Flora Hewitt Foundation, James Irvine Foundation, and Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC), 2006.

McConachie, Bruce. “Historicizing the Relations of Theatrical Production” in *Critical Theory and Performance*, Janelle Reinelt and Joseph Roach, Eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007, p. 284-294.

Miller, Toby and George Yùdice. “The United States, Cultural Policy, and the National Endowment for the Arts” in *Cultural Policy*. London: Sage, 2000, pp. 35-71

National Endowment for the Arts. “How Art Works: The National Endowment for the Arts’ Five-Year Research Agenda with a System Map and Measurement Model”. National Endowment for the Arts Office of Research & Analysis. September 2012. 43 pages. http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/How-Art-Works_0.pdf (last accessed, 2/11/14).

Postlewait, Thomas. Brief excerpt from Chapter 4, “The Theatrical Event” in *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Historiography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 117-120.

Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London/New York: Routledge, 1996.

Reid, Daniel. “An American Vision of Federal Arts Subsidies: Why and How the US Government Should Support Artistic Expression” in *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities*. Vol. 21. Issue 2. 2013.

Rose, Trisha. *Black Noise: Rap Music and Black Culture in Contemporary America*. Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1994.

Toepler, Stefan. “Roles of Foundations and Their Impact in the Arts” in *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions*. Helmut K. Anheier and David C. Hammack, Eds. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010, p. 283-204.

Williams, Raymond. “From Medium to Social Practice” in *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1977, p. 158-164.

Wolff, Janet. “The ideology of autonomous art” in *Music and Society*. Richard Leppert, Susan McClary, Eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987, p. 1-12.

Videos:

Roberto Bedoya. “Making a Place” Creative Time Summit, 2013.
<http://creativetime.org/summit/2013/10/25/roberto-bedoya/>

Maria Rosario Jackson TEDx <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cJKxvADyvLg>

Dr. Julia Bryan Wilson, UC-Berkeley Art History “Should Artists Professionalize?”
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4KbdrK7GQNA>

PROJECT APPENDICES (drafts)

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE CLASS WARM UP ACTIVITIES

1. Group Football toss

(Theme: rehearsal for in class discussions) (15 minutes)

- a. Round One: Class sits in a circle, tosses the football so that each member of the class gets the ball once. Rehearse this flight pattern several times to memorize the route.
- b. Round Two: Upon catching the ball, each student performs an “endzone dance” over and over until the entire group joins in and mirrors this response.
- c. Round three/discussion: Discuss how this exercise models our in class discussion ethos “eye contact”, “be ready to throw”, and “be ready to catch what’s been thrown” by a fellow class mate, and celebrate “catches” or “failures” equally as part of the game.

2. Moving and Speaking

(Theme: description as interpretation as a route to justification) (20 minutes)

- a. Round one, simple moving and stretching: in pairs, partners each take turns leading a physical “wake up” or warm up activity, follow the leader-style.
- b. Round two: same exercise, now with the “leader” attempting to describe the actions being done while they are happening to the follower, paying attention to body mechanics, function of the movement, Sensations while moving, Body’s relationship to space/other bodies, etc.,
- c. Round Three/discussion: *How do we justify our participation in the US arts infrastructure, how do our actions collide with our justifications? How do the artists/groups that we have elected to study in local contexts frame the significance and value of their work? How do these myriad justifications collide with Reid’s historical account of the legitimization narratives by which the US federal government officials justify direct subsidy and intervention in arts production?* (60 minutes)

3. Warm Up Activity: “Do a move.” (15 minutes, w/musical accompaniment)

- a. Round One: Repeat an action that you performed prior to entering seminar today, reflecting (internally) on who “taught” you this move, or how you learned to perform it.
- b. Round Two: Dance like someone in your life who LOVES dancing.
- c. Round Three: Dance like someone in your life who HATES dancing.
- d. Round Four: Do a move that has never been done before.
- e. Round Five/discussion: *Is there such a thing as independent art? How do performing arts depend on traditions, bodies, and circulatory systems in the world? How do institutions and communities archive moving traditions, which practices are included and excluded and how do our authors this week contend with the problems posed by “traditions”, “disciplines” and power asymmetries that oscillate around the very term ART?* (60 minutes total)

APPENDIX B: Close Reading Strategies

Your weekly summaries should address the following areas in lucid academic prose integrating topic and bridge sentences to create smooth transitions for your reader. See weekly assignments for additional criteria.

1. *Topic (given the topic of this course, the topic being addressed is frequently a problem that the author(s) feel needs critical attention):*
2. *Research Problem:*
3. *Key Terms/Concepts used to define the problem and point to its potential solution:*
4. *Review of literature (what key authors within the discipline say/don't say about the problem):*
5. *Author's Main Argument:*
6. *Arguing Against:*
7. *Scope (historical time span, geographical location, disciplinary, cultural, or institutional context):*
8. *Disciplinary location:*
9. *Methodologies used (Which authors/texts/data does this author use to evidence/support main claims?):*
10. *How is this text placed in intellectual history? What was the context of its writing? How has it been used since and by whom?*
11. *Costs and benefits? What does this approach allow the author to accomplish? What insights does restrict or occlude?*
12. *Significance/Urgency (why, in the author's view, does this project need our critical attention today?):*
13. *Usefulness for other projects? (For your own work, for the disciplines you are involved with, etc.):*

APPENDIX C: Major Paper Outline Guidelines (draft)

This major paper asks you to approach the US Performing Arts Infrastructure from the situated perspective of performing artists and arts intermediaries, and to historicize these projects by linking local practices to institutional practice, policies, and programs. This outline frames up some key questions to ask yourself in the process of selecting a target artist/arts group to fuel your investigation.

Step One: Identify the five “W’s” of your project:

1. Who
 - a. Identify an individual/group and its primary instigators/collaborators/administrators
 - b. Identify which institutions (public & private) and individuals help to resource this work, using available publicity and historical support data on the group and presenting institution (i.e. artist’s website, etc.,).
 - c. Who does this group/artist hail as its primary viewership, network, or constituency?
2. What
 - a. Identify a single live performance event that is happening in the LA area between now and week six, purchase a ticket, and attend this performance.
 - b. At the performance, observe and document the visible (and invisible) supports that make this work possible in thick detail.
 - c. Conducting historical research into the history of this group and its designated performance genres, connect this local production practices to comparative examples to contextualize the group’s infrastructural practices, policies, and politics.
3. Where
 - a. Identify and research the performance venue to locate its historical lineage as a performing arts context or other historical usages to which this venue has been put.
 - b. For non-local arts groups, “where” can also include the home locale of the group, or its touring trajectory, or its history of touring within particular geographical and cultural performance contexts
 - c. Where are examples of other places where this group performs? Where might one go to see other groups perform this kind of work?
4. When
 - a. Identify the literal date/time of the single event
 - b. Identify the historical timeline of the chosen case and track its production history using available sources
 - c. Identify field benchmark influences (other folks who do this kind of work) to contextualize influences and put these other groups into historical context
5. Why
 - a. Identify what kinds of justification narratives are put forth by the group or by other people (critics, presenters, etc.) on the group’s behalf.
 - b. Identify the corroborating narratives put forth by major supporters of this work if they are available to the archive.
 - c. Identify convergences and divergences in these local narratives and those put forth by public arts institutions about the value of performing art creation, participation, and consumption in US culture
6. How
 - a. Based on your preliminary research findings, identify patterns, themes, or outright tensions between these local examples, their institutional and individual supporters, and

- the historical traditions to which their work belongs, and identify these POLITICS as an area demanding further inquiry.
- b. The transdisciplinary framework attempted here combines archival research, field interviews, and observation/participation in live performance events to elucidate the historically contingent and interdependent practices, policies, and politics that support the performing arts in US culture.

APPENDIX D: Major Paper Guidelines (draft)

- I. Problem Statement (disconnect between policy and practice)
- II. Survey The Field (performance genre, cultural context, case study)
 - a. Historical Background
 - i. Field Infrastructure: Underlying foundation of the Performing Arts including its physical facilities, equipment, and personnel but with particular attention to Policies, Practices, and Political Enactments
 - ii. Field Agents: Prevalent intermediaries, roles, responsibilities
 1. Creating, producing, presenting, attending, funding, awarding, critiquing
 - iii. Field Forms: basic needs, resources, relationships
 1. Workspace, Administration, Funds for all stages of production, Creative Collaborators,
 - iv. Field Obstacles/Challenges
- III. Introduce Case Study
 - a. Profile, Mission, History
 - b. Production Models
 - c. Intermediaries: core collaborators,
 - d. Community/Informal Networks
 - e. Barriers to and Opportunities for support
- IV. Practices
 - a. Official, Standard, and Archival practices
 - b. Individualizing/Communitizing gestures
 - c. Partitioning, Border-Crossing, Bridging, and Alternative Maneuvering

APPENDIX E: Maps and Itineraries: Movement and Writing Workshop (60)

Goal: to bolster understanding of limits of historical analysis and to exercise our collective commitment to practice as a vital means of responding to and producing the world we inhabit.

Building off of Taylor's (2003) discussion of the Archive as the officializing maneuvers, narratives, and written documentation at play in the construction of history, this class activity asks students to move, write, sketch, and reflect on their personal history and the hierarchical ordering of particular events, people, and values. Reflection unfolds in five main moves.

- I. SKETCH (on available blank paper, map the pathway that led you to UCLA, in short or long term intervals. Pay attention to key turns and significant landmarks. This is your archival document.
- II. ROUTE YOUR ITINERARY ON THE MAP. All together, students will stand and attempt to walk through their designated map in the space, contending with external obstacles, some known limits and some unforeseen constraints.
 - a. Discuss the translation of your map to your itinerant route and your faithfulness to the project.

- III. REVISE THE MAP. Turning the page over, simplify the destination by drawing a start point, and end point, with only ONE major landmark in between.
- IV. ROUTE YOUR NEW ITINERARY, ADDING A PUNCTUATION “MOVE” TO DENOTE YOUR LANDMARK (a kick, spin, high five, yell, etc.). MEMORIZE THIS PATH.
 - a. Reflexively consider the difference between the STANDARD map, the ORIGINAL MAP, and the myriad offstage itineraries that escaped the archive.
- V. BODY MNEMONIC: Doing a quick body scan, think critically about your body as a repository of ideas, experiences, sentience, capacity and memory, and also as a productive agent intervening in space and historical time. Free write for five minutes, on a new piece of paper, the map that you move from this body-level place. What practices support your daily routes, which “moves” shape who you are and how you engage with and intervene in the world?



New Course Proposal

World Arts and Cultures M98TB Infrastructure and Performing Arts: Practices, Policies, Politics

Course Number World Arts and Cultures M98TB

Multiple Listed With Arts & Architecture M98TB

Title Infrastructure and Performing Arts: Practices, Policies, Politics

Short Title INFRSTRCT&PRFRM ART

Units Fixed: 5

Grading Basis Letter grade only

Instructional Format Seminar - 3 hours per week

TIE Code SEMT - Seminar (Topical) [T]

GE Requirement Yes

Major or Minor Requirement No

Requisites Enforced requisite: satisfaction of Entry-Level Writing requirement. Freshmen/sophomores preferred.

Course Description (Same as Arts and Architecture M98TB.) Seminar, three hours. Enforced requisite: satisfaction of Entry-Level Writing requirement. Freshmen/sophomores preferred. Examination of historically unstable infrastructure of performing arts through transdisciplinary lens of performance studies. Integration of archival and practice-based research to highlight tensions between official policy narratives and practical efforts of artists and arts intermediaries. Letter grading.

Justification Part of the series of seminars offered through the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows.

Syllabus File [Arts & Architecture M98TB.pdf](#) was previously uploaded. You may view the file by clicking on the file name.

Supplemental Information Dean/Professor Christopher Waterman is the faculty mentor for this course.

Grading Structure Class readings, discussions, and activities (20 points)
Weekly Writing Summaries (80 points)
In-class interview prompts/moderator facilitation (20 points)
Field Journal (20 points)
Attendance at UCLA live performance event (5 points)
Major Research Paper Outline (5 points)
Major Research Paper Draft one (10 points)
Major Research Paper Due (30 points)
Oral Presentation on Major Research Paper (10 points)
TOTAL 200 points

Effective Date Spring 2015

Discontinue Date Summer 1 2015

Instructor	Name	Title
	Sarah Wilbur	Teaching Fellow

Quarters Taught Fall Winter Spring Summer

Department World Arts and Cultures/Dance

Contact	Name	E-mail
	CATHERINE GENTILE	cgentile@oid.ucla.edu

[Routing Help](#)**ROUTING STATUS****Role:** Registrar's Office**Status:** Processing Completed**Role:** Registrar's Publications Office - Hennig, Leann Jean (LHENNIG@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 56704**Status:** Added to SRS on 8/5/2014 10:50:12 PM**Changes:** Title, Requisites, Description**Comments:** Edited course description into official version; corrected title, requisites.**Role:** Registrar's Scheduling Office - Thomson, Douglas N (DTHOMSON@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 51441**Status:** Added to SRS on 7/7/2014 2:09:06 PM**Changes:** Short Title**Comments:** No Comments**Role:** FEC School Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/12/2014 11:39:54 AM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** Routing to Doug Thomson in the Registrar's Office.**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Upton, Dell (DUPTON@HUMNET.UCLA.EDU) - 68370**Status:** Approved on 6/11/2014 2:22:31 PM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** No Comments**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 6/2/2014 4:10:22 PM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** Routing to Dell Upton for FEC approval.**Role:** CUTF Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998**Status:** Approved on 5/16/2014 4:35:17 PM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** on behalf of Professor Kathleen L. Komar, chair, Collegium of University Teaching Fellows Program Faculty Advisory Committee**Role:** Initiator/Submitter - Gentile, Catherine (CGENTILE@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 68998**Status:** Submitted on 5/16/2014 4:34:14 PM**Comments:** Initiated a New Course Proposal[Back to Course List](#)

[Main Menu](#) [Inventory](#) [Reports](#) [Help](#) [Exit](#)
[Registrar's Office](#) [MyUCLA](#) [SRWeb](#)

Comments or questions? Contact the Registrar's Office at
cims@registrar.ucla.edu or (310) 206-7045