

RECEIVED 20 MAY 2014

075147

ID: 125927325

Status: PENDING

AgingDate: 20140519

RequestDate: 20140519

NeedBeforeDate: 20140618

Borrower: NDD

Lenders: EUX,EUX,\*HNK,HNK

OCLCNumber: 823519241

RequestType: COPY

Title: Cord conference proceedings

IssueDate: 2009 published 2013

Pages: 338-349

Article: Ken Bartlett, Thomas F. DeFrantz, Janice Ross and Michael Huxley: Keynote Panel

Verified: <TN:902602><ODYSSEY:206.107.44.93/NDD> OCLC

BorrowingNotes: WE NO LONGER USE ARIEL. Please send copies via ILLiad, Odyssey, Email, Fax or Article Exchange.Thank you!  
(maxCost: \$50.00)

Patron: DeFrantz, Thomas

MaxCost: 50.00 IFM

ShipVia: Library Mail

Fax: 919-660-5964

Email: documentdelivery@duke.edu

Call No. GV LP3 C664  
Due Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Shipped Date 20 May 2014  
Lending Charges 12 IFM  
Invoice No. IFM

# Hong Kong University of Science & Technology Library

---

## *Document Supply Service*

Ariel: ariel.ust.hk  
Email: lbill@ust.hk  
Fax: (852)2358-1462  
Tel: (852)2358-6754

### **Copyright Notice**

Copy supplied for research or private use only. Not for further reproduction or distribution.

## Congress on Research in Dance Conference Proceedings

<http://journals.cambridge.org/COR>

Additional services for ***Congress on Research in Dance Conference Proceedings***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

---

### Keynote Panel

Ken Bartlett, Thomas F. DeFrantz, Janice Ross and Michael Huxley

Congress on Research in Dance Conference Proceedings / Volume 41 / Supplement S1 / January 2009, pp 338 - 349  
DOI: 10.1017/S2049125500001308, Published online: 04 January 2013

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S2049125500001308](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S2049125500001308)

**How to cite this article:**

Ken Bartlett, Thomas F. DeFrantz, Janice Ross and Michael Huxley (2009). Keynote Panel. Congress on Research in Dance Conference Proceedings, 41, pp 338-349 doi:10.1017/S2049125500001308

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## Keynote Panel

Ken Bartlett, Thomas F. DeFrantz, Janice Ross,  
Michael Huxley (Chair)

### Introduction

This conference is hugely significant in that a large group of people have come together to share their research in dance pedagogy. Because we are conferring about pedagogy, presenters have been talking about their, and their students', experience of learning and teaching in dance. It has been so exciting to hear the high level of engagement with pedagogical research, whether it comes from the studio or the classroom. And, following Chris Bannerman's keynote address on Friday, we can see how such distinctions between studio and classroom become permeable once we take an approach that attempts to understand the pedagogic needs of our twenty-first-century students. So, this conference has been a sharing of your experience, brought together by our common theme.

I'd now like to add another dimension in this session. We have invited three speakers who, in different ways, in addition to their own pedagogy, have been champions of others' dancing and others' pedagogy—who have “opened doors” by their practice. Ken Bartlett is an advocate for the thousands in the United Kingdom whose experience of dance is in the community, and he champions the development of a pedagogy that works for them. He has done so much to give their experiences visibility. Tommy DeFrantz has opened a door to show the possibilities of dissolving the boundaries that others have thrown up in terms of race, gender, technology art, and culture and his performance and pedagogy reflects this. Janice Ross has championed, in her carefully researched books, two of the most significant American dance pedagogues, Margaret H'Doubler and Anna Halprin.

So I invited these three people to speak at this conference on dance and pedagogy. I have given them a wide open brief: to speak for about ten minutes about what is on their mind at the moment. We have had a fascinating email correspondence, and I think you will find that what they have to say will, I hope, open doors to look through into the future.

We are going to hear our three speakers in alphabetical order by surname—Ken Bartlett, Tommy DeFrantz, and Janice Ross. I have then invited them to participate in an open discussion about what they have to say. There will, I hope, be a short period for us to widen the discussion. I would then encourage you to come to Ramsay Burt's second discussion session, where I hope you will be willing to follow up what comes out of our presentations here.

### Ken Bartlett

#### *A workforce for the future?*

*Ken Bartlett, creative director of the Foundation for Community Dance, asks if we need to develop*

*new methodological approaches for community dance to suit the needs of both people and dance in the twenty-first century.*

The best part of my job at the Foundation for Community Dance is the opportunity it has afforded me to see and celebrate how brilliant community dance is, what it achieves, and how it transforms the lives of people and their communities. Here I mean work led by members of the foundation and other artists, companies, and organisations who share the values of community dance and the ambition to widen access and increase participation in high-quality dance experiences that offer a lifelong relationship for people with the art form.

Writing earlier this year about the work of dance artist Royston Maldoom in the *Guardian's* Dance Preview (2008), dance critic Judith Mackrell described and almost wrote off community dance, or at least the performance aspect of community dance, as mediocre and politically correct (Mackrell 2008). Clearly she's seeing a different range of work than I am, but it is a criticism that I think we should consider. Judith is a smart cookie and knows her dance.

What if, I wondered, she has a point? And if she does, what do we need to do as a sector to be able to challenge these assumptions in the long term? Because I don't believe that anyone working in community dance wants to deliver work that is mediocre, or even regarded as mediocre. I believe that people strive to deliver work that is of the highest quality and that is transformational.

One of my concerns is that I don't hear enough discussion about our methodologies and approaches to pedagogy in community dance. This is perhaps not surprising given the nature of the work: individually led in the privacy of the studio, with everyone finding their individual solutions; a sense of threat when asked to reveal what we have been doing or even reflect critically about it. I suspect that, as the profession has grown to include a wider range of dance professionals and more dance styles and genres, these kinds of discussions are difficult and would be seen as highly critical of the individual practitioner's right to define his or her own working practices.

Community dance as a manifestation within the dance ecology of the United Kingdom has now been established for some thirty years. As circumstances and funding opportunities as well as the aesthetics of dance have changed over this time, so have the outward manifestations of community dance. However, the overriding aims of the community dance sector have largely remained the same—to increase access to and widen participation in dance—and are based on a fairly consistent set of values about the practice:

- Placing the participant at the centre of the activity
- Respect for difference
- Dance as an empowering tool for participants in the dance and the rest of their lives
- Being inclusive rather than exclusive.

It seems to me that in accepting a wider range of practices, purposes, and contexts within community dance, that the definitions of what community dance is have themselves become blurred. It has become increasingly difficult to establish a cohesive idea of what the professionalised community dance sector is, how it works, and what it can achieve for those who take part—even though we know this “thing” called community dance exists because we're all a part of it.

Over the past ten years, because of the particular take of a Labour government, we have become adept at arguing for the instrumental impact of dance at the expense of deepening the debate about its intrinsic values. It appears from the current media profile that dance is

receiving from such programmes as *Strictly Come Dancing* and the T Mobile advertisements that dance is the arts activity of the moment. Figures for participation and for dance audiences are rising significantly. The contexts for engaging people in dance continue to expand, and artists are embracing new contexts and people. So where is community dance in this developing picture of access to and participation in dance? Indeed, what is its territory?

In my childhood, when I lived in a small village in the Pennines, the local cricket club would hire the defunct village school hall and run whist drives to raise money for the coming season. Everyone would attend, from the youngest children to the oldest person; no one was excluded. After the whist drive, food largely prepared by the local women would appear, the card tables were pushed to the sides of the hall, and a three- or four-piece band was set up in the corner and everybody danced—traditional English dances as well as popular dances such as the waltz and the tango. Couples danced together and the young people were gathered in by the elderly to learn the same dances that had been passed down generation to generation. This is an example of a dancing community that is social, inclusive, and learns from each other without the need for any kind of dance professional or community dance artist.

There are many styles and traditions of dance being arranged for people to participate in across the United Kingdom largely as a result of the incredible mix of culturally diverse peoples who now live here. Whilst people might originally attend these sessions for social reasons—meeting old friends, maintaining a cultural heritage, etc.—what happens is that they become expert in those particular dances, getting more confident, learning new moves, and enjoying the full pleasure of participation in the activity of dancing. What they become after a while of dancing together is a community of dancers. This can be a mixture of the professional and nonprofessional—the key is the pleasure taken by all participating in the particular dance.

Community dance as I want to define it for the moment has learnt much from these manifestations: its inclusiveness, the social interactions it can promote, and the sheer pleasure of dancing communally with other people. The historical distinction between community dance and other manifestations of dance is its historic link with the theatre/concert dance tradition and the development of “new dance” in the United Kingdom in the 1970s, building on such things as pedestrian movement and contact improvisation. This work allowed and encouraged a small number of professional dance artists to see that there were alternative ways of engaging nonprofessionals, not only in dance but also more importantly in the art of dance. In the United Kingdom there were a number of important initiatives supported financially by the then Arts Council of Great Britain—the first Animateurs and Dance Artists in Education initiatives—that allowed these approaches to take hold and inspired other artists to develop new skills and approaches that placed participants not only in the role of learner but in the role of creator/artist, and gave purpose to the process by placing art making and performance as part of an ongoing process rather than an end in itself. These artists were equally concerned with the artistic quality of the whole process as well as the well-being and empowerment of the participants they worked with.

As we progress into the twenty-first century, from the Industrial Revolution through the technological revolution and into what some are beginning to call the cultural revolution, there have been significant changes in the way people choose to engage with each other socially and as members of society, as well as political and economic changes to the nature of long-established communities. We have seen massive shifts in the nature of work that large parts of the population are engaged in, changes to the skills base demanded by the

economy, and a huge shift in the nature of the population itself with different loyalties being expressed as part of individual and collective identities. We are, it seems, part of a culture that is not yet at ease with itself, where the individual demands a voice as a right as well as more disparate collective voices demanding to be heard as we come to terms with the fast and eccentric rate of change that we are dealing with in an age of uncertainty. This new way of being has had an impact on artists, as it has on the people they choose to work with in community dance settings, and it is in this context that I believe that we need to review our practices and pedagogic models to see if they are appropriate for our current and developing context.

When I look at the established professional dance world in England of producers, promoters, companies, conservatoires, and funders I am reminded of a closed religious order: the absolute truth was established back in the mists of time, and the only way to survive is to submit to the rites, rituals, and responses that have been established without question for generations. Pursuing my ecclesiastical metaphor, hopefully not stretching it too far, someone once told me that she thought there were two kinds of nuns, and for me there are two kinds of dance professional: those that have experienced God, and those that have been on their knees so long that they have no alternative.

I hope that you can see that I am attempting a fundamental challenge to how we in community dance operate, how we widen access and increase participation, and, indeed, how we actively seek to include difference and diversity in our pantheon of what we can call dance. I am challenging whether community dance should continue to align itself to the narrow aesthetic values currently being delivered, often beautifully, by the professional theatre/concert sector, and I want to ask whether in this present fast-changing context we should continue to privilege that sector as something to aspire to and measure ourselves against, when we are often seen as in deficit by that sector when we don't match up to their "standard" or view about what quality dance is or might be.

I am seeking for us to consider a twenty-first-century pedagogy in community dance that has art making as its focus and the participants at the centre of that, operating themselves as creative artists with control over content, form, and context. A pedagogy concerned with facilitating people to make meaning through the art of dance, not drilling people in how to dance in a particular style or tradition or in how to fit into the learnt aesthetics of the established dominant modes of dance or learning a set of steps. A pedagogy that is concerned as much with how the dance feels as how it looks. People are vessels that are full of dance, not empty and waiting to be filled with our view of what they need to become. What I want is a much more complex journey that will demand a different pedagogy than that learnt from the established order.

So what kind of pedagogy and pedagogy am I looking for in the twenty-first century?

I have already laboured the point about accepting people as potential artists where they are when they enter the dance space, and placing them and their aspirations, ambitions, and ideas at the centre of the process, and also about the importance of bringing a range of aesthetics to the fore rather than privileging a narrow historical perspective. I don't want to see community dance practitioners with an obsession about identifying the talented and the gifted against narrow criteria but rather operating as people who are prepared to take the time and make the effort to unearth potential and develop it rather than spot it and train it. People who can work with the half full rather than the half empty.

I think we really need to become people who are experts in the body—what it can do/

can't do, what it wants to do and doesn't want to do. A pedagogy based on much more than a short course in anatomy and physiology—one, as Miranda Tufnell suggests in the book *What Dancers Do that Other Health Workers Don't*, that develops a deeper connection to the experience of the body and a personal creative language, widening the field through which we perceive and experience ourselves and the world around us (in Greenland 2000, 9–26). One more concerned with whether it feels right rather than what it looks like, one that understands the body's development through our ages but that doesn't stigmatise what people can do because of their age or other condition, that celebrates what they can do rather than what they can't. Or what we think they can't. One that demonstrates we are experts in the body. As Amanda Fogg reported in the spring 2008 issue of *Animated* about the work of the Mark Morris Company with people with Parkinson's disease "this (the dance class) is an opportunity to puts the disease on the back burner, it's a dance class, we don't look at it like a therapy class" (2008, 33).

I am interested in developing a pedagogy that puts content and meaning back into the dance mix, saying things in dance truly meaningful about the human condition. Now don't get me wrong: I'm happy to be witness to dance that simply creates ripples in the air around me, nor am I banning people just having fun with putting their bodies into interesting shapes, positions, and gestures to see what will happen. However, I am more interested in us passing on what I'm calling the "deep rules" of dance, not its many outward forms; in supporting people of whatever body size, shape, fitness, or age to explore together; asking "I wonder what will happen if . . ." and then becoming highly skilled in manipulating the massive potential of the tensions between those deep rules of stillness and movement, silence and sound, darkness and light. People who are interested in supporting the making of meaning through dance rather than imposing their dance on people.

I think community dance artists have to become more knowledgeable and multilingual about the dances they know, so that when supporting and facilitating community dancers to make their work, they have as wide a range of reference points to draw upon to support the precise meaning they want to convey in their dances. This might include historical, culturally diverse, and social dances and knowledge of a wide range of dance and movement techniques to add to the meaning; rather than forcing people through a funnel, they allows artists to respond positively to the dances that people bring with them.

We still need to recognise the need to name distinctive dance practices, yet as American choreographer Liz Lerman has suggested over the years, we need to recognise that they are only separated by a permeable membrane. In other words, stop configuring dance as a pyramid or even a continuum that indicates that some forms and approaches are more important or intrinsically valuable than others.

Supporting people in art making is more than providing an expressive outlet; it is supporting and facilitating the conscious, knowing, illuminating, and constructed. So how do we move from the expressive wriggle of the two year old into the more conscious, controlled, embodied, and communicable piece of dance, apart from relying on them to begin to make the move to consciousness as part of the natural progression of child development?

I'd suggest the first step is to unearth and identify the content that the community dancer(s) want to communicate, and from there we can begin to identify the form that best serves the content and the dancers. We need to become more intuitive, curious, and knowledgeable about what specific bodies might be able to do and the risks we can ask the owners of those bodies to take, and indeed whether we can include what they do within our frame of reference as dance. It seems to me that if artists choose to work in this way, they



have to possess a rich understanding of what the body can do, what it is safe to do, and how to protect it for the long term.

In summary, then. I see a pedagogy that needs more educated dance artists who can engage with current issues facing their dancers and the wider world and a pedagogy that is based more on negotiation than instruction and that fully embeds its values in the practice; that gives more value to the making of meaning, art making, and content within the process; that has a multidimensional view of what constitutes art and dance and dance as art and has a multilingual, multicultural knowledge of dance and dances. This needs to be concerned with passing on the deep rules of dance—the grammar, not just the vocabulary—dance artists that have the skills knowledge and competence to call themselves experts in the body; a pedagogy that doesn't make careless assumptions about what is appropriate for individuals or particular groups of people; and finally a practice that has a more sophisticated set of quality benchmarks than a simple judgemental like or dislike.

I would like to see attention to these qualities and perspectives included in all the undergraduate courses for community dance. Our aim at the Foundation for Community Dance is to embed them in the development of our National College for Community Dance. Perhaps through this, and as people progress through their careers and acquire these skills, knowledge, and abilities, the suggestion that community dance practice is mediocre or just politically correct will seem like something very much from the last century.

### Thomas F. DeFrantz

#### *Pedagogies of multiple and overlapping points of entry to dance theory/practice*

These are comments to be spoken more than they represent a text to be read; I hope you will receive them in that spirit. I've been teaching theory and history at Hollins University/American Dance Festival for a few years and taught theory and history at Yale this year. At MIT I teach dance composition and run experiments with emerging dance technologies. What's shifted profoundly during this five-year period has to do with media availability and the capacities for focused attention/durational attention by students. YouTube has shifted conceptions of "scarcity" in our field so that the ephemeral has emerged in a very different configuration yet again. For many students, mediated representations of dance are not necessarily ephemeral so much as they are spreadable, and distinctions between live practice and mediated representations have been realigned.

So, I've been focused on finding ways to construct lectures around concepts that allow simultaneous and various points of entry to considering work—phenomenology, the postcolonial, techne-technique, feminist resistances, the monument/monumental, queer corporealities, ethnic studies, affect. This has surely dislodged the place of choreography as a central site of dance for me and in turn my students. I'd like to focus my time on how this has happened, what this emergent pedagogy looks like in my courses, and where I think this might lead me in five years.

In the admittedly rarefied sites where I continue to work, the realization of the information age allows for unprecedented access to media. Students now have fast access to basic information about dance and its histories, as well as video clips and specialized documentation found on university library Web sites that include subscriptions to *Dance Research Journal* and other dance-specific publications. The fact of this media being available doesn't mean that students know how to search for it, and I find it worthwhile to coach some basic search

processes at the beginning of coursework. We spend about ten minutes pursuing a search topic together in class, including Google; media available in the local campus library as well as the local public library; searches on Amazon and half.com for texts and DVDs; and looking at the Library of Congress and New York Public Library online. Usually, as students focus in on research topics, we work together—always by email—to create a bibliography of sources that could contribute to their particular project.

While I am overjoyed at the increased presence of dance media, I find that access to this information seems to come with a startling cost of durational attention. More and more often, students express their discomfort at extended viewing assignments. We also seem to struggle a bit to maintain focused attention in two-hour class lectures and seminar discussions. It is as though increased media availability challenges our collective ability to maintain a connection to mediated contents through time.

I don't allow laptops or cell phones in the class. I make an announcement in the first meeting of my courses that my laptop will be the only one buzzing throughout our work together. Some students protest, and others drop these courses, perhaps because the prospect of being without access to Facebook and email for two hours disturbs their sensibility. I've seen students try to surreptitiously text message during a lecture or discussion section; those students are chided and warned that a repeat offense will mean ejection from the class. This may seem a bit fascistic, as it does to me as I say it here, but I want to underscore for my students that our work together is done in the presence of the possibility of focused attention.

I am convinced that YouTube and Facebook promote a pervasive sense of segmentation. If you've ever found dance media on YouTube, you've discovered that work over a few minutes has to be posted in segments. For example, Mark Morris's *Dido and Aeneas* is posted online in five or six segments, which are easily viewed out of order or with durational gaps between segments. At the end of each three- to five-minute segment, the viewer is also subject to comments posted by other viewers that can surely distract from the process of considering the mediated dance. And then there are the advertisement banners that now blaze across the bottom of the screen in many YouTube clips.

I also wonder that reality television dance shows contribute to our shared sense of a shortened attention focus. *So You Think You Can Dance*, an American show in this genre, trades in this shrinking of dance-time even as it moves the choreographer from a place of primary importance—which might be our historical impression of this role—to a place of sideward necessity. On this show, each episode offers a narrative of the trials and striving that trouble the learning of a new dance; these background interviews prime the audience's anxiety that things may fail in the "live" performance that is at the heart of the show. A choreographer is introduced to organize the dancers, but the choreography is not included in the evaluative discussion. For the voting, only the performance matters. So the choreographer's craft of coordination, or creating structures for creative expression, is not central to the show.

Most remarkable to me in these programs is the tiny amount of actual dancing time screened. It's as if a group of researchers—including choreographers, I would imagine—determined the amount of information that two engaged dancers could learn in a week of rehearsals, and then built the half-hour or hour-long television shows around these calculations. These programs feature tons of filler material: fake conversations with the judges, brief interviews with the families, ersatz scenes of rehearsals, and the all-important confessions of distress that this week's dance will somehow fail. And then the contestants dance, for a couple of minutes, with lights flashing and music blaring.

I think that these shows recenter the dancing in dance, the performance cult of personality that confirms a rise in experiential desire for young dancers who can imagine themselves on these shows. Students imagine that they can get on these shows and somehow survive long enough in the process to be recognizable in the world. It doesn't really seem to matter much who "wins" or "loses" the competition, just so that they do enough to be recognized as having been on the program.

In all of this, I wonder that choreography has been de-centered as a sustainable process of expression. If the dancing is the thing that matters, and the choreographer's craft only a sidebar to the actual event, what do these mediated representations of dance offer as a sustainable creative practice? On these programs the choreographer makes a dance and goes away; that dance is not particularly valuable in and of itself, and it certainly seems to be disposable. So in my dance history courses, I am often compelled to explore choreographic craft and its affiliations with labor and care so that we can start to construct histories together.

In my dance history courses I tend to start with the widest questions that concern me in my own research and then focus in on more detailed information study as the semester goes along. I've stopped worrying about "finishing" something in particular in a semester or a year of coursework. I realize that I don't expect students to finish their training in a physical technique in the time of a semester; I try to structure our time in the history classroom as part of a process of training students to construct useful questions and affiliations of their interests.

So, overlapping prisms of analysis provide the framework for our encounters. For example, we begin with broad questions, such as these from a spring 2009 dance history course:

#### Contemporary Dance Theater: Ideologies and Practices, Session One

What are the guiding principles of contemporary dance theater? What does it look like; who makes it; where does it happen; what can it do? Consideration of divergent ideologies of dance circulating in 2009; the work of Bill T. Jones, Wim Vandekeybus, Trisha Brown, Ananya Chatterjea.

A later unit on tap dancing was structured around the concept of surrogation:

#### Tap Dance: Surrogation, Hybridity, and American Social Dance Inventions

If American corporealities are, by historical incident, hybrid inventions, how are we to untangle their histories? How does surrogation function within the consideration of corporeal practices? What sorts of histories of tap dance can we construct? Consideration of Bill Bojangles Robinson, Savion Glover, Fred Astaire.

Diasporic memory, queer studies, feminist theory, the realm of dance criticism, spectatorship studies, and the hyper-real of music videos are all woven into the fabric of this dance history course. In response to the availability of information and media related to particularities of performance, we spend most of our time together working through concepts and techniques of analysis that contribute to how we understand dance history in the world.

What I imagine for five years from now are additional prisms of dance technology and mediated performance becoming central to how I teach students dance history. I find myself more and more concerned with history as a connectivity, as a capacity for people to question choices that we make. Through dance history, students imagine possibilities that they haven't yet experienced.

I imagine that we will continue to reposition our concepts of scarcity and the ephemeral in relation to dance. Dance can possibly become less and less "scarce" and its concepts less

“ephemeral” with emergent technologies. I imagine that we will make more space for theoretical and theatrical innovation that can extend the experience of dance beyond its local performance in time and space. So, the crisis of recovery that has haunted dance history may shimmer and shift to embrace capacities of perception that we are now just beginning to recognize.

I also imagine that dance will continue to grow in its place in the academy. In the United States more and more universities are trying to have dance programs that can answer calls from prospective students and compete in the crowded field of higher education.

## Janice Ross

### *Dance at the end of the university: Pedagogy for the impressed*

One of the changes I find most fascinating about dance pedagogy and research at the present moment is what I am calling a radical shift into a “Pedagogy for the Impressed.” I see this as one of the most consequential realignments between the body as offered to the intellect since dance entered higher education nearly one hundred years ago. In particular, I’d like to say a few words about the peculiar tension between the body and its social visibility as negotiated by dance studies, dance pedagogy, and dance celebrity in the university, and how the society of the spectacle is profoundly influencing the shape of dance in the university. I have just completed my fourth year of teaching the first freshman core requirement in the arts and humanities at Stanford University to have dance and performance as its focus. Coming from this experience, I will make some observations on how the habits of viewing dance in mass media are creating a spectacle-saturated conception of dance teaching and an unprecedented appetite for the star dancer as pedagogue—and the implications of this.

I’m calling it the new Pedagogy for the Impressed—and one might also call it dangerous—but the facts are the same: In the last few years one of the most dramatic, and potentially profound, migrations in dance has been from the stage to the U.S. higher education classroom. The migrators are dancers—celebrated artists—mostly in contemporary dance, who are have become sought after, sometimes even targeted recruits, for university faculties in the United States. (Sara Rudner of Tharp’s company at Sarah Lawrence; David Dorfman, Connecticut College; Bebe Miller, Ohio State University; Victoria Marks, University of California at Los Angeles; Mary Cochran of the Paul Taylor Company at Barnard; Simon Dove at Arizona State University; Yvonne Rainer at University of California at Irvine; Emily Coates at Yale; and, just last month, Susan Marshall was named the first director of the program in dance at Princeton University.)

This is great, but I think it is also potentially scary, particularly when viewed from the corner of dance pedagogy where I live my academic life: dance history. History and popular culture both have a part to play in my anxiety. At issue is the role of dance in the modern university—and how the work that artists produce might be framed as research production and knowledge construction, as “theory in practice,” a way that the body vivifies new ideas in visual form.

When Margaret H’Doubler first shepherded dance into higher education in the United States as an academic pursuit in 1917 at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, inaugurating the first dance program in higher education in the United States, she deliberately left the artists, and dance history and criticism, outside. In her classroom dance was consciously constructed as self-expression and self-discovery rather than training for a performing ca-

reer. At that time, to have a professional dancer as the instructor risked creating imitators of that artist's style rather than free thinkers/movers. Dancers were also a morally suspect population—not a lauded one as they are now. Disciplines yielded to higher education's structures then, and so it was for nearly one hundred years, until this recent push toward "Teaching with the Stars."

From having been anathema in the academy at the start of the last century, the celebrated professional dancer has moved from being not just acceptable but highly desirable as a university faculty member. No longer does the dancer have to be retired, and with a newly earned college degree, as was often true of the transition years of the postdance boom period. These choreographers I have named, who have mostly been hired in the last few years, are often being actively recruited in the midst of their celebrity and promised a position that permits a mix of teaching and performing and touring with their own companies.

So what is this about? Is it all good or should we reserve some suspicion? Last October in an essay in the *Boston Globe*, Marjorie Garber, chair of the Department of Visual and Environmental Studies at Harvard, issued an enthusiastic call for "Big Art"—for universities to become patrons of the arts and fund the actual making of art (2008). Effectively, this call was for higher education institutions to contain and nurture artists on the scale with which they approached science and the nurturing of scientists during and after World War II in the era of "Big Science."

Last week the University of Chicago's Teaching Artist Research Project (TARP), sponsored a national Webposium on the role of the teaching artist—as the culminating event in this project begun in late 2006 as the first large-scale survey of what it defines as "Teaching artists, the hybrid professionals that link the arts to education and community life" (University of Chicago Survey Lab 2009). TARP sees teaching artists as the creative resource behind the major innovations in arts education of the last decade. This first large-scale survey of teaching artists has as its goal to deepen our understanding of the lives and work of teaching artists through studies in twelve communities, and it will inform policy designed to make their work sustainable, more effective, and more meaningful.

The Survey Lab is collaborating with the National Opinion Research Center to carry out this first large-scale survey of teaching artists, which has as its focus to illuminate the work teaching artists believe is their best and identify the kinds of structural and organizational supports that enable work at the highest level. ("We will investigate how best to develop teaching artist capacities, to understand the dynamics between artistic and educational practice, and to keep artists engaged in the field. We will explore how higher education can make a more meaningful and strategic contribution toward preparing young artists to work in the field." [University of Chicago Survey Lab 2009]). *Critical Correspondence*, the web-based publication of the dance lab Movement Research in New York, has launched its own initiative, a project tellingly titled "The University Project." This is apparently a dancer-driven initiative that "aims to shed light on the shifting relationship between academia and working artists and in particular this phenomena of more and more Universities being interested in bringing working artists onto their faculties" (Movement Research 2009). So several issues are potentially at risk here: the preparation of dance educators, and the cultivation, refinement, and instruction in the offstage aspects of dance pedagogy, history, criticism, and theory.

I will end with a quick cataloging of my concerns: What kind of a shift in dance pedagogy and research might the presence of dance celebrities in the university bring? What might happen to the breadth and balance of the curriculum that represents the full

dimensions of our discipline? Does the star as pedagogue inspire and train dance teachers, theorists—historians, critics—or inspire performers? Donors? Where are universities in researching this shift?

There are strategic as well as trendy reasons for this shift, I think. Interestingly, the more plentiful, but also the more mediated, representations of dance in the academy and popular culture are becoming—Tommy's YouTube phenomena, reality dance competition TV shows—films about the training of dancers—the more the curiosity about the live event, and now extended to the live artist, grows. Guy Debord in his *Society of the Spectacle* (1967/2002) and Walter Benjamin in *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1935/2008) both cautioned us much earlier in the midst of last century about the phenomenon of the dangers of the surface, the mediated, the reproduced image in art—and the way in which this phenomenon stood for a broader set of cultural performances.

How do pedagogy and research in the university need to be rethought to maximize the celebrity dancer in a way useful to dance pedagogy in higher education? As Jill Dolan has noted, it is vitally important that academics, critics, theorists, and scholars learn to work together productively—that the disdain and distrust these groups sometimes hold one another is counterproductive if not destructive.

Working together we might enhance our mutual progress toward a more liberal democratic education and the flourishing of the arts as social entitlement and a rich site of critical engagement. We need to continually trouble how the theory/practice divide has hobbled academics' and artists' thinking about their work.

So now that dancers and choreographers are in the academy together, the real work begins. Most significant is the question, "Will our new colleagues succeed in establishing that the work they teach is a significant part of the standard university and college curriculum—with the markings of acceptance and value science has today—backed by lab space, funding, graduate students?" We have a second chance to bring the whole discipline of dance into the academy and to repair, but also rewrite, divisions created ninety-two years ago. I hope we get it right this time around. The stakes are too high for us to risk failure.

## Works Cited

- Benjamin, Walter. 1935/2008. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Debord, Guy. 1967/1992. *The Society of the Spectacle*. London: Rebel Press.
- Fogg, Amanda. 2008. "We are all dancers': Dance and Parkinson's Disease." *Animated* (Spring): 32–35.
- Garber, Marjorie. 2008. "Higher Art: Universities Should Become Society's Great Patrons of the Arts." *Boston Globe*, October 5.
- Greenland, Penny, ed. 2000. *What Dancers Do That Other Health Workers Don't*. Leeds: Jabadao.
- Mackrell, Judith. 2008. "Dance Preview: The Royston Maldoom Project: Overture 2012, London." *Guardian*, November 1.
- Movement Research. 2009. *Critical Correspondence: The University Project: A Collection of Data, an On-going Conversation*. Retrieved January 10, 2010, from <<http://www.movementresearch.org/publishing/?q=taxonomy/term/657>>.
- University of Chicago Survey Lab. 2009. *An Introduction to the Teaching Artist Research Project (TARP)*. Retrieved January 10, 2010, from <<http://surveylab.uchicago.edu/projects/tarp.shtml>>.

---

© 2009 Ken Bartlett, Thomas F. DeFrantz, Michael Huxley, Janice Ross.

**MICHAEL HUXLEY** (Chair) is a principal lecturer in dance at De Montfort University, where he teaches and researches dance history. He is chair of the CORD editorial board and a senior academic adviser in dance for PALATINE, the U.K. higher education subject centre. He has been closely involved with CEPA since its inception and is conducting pedagogic research into the student learning experience.

**KEN BARTLETT** is creative director of the Foundation for Community Dance and leads the company's artistic policies and the development of programmes of work of strategic importance nationally and internationally, particularly those that support intercultural dialogue, diversity, and disabled people. Ken is an advocate for access to, participation in, and progression through dance. A regular contributor to conferences and publications, Ken also commissions the foundation's own magazine, *Animated*. A former teacher and school inspector for the arts, Ken was, before joining the foundation in 1995, head of Arts and Cultural Services for Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council, starting the process of developing the New Art Gallery and Community Arts Development. Ken has lectured in the United States, Australia, Latin America, Europe, and Asia.

**THOMAS F. DEFRANTZ** was born a Hoosier (Indiana), liberated by high school in San Francisco, attended college back on the East Coast, and earned a Ph.D. in performance studies at New York University. He created the theory/history curriculum at the Hollins University/American Dance Festival M.F.A. program and was a visiting professor at Yale University in 2008–2010. He is a convener of the Choreography and Corporeality Working Group of the FIRT and of the Black Performance Theory Working Group, and artistic director of SLIPPAGE:Performance|Culture|Technology, in residence at MIT. His newest project is CANE, a responsive environment dance work (2009). DeFrantz is always interested in stories, how we tell them, and what we think they might mean.

**JANICE ROSS**, professor in the Drama Department and director of the Dance Division at Stanford University, is the author of *Anna Halprin: Experience as Dance* (University of California Press, 2007), for which she received a Guggenheim Fellowship; *San Francisco Ballet at 75* (Chronicle Books, 2007); and *Moving Lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and the Beginning of Dance in American Education* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2001). She is current president of the Society of Dance History Scholars.