DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 747		SO 017 701

AUTHOR	Baker, David W., Comp.
TITLE	Teachers in the Arts: Proceedings of a National Symposium (Baton Rouge, Louisiana, May 1-3, 1985).
INSTITUTION	Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge.
SPONS AGENCY	Louisiana State Arts Council, New Orleans.; Louisiana State Dept. of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Baton Rouge.; National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	85
NOTE	133p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Art; Art Teachers; Dance Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Improvement Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Music Teachers; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Continuing Education; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Improvement; Theater Arts

ABSTRACT

Initiated to address issues concerning preservice and inservice needs of art, music, dance and theater arts teachers, this symposium considered ideas and methods for improving teacher preparation and education at all levels of instruction. Charles Fowler presented "The Crisis in Teacher Education: Issues for the Arts," and Kathryn Martin, in "On Teaching Teachers to Teach," analyzed a status report on learning processes in arts teacher education. In "Art for Art's Sake and More," G. Leland Burningham considered the relationships and conflicts of arts teaching as they relate to the total education process. What art teachers need to know for effective classroom teaching is described by Gerard Knieter in "Teaching the Arts," and Brent Wilson concluded with "Evaluating Teaching in the Arts: Scenes from a Complex Drama." Responses to a number of these presentations are included. Additionally, these proceedings contain information on: (1) planning and developing the symposium; (2) the agenda; (3) recommendations for arts teacher training improvements; and (4) a summation and evaluation of the symposium. (JHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288747

TEACHERS in the ARTS

A NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

SO 014701

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David W.
Baker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

TEACHERS IN THE ARTS
A National Symposium

Supported by Grants From:

The Louisiana State Arts Council
The National Endowment for the Arts
Louisiana State University

Occurring At:

Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

May 1 - 3, 1985

Through the:

Design, Research and Service Division
College of Design/Louisiana State University

Project Director:

Dr. David W. Baker, Associate Professor of Art, School of Art, College of Design, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Assistant to the Project Director:

Eloise M. Murchison, Doctoral Candidate, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

This publication was funded in part by a grant from the National Endowment of the Arts, Office of Cultural Development, Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, State of Louisiana and the Louisiana State Arts Council.

1985

CONTENTS

PREFACE

A Commitment to Education
by Gordon Bolar. v

I. TEACHERS IN THE ARTS/PLANNING, DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING THE SYMPOSIUM

The Symposium: From Beginning to End
by David W. Baker 1

II. AN OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION/THE NATIONAL SCENE

The Crisis in Teacher Education: Issues for the Arts
by Charles B. Fowler. 13

III. A STATUE REPORT ON ARTS TEACHER EDUCATION/A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

On Teaching Teachers to Teach
by Kathryn A. Martin. 25

A Response: The Role of the University in Arts Teacher Education
by Lin M. Wright. 36

IV. THE ARTS IN EDUCATION AND REGULATORY INSTITUTION/ RELATIONSHIPS AND CONFLICTS

Art for Art's Sake and More
by G. Leland Burningham 45

A Response: Monolithic Structures and Teacher Training
by Stanley S. Madeja. 56

V. WHAT ARTS TEACHERS SHOULD KNOW/PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Teaching the Arts
by Gerard L. Knieter. 61

A Response: A Letter from Al Hurwitz 77

VI. HOW WILL YOU KNOW A GOOD ARTS TEACHER WHEN YOU SEE ONE/ STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

Evaluating Teaching in the Arts:
Scenes from a Complex Drama
by Brent Wilson 85

A Response: Reviewing Scenes from
a Complex Drama
by Carol Kuykendall 102

VII. BREAKOUT SESSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Orange Line Group Recommendations
by Shirley Trusty Corey 111

Red Line Group Recommendations
by William R. Detmers 112

Black Line Group Recommendations
by Neil Mooney. 115

VIII. SUMMATION AND EVALUATION

Reflections and Projections: A Symposium Examined
by Harlan Hoffa 119

PREFACE

A Commitment to Education

Gordon Bolar

The Louisiana Division of the Arts has for several years attempted to support and develop the Arts in Education in the state through various means. One of the DOA's efforts has included the traditional NEA funded Artists in the Schools or Artists in Residence program. Between twelve and sixteen grant applications from schools and school boards are funded each year to place artists from a variety of disciplines in educational settings. In addition, various projects from schools, libraries, and arts councils were funded for arts camps, workshops, and other arts related activities directed at teachers, principals, and students.

None of these efforts, however, including a 1978 Governor's Conference in Arts in Education substantially altered the status of arts in education in Louisiana. School boards continue to place the arts as a low priority during the eighties. Dwindling revenues for local governments complicated the situation, especially in the previously "oil rich" southern portion of the state. With new emphasis on computers and the basics during the eighties the arts are not gaining but losing ground in Louisiana schools. The only bright spot during the late seventies and early eighties was delivery systems improved for the arts in many Louisiana communities. Without school board cooperation, however, the effectiveness of museums, symphonies, dance groups and local arts agencies was limited.

To compound the situation there appeared to be little cooperation or agreement between state institutions controlling the educational system. The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Department of Education, the state legislature, and the state's university system had little in common, let alone any interest in discussion or planning the future of the arts the state's schools. In the view of the Division of the Arts, a forum was desperately needed for addressing issues in arts education common to all of these institutions. The classroom and art teacher was an obvious focal point for each of these bodies. While teacher involvement was always an essential part of the Division of the Arts' plan for the state, this agency had previously provided relatively little in the way of programs or funding to implement such involvement.

With the appointment of a new Louisiana State Arts Council in 1984, however, the commitment to Arts in Education changed. Although the LSAC's budget had been sharply reduced during the eighties, the Council placed Arts in Education and new initiatives as high priorities. Under the leadership of Al Head, then the DOA's Executive Director, and chairperson Jane Ann Tudor, the LSAC committed $14,500 to a national symposium on Teachers in the Arts. This money was supplemented by donations from Louisiana State University and matched by an Arts in Education special projects grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Council and the DOA staff believed that such a gathering was an excellent method of gaining the attention of heretofore uninterested parties, i.e. the legislature, school boards, principals, and the state's university educators responsible for training teachers. Louisiana State University offered the perfect site for the symposium. Meeting facilities were second to none and a May date in Baton Rouge coincided with the legislative session.

Two final ingredients were necessary to insure a well run and effective symposium. First a planning committee was created with representation from across the nation, and from within the state. Louisiana participants on the committee were to include a school board member, a university professor, an art supervisor for a school system, a member of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, a representative from a University Education program, and a member of the State Department of Education. Secondly, L.S.U. was contracted to provide facilities coordination, and a staff for setting up and implementing the symposium. From the outset, in-state ownership, involvement, input, and commitment was deemed essential. Without it the National Symposium for Teachers in the Arts would not have come to fruition.

Gordon M. Bolar was the Director of Arts in Education, the Louisiana Division of the Arts. As of June 1, 1985 Dr. Bolar became Executive Director of Alaska Arts Southeast, Sitka, Alaska.

TEACHERS IN THE ARTS

A National Symposium

I. TEACHERS IN THE ARTS / PLANNING, DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING THE SYMPOSIUM

The Symposium: Beginning to End

David W. Baker

Teachers in the Arts / A National Symposium was initiated to address issues concerning the pre-service education and in-service needs of art, music, dance and theater arts teachers. The symposium gave special attention to the roles played by public schools, state departments of education, legislatures, and higher education in the training, certification and support of arts teachers. The primary goal of the symposium was to generate the publish recommendations--and to clarify the basis for them--for improving practices that prepare and support people who teach the arts at all levels of instructions.

Planning The Symposium.

Upon funding, the Louisiana Division of the Arts and The Design, Research and Service Division of the College of Design, Louisiana State University appointed a Director for the project. A planning committee was then formed by the Director of Arts in Education, the Louisiana Division of the Arts and the Project Director of the Symposium. This committee was bound by the supporting grants to plan for a three day symposium with national representation and consequence which would generate a body of information on issues centering on arts teachers. This information was to be formally presented at the symposium, reflected upon by formal responses and group discussions, and then published in a monograph.

The planning committee included the following arts educators and advocates:

Dr. Stanley S. Madeja Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Norther Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois.

Ms. Myrtle Kerr Supervisor of Arts and Humanities, Louisiana State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Ms. Rachael Dunn Director of Art, Caddo Parish Public Schools, Shreveport, Louisiana.

Mr. Kyle Walls Executive Director, Arts and Humanities Council of Greater Baton Rouge, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Mr. John Scott Visual Artist, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Ms. Shirley Trusty Corey Director, Arts in Education, New Orleans Parish Public Schools, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Dr. Charles Fowler Consultant in the Arts, Washington, D.C.

Dr. David England Associate Professor, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Dr. Gordon Bolar Director of Arts in Education, Louisiana Division of the Arts, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Dr. David W. Baker Associate Professor School of Art, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana and Project Director, Teachers in the Arts/A National Symposium.

These planners were given the responsibility to identify the major issues that the symposium was to address and to recommend presentors and respondents to give the attention needed to those issues.

The following topics were selected by the planning committee as the foci for the symposium presentations and small group discussions. It was hoped that these topics would represent a balanced consideration of the symposium theme:

AN OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION/THE NATIONAL SCENE

While the symposium focused on issues related to the preparation of arts teachers and their professional needs once they become practitioners, it was believed important to place these issues in the context of general teacher-training practices and educational conditions. Thus, a presentor would be asked to present views on teacher training practices, certification issues and the professional needs of those who are currently teaching. Also, any specificity the presentor could give to issues related to the making of arts teachers--or general classroom teachers who teach the arts--would be encouraged.

A STATUS REPORT ON ARTS TEACHER EDUCATION/A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The planning committee felt that responses to the following questions would be an important contribution to the symposium: At what point in the education process should the arts education student be taught how to teach? Do education courses work as they now exist in higher education? Does a truly gifted and inspired artist need to be taught how to convey his or her art form to his or her students? Do arts teachers in training need more time for student teaching? Are arts teachers "selling out" when they use the arts to teach other subjects? Should arts educators--the teacher trainers--develop a more holistic approach to the arts and "the basics?" The teacher as artist/ the artist s teacher--who should assume arts education roles? Can one teacher effectively teach all arts disciplines? How can art educators be sustained in a system which is currently judging teachers on their effectiveness in promoting cognitive skills--the back-to-basics concerns? How many hours of a given arts discipline are/should be required for undergraduate and graduate students studying arts education? These, and other issues a presentor might believe to be related to the current teaching the arts were felt to be of special interest to symposium participants.

THE ARTS IN EDUCATION AND REGULATORY INSTITUTION/RELATIONSHIPS AND CONFLICTS

The committee felt there was need to focus on the relationships and conflicts that exist between the arts in current educational practices and the institutions--i.e., state departments of education, legislatures, higher education, school committees and administrators, advocacy groups--that deal with and influence arts teacher training and inservice support. A presentor would be encouraged to give attention to issues related to institutional and professional policies regarding the arts in education; the influences of calls for "back-to-basics," "computer literacy" and vocational training; the economic and social factors involved in institutional/teacher training relationships; and how these and other issues impact upon the priorities and responsibilities of institutions and the needs of training and supporting arts teachers. Of special interest would be the presentor's views on the relationships and conflicts that exist between institutional "sets" and the making of arts teachers at all levels of instruction.

WHAT ARTS TEACHERS SHOULD KNOW/PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

The presentor was asked to consider what a good music, art and theater arts teacher should know and be able to do. The planning committee felt that responses to the following types of questions would make an important contribution to the symposium: What should be included in the preparatory training of arts teachers? What is the archetypal arts teacher--what should they be? Should arts teachers incorporate real life experiences in their teaching? To what extent and how? How can arts teachers be kept abreast of developments in their respective fields? What are the programmatic rules on how to train arts teachers--the concrete and applicable as opposed to the philosophical and theoretical? What should they be? How should discipline content--the art form, the science of pedagogy, and research be combined for effective teacher training? How can the barriers exiting between teachers and artists be overcome at all levels of instruction in the preparation of arts teachers and those currently teaching the arts? How should arts teachers be prepared to utilize the rapidly developing and changing delivery systems for the arts in education--museums, opera, television, film, etc.? What "outside" issues--social, economic, cultural--affecting the training and support of arts teachers? Can general classroom teachers do a responsible job in teaching the arts? If so, what do they need to know? What is a realistic profile of a master arts teacher? Of a classroom teacher who is responsible for teaching the arts? And above all else--what will the future demand that arts specialists know?

HOW WILL YOU KNOW A GOOD ARTS TEACHER WHEN YOU SEE ONE/ STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

> The committee felt strongly that the symposium should offer a presentation on arts teacher evaluation. Simply put, how would one know a good teacher when they see one? What criteria is appropriate and acceptable in evaluating art, music and theater arts teachers? What evaluation instruments exist? What is their nature, their value, their effectiveness, etc.? Why is teacher evaluation in the arts important? How does it differ from other evaluation practices--i.e., those for history teachers, math teacher, etc.? Or does it differ? What problems remain to be solved in arts teacher evaluation practices? How is, or might be, evaluation related to the certification of arts teachers? How can a national consensus on evaluation processes be achieved in areas that are historically seen, and valued, as being individualistic, subjective, and lacking definition?

The planning committee, with its concern for evaluation, and agreed that the symposium should close with summative and evaluative remarks. Thus, a sixth major presentation was called for by someone skilled in this process.

And finally, the committee agreed that audience participation must be an important feature of the symposium. To insure that this occurred, break-out sessions were recommended as an essential element of the symposium agenda. Furthermore, the committee recommended that group leaders be identified and that they be invited to submit summative reports to the Project Director for inclusion in the symposium monograph, which would also include all addresses and responses.

Developing the Symposium.

After the planning committee met, the Project Director responded to their recommendations and invited the following arts educators and advocates to prepare formal presentations and responses for the symposium:

Dr. Charles B. Fowler. Consultant in the arts and education editor Musical America/High Fidelity Magazine, Washington, D.C.

Ms. Carol Kuykendall, Assistant Superintendent, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas.

Dr. G. Leland Burningham, Superintendent of Public Instruction, The Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dr. Gerard L. Knieter, Dean of Fine Arts, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.

Dr. Brent Wilson, Professor of Art, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Kathryn A. Martin, Dean, School of Fine Arts, The University of Montana, Missoula.

Dr. Al Hurwitz, Director of Teacher Training, The Maryland Institute - College of Art, Baltimore, Maryland.

Dr. Stanley S. Madeja, Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois.

Dr. Harlan Hoffa, Associate Dean, College of Art and Architecture, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Lin M. Wright, Chairperson, Theater Arts Department, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

Dr. Marilynn Price, Program Officer, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, The J. Paul Getty Trust, Los Angeles, California.

To compliment these presentor's and respondent's formal preparations, the Project Director invited the following arts educators to chair the small group participation sessions:

Ms. Shirley Trusty Corey, Director, Arts in Education, New Orleans Parish Public Schools, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Ms. Karen Carroll, Instructor of Art, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Dr. William R. Detmers, Associate Professor of Art Education, The University of Hawaii - Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dr. Neil Mooney, Supervisor of Art Education, The Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

Following the identification of participants, a brochure announcing the symposium was prepared and mailed to over 5,000 arts educators and arts advocates who were identified by the Louisiana State Division of the Arts, The Louisiana State University and Regional and National Arts Organization mailing lists. Also, announcements of the symposium were published in all national arts organization newsletters and in nationally distributed professional journals.

The symposium was open to anyone interested in the pre-service education and in-service support of arts teachers. In that it was supported by grants from the Louisiana Arts Council, The National Endowment for the Arts, and Louisiana State University, no registration or participation fees were required. Also, it was announced that the symposium monograph would be available from the Louisiana State Division of the Arts upon request.

Implementing the Symposium.

The symposium followed this agenda:

AGENDA

TEACHERS IN THE ARTS/A NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
May 1-3, 1985, Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1	Registration--International Room/LSU Union 1:00 - 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 - 8:00 p.m.
2:00 p.- 3:30 p.	Invited Presentation---International Room/ LSU Union · The Audubon Project: An In-service Program for an Art Centered Elementary School--William Detmers, Associate Professor of Art Education, The University of Hawaii - Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3:30 p.- 5:00 p.	Mixer (cash bar)--Chancellor's Dining Room/ LSU Faculty Club

7:30 p.- 9:30 p. General Session--Vieux Carre Room/LSU Union

. Opening Remarks--David W. Baker, Project Director for the Symposium and Associate Professor, School of Art, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

. Welcomes-- Jerry Nielson, Dean, School of Design, Louisiana State University

-- Kyle Walls, Executive Director, Arts & Humanities Council of Greater Baton Rouge

-- Gordon Bolar, Director of Arts and Education for the Louisiana State Division of the Arts

. Address--An Overview of Teacher Education by Charles B. Fowler, Journalist and Consultant in the Arts, Washington, D.C.

THURSDAY, MAY 2

Registration--Cotillion Ballroom/LSU Union
8:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

9:00 a.-10:30 a. Presentation--LSU Union/Cotillion Ballroom

. A Status Report on Arts Teacher Education/A Critical Analysis--Kathryn Martin, Dean, School of Fine Arts, The University of Montana, Missoula

. Response--Lin M. Wright, Chairperson, Theater Arts Department, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

10:30 a.-11:00 a. Coffee and Rolls--Courtesy of the School of Art/LSU--Regency Room/LSU Union

11:00 a.-11:30 a. . A Point of View/Discipline-Based Art Education--Marilynn Price, Getty Center for Education in the Arts, The J. Paul Getty Trust, Los Angeles, CA

11:30 a.-12:30 p. Break-out sessions for audience participation--LSU Union

- (Red Line) Regency Room--Moderator: William Detmers, Associate Professor of Art, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
- (Blue Line) Barataria Room--Moderator: Karen Carroll, Instructor of Art, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
- (Orange Line) Council Room--Moderator: Shirley Trusty Corey, Director of Arts in Education, New Orleans Parish Public Schools
- (Black Line) Royal Ballroom--Moderator: Neil Mooney, Supervisor of Art Education, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

Note: The moderators will remain the same for the "color line" groups throughout the symposium.

2:00 p.- 3:30 p. Presentation--LSU Union/Cotillion Ballroom

- The Arts in Education and Regulatory Institutions/Relationships and Conflicts--G. Leland Burningham, Educational Administrator and Arts Advocate, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Response--Stanley S. Madeja, Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois.

3:30 p. - 5:00 p. Break-out sessions for audience participation--LSU Union

7:00 p. - 9:00 p. Reception for Symposium participants and Registrants--Louisiana Arts and Science Center, Baton Rouge. Courtesy of the Greater Baton Rouge Arts and Humanities Council and the Louisiana Arts and Science Center.

FRIDAY, MAY 3	Registration--Cotillion Ballroom 8:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
9:00 a.-10:30 a.	Presentation--LSU Union/Cotillion Ballroom . What Arts Teachers Should Know/Preservice and In-service Training--Gerald L. Knieter, Dean of Fine Arts, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio. . Response--Al Hurwitz, Director of Teacher Training, The Maryland Institute--College of Art, Baltimore, Maryland.
10:30 a. - 11:00 a.	Coffee and Rolls--Courtesy of the School of Art/LSU--Tegency Room/LSU Union
11:00 a.-12:30 p.	Presentation--LSU Union/Cotillion Ballroom . How Will You Know A Good Arts Teacher When You See One?/Standards of Evaluation--Brent Wilson, Professor of Art, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania. . Response--Billy R. Reagan, Superintendent, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas.
2:00 p.- 3:00 p.	Break-out sessions for audience participation--LSU Union
3:30 p.- 4:00 p.	General Session--LSU Union/Cotillion Ballroom . Symposium Summation and Evaluative Remarks Harlan Hoffa, Associate Dean, College of Art and Architecture, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

The final aspect of the implementation of this symposium was the production of the monograph which includes the full text of the presentations given at the conference, the formal responses to them, the generalized reactions of the audience to the symposium programs and a description of it's design, development and implementation. The objective of this monograph is to capture the collective thinking of all symposium participants and to make it available to a national audience over an extended period of time. By doing so, it is hoped that a dialogue, and a growing attention to needed changes in arts teacher pre-service education and in-service support might be generated. The design, development and program of the symposium has here now been explained and the following chapters in this monograph conclude the implementation of the symposium. Whether or not Teachers in the Arts/A National Symposium achieves its goals depends upon the actions of it's participants and readers of this monograph.

David W. Baker was the Project Director for Teachers in the Arts/A National Symposium, during which he was an Associate Professor of Art at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He is currently an Associate Professor of Art Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

II. AN OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION/THE NATIONAL SCENE

The Crisis In Teacher Education: Issues for the Arts

Charles B. Fowler

The national cry for educational excellence--as though excellence were some kind of new idea--has weighed teachers in the balance and found them wanting. There are many experts who believe that the problems of education today lie right at the feet of America's teachers. It is an obvious truism that the quality of education is directly dependent upon the quality of teaching.

Let's take a look at some of the larger issues in teacher education with the help of some of the data that Dr. C. Emily Feistritzer, Director of the National Center for Educational Information, has assembled and consider some of the possible implications for the arts.

Standards.

The American Teacher,[1] a comprehensive data-based study of the current condition of teaching and teacher education in this nation, states that "Never before in U.S. history has the caliber of those entering the teaching profession been as low as it is today."[2] The Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of prospective education majors are well below those of most other college majors. When the SAT was given in June 1984, for example, students aspiring to be teachers scored 28 points below the mean in the verbal portion and 46 points below the mean in mathematics.[3] Teaching is not attracting the better minds.

Then, too, the brightest young women, once a prime source for new teachers, are seeking more lucrative options in a wide range of professions.[4] Traditionally, women have formed 70 percent of the teaching force. Today, teaching is becoming an occupation of last resort. Yet the National Education Association estimates that we will need 200,000 new teachers a year at least through 1990.

Additional findings from two surveys conducted in 1984 by Feistritzer's National Center for Education Information further reinforces the crisis of standards in teacher education.[5] This report found that "An astonishing 82 percent of the institutions having teacher education programs in this nation ignore Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Test (ACT) scores in considering applicants for teacher training." Generally, these are the smaller colleges that produce half of our teacher graduates. Rarely do they reject any applicant. Few bother to look at an applicant's high school rank or grade point average. Feistritzer tells us that "they do not have rigorous entry or exit requirements," and "fewer than 20 percent of them are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education."[6]

The report also states that "Fewer than half of the institutions surveyed--47 percent--require passage of any kind of test upon completion of their teacher education programs." Only five percent require graduates to pass a test in the subject area they will teach. And compared to ten years ago, prospective elementary, secondary, and special education teachers are required to complete more education courses.

What is evident here, then, in Feistritzer's words, is that "There is a serious crisis in teaching in the United States," The crisis, she says, "is deeply rooted" and will not be easily averted.[7] Teaching, she maintains, "has a way to go before it can truly be called a profession." The reasons:

> Unlike other professions, teaching has no national standards, such as a proficiency examination, to qualify aspirants for licenses to practice. And all are far more selective about who gets into the process in the first place.[8]

How does this crisis impinge on arts education and the education of arts teachers?

Feistritzer has assembled a very strong case for unacceptable and declining standards in teacher education. It is important to understand that she is dealing with classroom teachers. Arts programs tend to have their own entrance requirements. (SAT scores for college-bound seniors in art, music, and theatre are consistently higher than those for education majors.[9] What we must realize, however, is that arts education exists in this milieu of generally declining standards. What the experts and the public think about teacher education, they tend to apply across-the-board. And they will apply the solutions--say, more emphasis on testing--indiscriminately as well.

The situation with classroom teachers--their potential, the quality of their education, and the new demands placed upon them--will also affect the decisions we make about their role in arts education and the kind of education in the arts that we should or could expect of them. As usual, the arts will not be on the priority list of reforms for the education of classroom teachers.

Pay and Prestige.

For more than a decade there has been a steady cline in the number of young people choosing education as a career.[10] Among the probable reason for this are low pay and shrinking prestige. This may account for the reason that many who graduate as fully certified teachers never enter the classroom. An upturn in the elementary school population, beginning this year, coupled with an increase in teacher retirements, will cause teacher shortages. The result may be understaffed schools and larger student-per-teacher ratios or schools that are staffed by under-qualified teachers. There are already severe shortages of qualified science and mathematics teachers.

It has also been established that "Teachers are dissatisfied with their lot and the condition of their profession, and with good reason." Compared with other professions, the starting salaries of teachers are low and the gap widens further with time. According to public opinion polls, the "public's attitude toward teachers is deteriorating, from 49 percent expressing a 'great deal of confidence' in them in 1974 to only 29.8 percent in 1981."[11]

Arts teachers are deeply affected by these conditions. A survey of 1,186 art teachers, conducted by the Alliance of Independent Colleges of Arts in 1983-84, revealed that they feel a strong need "to gain recognition and prestige for art and for art education."[12] They want "ammunition to answer students, parents, administrators, and the community, who said that art education was nice but one could not make a living at it."

This survey found that, as of June 1984, "nearly 70% of the schools had experienced reductions in faculty positions, course offerings or program budgets for the teaching of art over the past three years."[13] And, in addition, 40% of the schools anticipated additional cuts in the next three years.

But most important perhaps, were the requests for assistance in improving art education. Evidently, the situation is so dire that art teachers realize that they must improve the qualifications and the dedication of their fellow art teachers, further the discipline of their art, and improve the materials of teaching. This two-year inquiry shows that "art education is in serious trouble."[14] One can surmise that similar attitudes and difficulties plague music, and perhaps theatre and dance as well.

We do know that enrollments in teacher education programs in the arts are declining. In the decade from 1971 to 1981 bachelor's degrees in art education fell by 57.7 percent, those in music education by 26.6 percent.[15] The word spreads quickly among career-conscious, arts-talented high school students that teaching pay is low and that there are few jobs at the end of the line. Teachers may also, unwittingly perhaps, convey their dissatisfactions with teaching to their students.

Certification.

Feistritzer finds that the "The process of certifying teachers in the U. S. is chaotic, varying enormously from state to state and even within states." She says that "The numbers of different types of certificates and what is required to get one within a state, much less nationwide, are staggering." With the exception of Vermont and Virginia, all states issue substandard, limited, or emergency certificates when applicants fail to meet full-credentialing criteria. "Half of the states let people teach on substandard credentials who have less than a bachelor's degree, and all but four renew such certificates." This means that many teachers in the United States are working with substandard credentials or no certification at all.

With one exception, all states certify teachers both by approving college preparatory programs and by reviewing the credentials of individual candidates. Only Mississippi does not approve programs. Feistritzer says that "Since the majority of teachers in the United States have graduated from approved programs, the standards used to approve teacher education programs are of more significance than the individual certification requirements."[16]

But, in increasing numbers, states are beginning to require prospective teachers to pass teacher competency tests in order to be certified. Twenty-five states now require that teachers pass exams for certification, including 17 that have gone into effect since 1982. Some or all of the National Teachers Exam is required for certification in 13 states. In Arkansas, where opposition gained national attention, both new and certified teachers must pass a test.[17]

Such state mandated testing may well lead to the demise of the program approval and accreditation procedures presently practiced.[18] New Jersey has already adopted an alternative route to certification due to the threat of severe teacher shortages. Half of the state's 73,500 teachers are expected to retire or leave for other jobs during the coming decade. To maintain the teaching force, those lacking traditional education degrees can now earn teaching credentials largely through on-the-job training.[19] Will such programs, if successful, prompt policy makers to eliminate formal teacher training programs?

Teacher competency testing is presently taking three forms: (1) the use of the standardized National Teacher Examination, which in some states is coupled with a subject area examination, say, in visual arts education; (2) the use of tests developed by the individual state such as those used in Oklahoma and Georgia which test candidates in-depth in their major field; and (3) an entry year, apprentice-type program under the direction of a committee consisting of two practicing teachers and an administrator who recommend certification or an additional year of apprenticeship. This latter program is practiced in Oklahoma and Georgia and is being instituted in Kentucky and North Carolina.[20]

In the arts, teacher education programs are approved (evaluated) by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and by specialty organizations such as the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and/or the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). If these standards are to assure excellence in the supply of arts teachers, they must take into account changes that affect arts teachers today.

How we educate teachers is determined by what we want these people to be able to do and what they need to know to be able to do it. So any discussion of teacher education in the arts is necessarily wedded to coming to consensus about (1) educational realities today and (2) the goals for arts education. Perhaps some examples will help establish the need for this kind of thinking.

Today's Students.

The conditions of teaching are changing. For example, ethnic and racial minorities in the United States are expanding rapidly.[21] "Almost all of the larger states are showing higher percentages of minority students--46 percent in Texas, for example, and 32 percent in New York."[22] By 1990, minorites will constitute more than 30 percent of the total U. S. school-age population.

If we want arts programs that reach out to all the students, then we must become cognizant of who all those students are. The rapid growth of ethnic and racial minorities means that our student population is vastly different than it was just 20 years ago. "One in 5 children in this nation live below the poverty level...,"[23] and the same number now live with a mother and no father present. There are many "latchkey" children who go home from school to empty houses. Five times as many children are born out of wedlock today as in 1970. In 1982, more than half of all black children (57%) were illegitimate. Feistritzer has found that,

> There is a direct correlation between student achievement and family income levels, level of education of parents, whether the child lives with both parents, socio-economic status of the family, and parental involvement in the child's school.[24]

Children from problem situations consistently fail to achieve in school at the level of children from non-problem situations. Yet teachers face children from problem situations as a matter of routine. As student's profiles change, so, too, do the demands upon teachers and schools.

Where do arts teachers stand in all of this? First, reaching all the students, something we have yet to do, will be more difficult, not less. In the arts, we have simply sold the problem of working with problem students, particularly on the secondary levels, by opting out. We make our courses elective, or we select students for participation as in band, chorus, theatrical productions, dance groups, or special courses in visual arts. In America's high schools, arts teachers teach the bright and the talented students, and one can accurately assume, the non-problematic.[25] But we ignore the other students at our own peril. The arts become viable educationally to the degree that they are a necessary and valuable part of every student's education.

The problem of elitism comes right to the surface here. Are we going to reach the many or retreat--some might say "cater"--to the few? The preparation of teachers must take into account the circumstances of teaching. If this is the case, efforts must be made to teach prospective arts teachers to work with the diverse populations they will inevitably encounter in the public schools. Boston University's School of Education is moving in this direction. Dean Paul B. Warren says, "We are on the verge of formally putting into place a requirement that all (education) students spend a semester working in a cultural setting different from that in which they grew up."[26]

Feistritzer would agree with this move. She believes that "we need a different kind of people in teaching--tougher and possessed of broader knowledge and ability." She says, "The luxury of having chit-chats about teacher education is over. This is serious business."[27]

If arts teachers are going to be successful, they will have to be able to cope with today's more difficulty-to-handle students. They will have to understand something of the arts of Afro-, Asian-, Hispanic-, and Indian-Americans and how to relate these arts to the larger culture. And they will have to know how to help minority children find their individual and group identity through the artistic process. Ignoring the problem won't make it go away.

Let's look at one other critical area.

Substance.

Recent education studies and reports call for higher educational standards and greater challenges in the learning process. Substance has become the major criterion of educational worth. If we view the arts as a major area of human knowledge comparable to the sciences, then the individual arts must be taught so that this is evident. But first, the individual art teachers must see themselves in the context of this comprehensive arts curriculum, just as biology teachers see themselves in the context of the total science program.

In the recent regional meetings on arts education sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Association of State Arts Agencies, it was obvious that principals, superintendents, school board members, and state education officials easily accept the concept of "the arts" as a major curriculum area. But many arts specialist seemingly do not. Thinking comprehensively does not mean that we dilute, erase, or ignore our specialism. It means that we understand our relation to the other areas and that we work together. The generic view also encompasses the possibilities for extending, enriching, and deepening arts programs through collaborations and enlisting the efforts of classroom teachers. It's simply a broader outlook.

And part of that broader outlook is to recognize the individuality of each art and the different problems each faces. The Getty Center for Education in Arts has found that visual arts programs in many schools over emphasize studio art and creativity to the neglect of art history, criticism, and esthetics. They seek to establish the visual arts as a serious academic subject through discipline-based instruction.

But the problems in the visual arts is quite different than the problems in music, just about the opposite, in fact. In music, particularly at the elementary and junior high school levels, there are well organized, sequential curricula that encompass the learning of music history, acquaintance with music literature, composers, and performers, knowledge of musical forms, and mastering the technique of the art, including reading. If anything, creativity is neglected. So, while we look at the matter of teacher education in the arts together, we must not make the mistake of making hasty applications across fields.

We approach the arts comprehensively to broaden, deepen, and enrich the curriculum, not to make it uniform. If in the process of administering a comprehensive arts program, we ask or expect arts teachers to serve as cultural coordinators, to provide in-service education programs in the arts for classroom teachers, to coordinate arts programs taught by classroom teachers, resident artists, and educational representatives of community arts enterprises, to develop curricula to meet new graduation requirements in the arts, and to direct advocacy efforts to win broader support for arts education, then arts teachers--prospective and practicing--face demands that may require different and additional education.

The idea, too, of striving for greater substance in arts teaching has many implications for teacher education, both for the specialist and the classroom teacher. The greater the emphasis given to substance, the less likely it is that classroom teachers can teach the arts curriculum. They simply do not have the background, nor does it appear that their education, whether in-service or pre-service, will provide it. In Michigan, for example, less than 50% of the institutions that prepare classroom teachers require a methods course in any of the arts.[28]

The lack of the arts in the preparation of classroom teachers is historic practice bordering on custom. This prevailing deficiency was precisely why arts specialists were called for in the first place. The argument to maintain arts specialists in the elementary schools has credence so long as elementary teachers are unprepared to teach the arts. That's the irony. If arts specialists fight for a better arts education for the classroom teacher and achieve it, they do themselves out of their jobs.

Indeed, Goodlad asks, "Why specialists in the arts and physical education, if not in English, mathematics, and social studies?"[29] And he suggests that all teachers be prepared "with such depth in one subject as to be able to serve as a consultant to the rest of the teaching staff." What he seems to be saying is that every teacher should be a specialist at something. If this is the goal, then let the arts show the way.

But the prevailing situation does not preclude the greater involvement of classroom teachers in arts education. One of the main reasons that the arts remain peripheral is that they exist outside the framework of what the elementary teacher is required to teach and is held accountable for. But most classroom teachers have enough good sense to know that children should have the arts. They'll pitch in and give a hand, if they know how. When they're provided with some background and assistance, classroom teachers can become expert at integrating the arts into their regular subject matter teaching. They can learn to use community arts resources effectively and can enlarge and extend the on-going arts program and make the work of the specialist far more significant.

The additional demands being placed upon arts teachers--to incorporate community arts resources, to work with classroom teachers, to meet the needs of today's students, and to intensify arts study--implies that arts teachers, too, may need in-service re-education and that their pre-service programs will have to change as well. The tuba player in marching band who felt exploited because all he did was dot the "i" in the formation may have been trying to tell us something.

The goals of excellence and quality in American education beckon us to move toward reform. If teachers are part of the problem, they can be part of the solution as well. Arts teachers cannot claim immunity to the ills of American education, nor innocence of the problems, nor can they claim total perfection in their craft. We, too, have new challenges to meet, new territory to explore, and new powers to gain. Let us take up the task with enthusiasm.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Dr. C. Emily Feistritzer (ed.), The American Teacher (Washington, D.C.: Feistritzer Publications, 1983).

[2] Ibid., p. 59.

[3] This is according to the Educational Testing Service that compiles the exam.

[4] Op. Cit., p. 60.

[5] C. Emily Feistritzer, The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 1984). The material cited here comes from the Summary and Conclusions, pp. 54-61.

[6] Ibid.

[7] The American Teacher, op. cit., pp. 59 and 61.

[8] The Making of a Teacher, op. cit., p. 57.

[9] Music and Music Education: Data and Information (Reston, Virginia: Music Educators National Conference, 1984), p. 36.

[10] The American Teacher, Ibid., p. 59.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Henry E. Putsch, "AICA Survey of Current Trends in Art Education," Art Education in the Schools: Strategies for Action (Washington, D.C.: The Alliance of Independent Colleges of Art, 1984), p. 30.

[13] Ibid., p. 26.

[14] Ibid., p. 31.

[15] Ibid., p. 22.

[16] C. Emily Feistritzer, The Condition of Teaching: A State by State Analysis (Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983), p. 98.

[17] Barbara Vobejda, "Facing Teacher Competency Tests," The Washington Post, April 22, 1985, p. 1.

[18] Robert L. Erbes, Certification Practices and Trends in Music Teacher Education, 1982 - 1983 (Reston, Virginia: Music Educators National Conference, 1983), p. 39.

[19] Debbie Goldberg, "New Teacher Certification Program Bypasses Traditional Education Degree," The Washington Post, April 26, 1985, p. E1.

[20] Ibid., pp. 39-40.

[21] The American Teacher, Ibid., p. 60.

[22] Ibid.

[23] C. Emily Feistritzer, Cheating Our Children: Why We Need School Reform (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 1985), p. 59.

[24] Ibid., p. 60.

[25] According to a recent survey of every high school student in the class of 1982, "The percentage of schools with above-average numbers of offering in the arts...was greater when over one-third of their students were in an academic program." The survey also reported that "In general, the percentage of schools offering arts courses decreased as the percentage of students in a college preparatory program decreases...and cultural appreciation courses were offered more frequently in schools when the percent of students expected to go to college exceeded 75 percent." See Course Offerings and Enrollments in the Arts and the Humanities at the Secondary School Level, report prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984), pp. 44 and xvii.

[26] "A Blueprint for Improving Teacher Education," *B U Today*, Vol. 1, No. 27 (April 10, 1985), p. 2.

[27] Conversation with Emily Feistritzer, April 22, 1985.

[28] Survey sponsored by the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education, Jeannine M. Galetti, Project Director, April 1985.

[29] John I. Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984), p. 185.

Charles B. Fowler is a Washington, D.C. free lance writer and consultant in the arts. He is also education editor of Musical America/High Fidelity Magazine.

III. A STATUS REPORT ON THE ARTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION/A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

On Teaching Arts Teachers to Teach

Kathryn A. Martin

"Thanks to art, instead of seeing a single world--our own--we see it multiply until we have before us as many worlds as we have artists" (Marcel Proust). Fundamentally, I believe it is from these many worlds,or these many visions, that comes the genius that is willing to risk, and to innovate, to be the individual that makes a difference.

Although the educational system has always been a target of criticism, at no other period of history have so many reports been issued suggesting areas of needed restructuring. From "A Nation At Risk" to the recent report on teacher training by an independent committee established by the American Association of College for Teacher Education, it is evident that significant restructuring and subsequent change is necessary and expected of the educational system on all levels. The arts are no exemption to the need to examine, ask the hard questions, and proceed to make the necessary changes. However, in no other period of history have those of us involved in arts education been in better position to make the case for the arts being basic to everyone's education. Changes in curriculum must be made on all levels of education and these changes must be made not only through addressing the quality of curriculum, but with the arts in a central position, clearly impacting pre-service and in-service training for arts specialist.

This paper will attempt to review the components of the learning process, regardless of discipline, the arts as they relate to the learning process, the role of the arts specialist, as teacher of a specific discipline, and as the arts specialist relates to the classroom teacher. Hopefully, these comments will be seen within that framework, and as a possible model for pre-service and in-service restructuring. As a point of reference, using the term "art educations" is meant to imply the following balanced approach to the teaching of any one of the arts disciplines. The arts education experience must be centered in the sequential learning of skills in the particular discipline. The balanced arts education program includes residencies by artists, both in the discipline of the specialist and in other areas of the arts, performances in music and theatre, and where available museum visits. All are components of the balanced curriculum based arts education program. The arts specialist and the classroom teacher work in tandem to achieve the goals of the arts discipline and to relate learning in the arts, to learning in other areas of the curriculum. Any discussion of arts education which refers to terms such as "creative process," and "aesthetic experience," must be understood and used within the framework of the sequential skills based programs in arts education. The arts are done a disservice when jargon replaces the essential emphasis on the sequential learning of skills at any level of education through pre-service.

The process of teacher training and education in any discipline must begin with an exploration of the learning process. Learning, we are told, is primarily the ability to discover, to experience, to analyze, and to synthesize. Thus a critical responsibility of the teacher, the educator, is to assist in the development of the environment which makes possible facilitating the processes that leads to discovery, experiencing, analyzing and synthesizing. Two discipline-based examples help illustrate this point: Within the theatre tradition, we are taught that to understand a play script, prior to acting or designing for the play, we must discover the "inner meaning," we have to experience the action, we have to analyze the motivation and synthesize the elements of the script into a single focus in order to act, direct or design. In art history the analysis and synthesis of the historical and cultural implications are critical to an aesthetic analysis of the art work. As educators we strive to teach each student in all disciplines: (1) the sequential acquisition of knowledge and skills; (2) the ability to communicate; and (3) the need to be self-motivated. My perspective of the creative process suggests that pedogogy must involve the learner in the processes of discovery, experiencing, analyzing and synthesizing; and if indeed our goal is the acquisition of knowledge and skills, the ability to communicate and self-motivation. For learning to have taken place, the learner must be capable of analyzing and ultimately synthesizing the knowledge and skills and be capable of communicating the experiences. This is equally important from kindergarten through the pre-service training.

Frequently, the quality of teaching and the importance of the subject matter is determined through examination and testing. This is most often not the case in arts, and unfortunately we have accumulated little data on inputs and outcomes within arts programs at the elementary and secondary systems. We believe those involved both in teaching and as students must have the opportunity for discovering, experiencing, analyzing and synthesizing. Without which learning is at best marginally happening, if at all. The discovering, experiencing, analyzing and synthesizing is facilitated by the teacher. But the teacher is also involved in the execution of the skills with the students, whether in painting, drawing, musical activities or in drama process and product. It is important to understand that in facilitating the creative process, in addition to learning skills and knowledge, the teacher's input must provide students with the critical ability to learn to value their work, and to distinguish their better work from their work of lesser quality. This process of critical analysis is perhaps best described by T. S. Eliot in "Tradition and the Individual Talent" where Eliot tells us that one cannot truly be creative without first knowing what has been created.

As we train teachers, both arts specialists and classroom teachers there are certain common skills, knowledges and understandings which are essential for the individuals trained as teachers to go into the classroom to facilitate the discovering, the analyzing, and the synthesizing. Clearly, a primary focus of all training of both arts specialists and classroom teachers should demonstrate the total concern for the dignity of the person. In addition, with the arts specialists we are assuming (1) a basic knowledge of the aesthetics of the discipline; (2) a basic knowledge of studio art (or music, or drama or dance performance); (3) a basic knowledge of the history of the art form; and, (4) a basic knowledge of criticism; and (5) some knowledge of the art disciplines outside the discipline of the major. Further, the arts specialists must understand that the arts can and do reflect the life experience and must demonstrate a concern for the dignity of the individual. The arts experiences also contain many transferable pedagogical approaches within the learning process, which provide additional rationale for the inclusion of the arts within the curriculum, and the liberal use of the arts in the pedogogical training of teachers.

Consider the following three examples of pedagogical transfers that are possible through the use of the arts in education. (1) The sense of perception: the ability to perceive is the basis of abstract learning. Abstract learning is a prerequisite for learning the basic functions of reading and mathematics. Our abilities to use symbols and to decode those symbols differently in given situations is a function of perception; (2) basic to order and sequence: order and sequence are required to teach and to learn the skills of an art form. Again, we are involving the learner in the classification and decoding process, which in turn supports learning and becoming skilled at the acquired traits of fluency and flexibility; and (3) since art is very much tension and resolution of tension, the understanding of art addresses the wholeness of each of us and provides us with another format for learning on-going conflict resolution skills.

Momentarily let us explore the importance of order and sequence as a transferable pedogogical learning process. To learn, to acquire knowledge and skills in the arts, requires an orderly sequential structure. For the teacher to structure the lesson plan for teaching the skills of an arts process, whether it is ceramics, painting, piano, choreography, or drama, there is a necessary order and a sequence without which one does not progress within the learning process from a "point A" to a "point B". Within the school environment a tremendous amount of flexibility is essential to the successful teacher, to enable students, at different rates of learning and different skill levels to achieve the skill to progress from a "point A" to a "point B," regardless of the discipline. Now, meeting those learning differences in individual students is as necessary in reading and mathematics, as it obviously is in any of the areas of the arts, and the ability to understand and to have experienced sequential learning in the arts provides the teacher, both classroom and specialist, with increased pedagogical techniques. Further, as the student is more involved in experiential activities, we believe observable traits begin to surface, and here gain, there exists a need for research. They become more fluent and the concept of sequence transfers readily from the arts activity to other areas of curriculum. Increased flexibility enable the child to adjust more readily to rapid change. The individual becomes increasingly more original in such activities as creative writing and the "joy" which is so often lost in the educational system gives way to the ability to celebrate. Fluency, flexibility, originality and celebration contribute to the ability to communicate, both verbally and nonverbally, all of which are significant goals within the learning process. As arts specialists this is all obvious, however, again, research needs to be developed to more adequately support these critical theories.

As one proceeds, the obvious question surfaces, where are we with teacher education? And, what should be the outcome of a teacher education program? During the past several months a variety of reports have been issued suggesting American education is in crisis; undergraduate degrees no longer hold much significance; all areas of education are in need of reform; and most recently, a report on the need for greater "Rigor in the preparation of new teachers" (Winkler, 1985, p. 1.).

Clearly with teacher education, there is need for reform. If the arts are integral to the curriculum, both because of the intrinsic value of the arts, and also because the teaching of the arts is based on the premise that a primary importance to the educational system is the cultivation of and evaluating, the arts provide a process of continuous response to our perceptions. This must clearly be a basis of all teacher education, both as a focus of professional education and as a focus of learning within any single discipline. Arts specialists are not magicians or miracle workers, and if it is expected that arts education is accomplished through a once a week music or art session, we are simply expecting the impossible. Arts education can no more be accomplished through a once or twice a week class, than can learning in any discipline considered basic.

Earlier in this paper I suggested some basic areas of competency for the training of the arts specialist. The competencies are as follows: (1) a basic knowledge of the aesthetics of the discipline; (2) basic knowledge of a studio area (in music, dance, drama, or visual arts); (3) basic knowledge of the history of the art form; (4) basic knowledge of criticism of the art form; and (5) some knowledge of the vocabulary of the arts disciplines outside the discipline of major. Obviously the importance of process and product must be kept in balance within the training process as well as within the classroom experience. Further, I would suggest that our courses in higher education are less effective because of a lack of balance among these four areas of competency; and thus, there exists a frequent imbalance between process and product, both in the training of elementary and secondary teachers and in the teaching of the arts in the elementary and secondary school.

Interestingly enough, the recent report on teacher training prepared by an independent commission established by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, indicated the need for "those entering the teaching profession should have an academic concentration and a genuine liberal education" (Winkler, March 6, 1985, p. 17). We have a discipline concentration within most teacher training institutions in the arts. However, I would submit we under emphasize the studio focus and the historical and critical aspects of the discipline while we stress a variety of "education" related courses. This is not to suggest art education or drama education or music education are not important, rather these two or at most three courses should not be considered sufficient skill development in the discipline. Also, often it is the learning of individual skills that provide important insights into the understanding of how concepts of a subject are learned and what to do when individuals have difficulty learning particular concepts. We become most adept at learning from criticism when we have been constructively criticized in a variety of circumstances and when we have improved as a result. Within the arts, a primary learning process is through criticism. Criticism requires the ability to communicate and our communication becomes more perceptive through criticism, particularly in the arts. If we agree with the recommendations of the recent report on teacher training; that teachers need considerable practice in constructive criticism, and greater diagnostic and perscriptive ability in addressing learning problems, then we in the arts should be leading the way in teacher training reform, because our disciplines force us toward some fundamentally sound practices, such as the academic concentrations and the value of criticism to learning.

On the other hand, we must force ourselves to become involved in some re-structuring of our teacher training programs. We need to be willing to risk being wrong, to aid us in discovering more effective ways of teaching pedogogy at the same time we are providing the much needed additional studio experience, and some additional historical and critical domain experience at the pre-service level. Ideally, the learning experience at the pre-service level would provide pedogogical experience and there would only be a need for integrated seminars on pedogogy, rather than efforts to "teach people to teach." I alluded earlier to the need for more balance within the discipline competencies, and I would add to that the need for a much less fragmented approach, as well as the need for a much more integrated approach to professional education courses, particularly pedogogical, within the arts disciplines.

If we are to attempt to develop more effective pre-service programs in higher education, we must include more in-depth experiences in those aspects of the arts, specifically the creative, the critical and the historical, both for the arts specialists and for the classroom teacher. We continuously uphold the importance of the arts process, and I referred frequently in this paper to the areas of perception, order and sequence, and tension and resolution. In each of these areas the arts are singularly important in the learning experiences of children, and equally so within the pre-service training of teachers. However, we must remember the arts are important well beyond their use as process, and in the training of the arts specialists and in the training of the classroom teacher, the integrity of the arts must be maintained.

Just as the school day is already extremely full for the child learner, and the list of required courses extremely long for the prospective teacher; the classroom teacher and the arts specialists must attempt to achieve a balance between the fusion of the arts in curricula activity and exploring the value of creating the arts product. This point cannot be over-emphasized, at the elementary, secondary or within the pre-service training programs. There must be continual effort to balance the use of the arts in support of curricula activity, and the value of the individual participating in creating the arts product. Frankly, the arts methods classes as they are primarily taught within many pre-service programs are a waste of time, particularly when the emphasis is on the cutting out of "turkey's, christmas trees, etc.", rather than the development of studio skills and the exploration of the concepts of perceiving, exploring, and creating. The pre-service training of the elementary classroom teacher includes little or no background in the historical and critical domains of the arts, and marginal amounts of work in the areas of aesthetics and studio art of creative expression regardless of discipline! For classroom teachers and art specialists to be successful this simply must be adjusted.

To this point I have spent considerable effort attempting to illustrate that there are parallel processes between classroom learning and the pre-service training of teachers, both for arts specialists and for classroom teachers. The training process must be an example and reflect expected skills and processes of the classroom. This is obviously not the case in many instances and I would conclude that the value of much pre-service course work in professional education is marginally successful at best, and that some arts education courses are similarly lacking.

Where then should we be going with the pre-service training of arts specialists, as well as with the arts methods courses for the classroom teacher? In an effort to respond with some possible suggestion, I would first like to review the role of drama within the learning process as a possible conceptual model for pre-service activity. "The dramatic process includes the creative processes by which children originate and form drama, such as perceiving, responding, imagining, creating (improvising and forming), communicating and evaluating" (Skis, 1977, p. 4.). Fundamental to each of us is what is called our dramatic imagination, and defined as our innate desire to understand, to be understood and to communicate. Quite obviously for learning to take place, the goals of responding to perceptions and the ability to communicate ideas and evaluate ideas must be goals for the teacher; and of the pre-service educational process, as well as goals for continued development through in-service.

A variety of issues and expectations impact pre-service and in-service training, which should be addressed. The following will be an attempt to address some of these issues and to make recommendations about possible changes in the pre-service and in-service programs in the arts, as well as some recommendations aimed at the relationship of the arts to the curricula and classroom activity of the general classroom teacher.

Arts education should be curriculum based, sequentially and include studio experience, the opportunity to work with visiting artists, and elements of history and criticism. Obviously, the training of the arts specialists must include these elements. The discipline trained arts specialist should also understand and be conversant in the vocabularies of the arts disciplines other than the one in which the individual majored. This comment should not be interpreted to suggest that one person can or should teach in more than one discipline in the arts, unless the individual has achieved more than one discipline based major. However, the arts specialist should be able to integrate some introductory concepts in the arts, beyond the discipline of major.

As has been suggested previously, the arts specialist should be prepared to assist the classroom teacher in the pedogogical use of the arts. Here again, one is not suggesting the arts should "sell out" and that we should be content for the arts to serve solely in a support position within the curricula. However, the arts provide the best pedogogical support for some aspects of early learning, and why should not the arts be used in that capacity? If the learning process is related to the concepts of perceiving, responding, imagining, creating, communicating and evaluating, and if important to the achieving these qualities is the growing ability to analyze, synthesize, and problem-solve, then the arts must be used, because these qualities are integral to learning any one of the arts disciplines.

As fresh impetus is give the "Back to Basics" movement, the arts educators at all levels must be a positive collective in asserting the role of the arts. The arts must be considered basic because they are substantive areas of knowledge as well as creative pursuits. If this were the accepted position, the problem of those areas of the arts taught once or twice a week in the elementary school would quickly be dissipated. For some reason we seldom provide history and literature teachers with the ability to teach art history as it impacts and reflects social and political history, or literature as it parallels or differs from the analysis provided by art history. Arguments do not exist to contradict the benefits of increased knowledge and more integrated education as it supports and strengthens the basics. However, little if any hard research exists to support the value of the arts, as those of us in the arts would describe. Certainly the generation of this research is becoming an increasingly important responsibility of higher education.

The question of the teacher as artist and the artist as teacher is critical to the restructuring of pre-service and in-service programs in the arts. The following may be overly simplified, but constitutes a framework for the consideration of the issue of the artist as teacher and the teacher as artist. The arts specialist must be able to create an arts product, whether that is a painting, playing the piano, or facilitating drama activity. The arts specialists must have personally acquired the skills to create in some area of the discipline in which they are working. In addition, the arts specialist has studies, experiences and experimented with a variety of methods for the teaching of the skills of the discipline. The role of a visiting artist or artist-in-residence should not be seen as replacing the arts specialist, nor should it be assumed, that the visiting artist is a teacher. The visiting artist may be a wonderful educator, but that is not necessarily the role of the visiting artist. Rather, the visiting artist is present in the educational setting in much the same way that a businessman visits a business class, as a practitioner of the discipline; to demonstrate, to discuss, to critique and to create, and very importantly to be able to communicate with those in the school. Touring performance groups are also visiting artist, in music, dance and drama. In all instances where artists are used to supplement and support existing arts programs in the schools, the visiting artists should be oriented to the educational setting and performance companies should provide pre-performance and post-performance curriculum materials for the classroom teacher and arts specialists.

This paper has attempted to explore probable intended results of the learning process, the critical importance of the arts in the learning process, and to attempt to discuss whether or not the arts specialists are being trained to facilitate the desired end result. My perceptions suggest a discrepancy exists between what constitutes a valid learning process and the content of pre-service and in-service activity. The entire required course structure must be reviewed. Professional education courses often are of much less importance than more substantial work in the discipline could be in the training of arts specialists. Efforts must be made for the entire pre-service experience to have more continuity, and less fragmentation. Those of us in the arts must find ways within the structure for pre-service students to learn the vocabularies of the disciplines other than the discipline of major, and the arts specialist should have had some studio experience in an area of the arts in addition to the discipline of major. Pre-service students in all of the arts disciplines should have the opportunity to work with visiting artists and have explored the relationship and value of visiting artists to the classroom teacher and for the arts specialists. The additional time in the pre-serivce program needed to accomplish these goals could be provided through restructuring existing courses, and dropping those professional education courses which are simply not as important as the increased work in the arts.

The methods classes for the classroom teacher need to be carefully examined. Arts educators should insist on the inclusion of creative dramatics, studio experience, and some historical and critical course work, rather than just the fundamentals methods courses.

Again, we can begin to accomplish the content adjustment through some reorganization of the content of existing courses. Every effort must be made for on-going collaboration between schools/colleges of fine arts and schools/colleges of education. The pre-service and in-service programs needed to assist the specialist and the classroom teacher is developing the strategies for collaboration between the elementary and secondary schools and the state arts agencies, the artist-in-residence programs, the Young Audience's programs and the resident cultural organizations collaborating through tours, performances, master classes and a variety of other joint efforts to share expertise and skills.

All of the pre-service and in-service changes and restructuring will only be of minimal significance if educational policy makers cannot be made to understand that the time given to art, music and drama in the once or twice a week format is simply inadequate, and negatively impacts the student's ability to learn in other areas of the curriculum. The policy makers need to realize that giving the classroom teacher "preparation time" during the art, music and drama specialists' time with the class adds to the already fragmented approach to education, and also, probably negatively impacts learning in other areas.

The quality of our culture is judged by the quality of our artists, and each citizen has a right to basic literacy in the arts.

> "The arts enable us to see in ways that our limited experience would otherwise preclude--the broad potential inherent in the human condition. Its power is awesome! To hear Beethoven's Ninth Symphony is to begin to comprehend the possibility of universal peace in human affairs. To study a Greek sculpture is to envision an ideal form in the human being. To contemplate Lear is to comprehend man's strength and struggle with mortality. In such particularized manifestations, art leads man to insights about humanity that otherwise would not be possible" (CCED, June 1984, p. 1).

If as a nation we believe in a richer and fuller life for all of our citizens, and in the individual as the focal point of the educational process, then we must affirm that the arts and the training of the arts specialist, and the role of the arts in the education of our young are major priorities in the educational system and are represented by a major commitment of time and, energy and resources. If we want future generations to judge us as artists and scientists, rather than technicians, then scientists must study the arts, and the artists must study science.

Finally, I would suggest that my greatest fear about the educational process on all levels is not that we will not learn about Shakespeare because we cannot read, or will not learn to paint because we do not have paint, or will not learn to write because we cannot spell; rather my greatest fear is that we will not understand Shakespeare, we will not be able to pain, and we will not be able to write because we cannot see! It is my hope and dream that through the arts process we will guarantee that our students will leave the educational setting at every level, not only able to see but excited about the prospects of creating art work and able to share that reflection with our society and culture.

REFERENCES

Winkler, Karen J. "Rigor Is Urged in Preparation of New Teacher," The Chronical of Higher Education, Vol. XXX, Number 1, March 6, 1985, pp. 1, 13 - 21.

Siks, G. B., Drama With Children, New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Eisner, Elliot W., "Mind as a Cultural Achievement." Educational Leadership, March 1981, 38 (6) 446-471.

California Council of Fine Arts Deans (CCFAD), "The Arts: As Essential Ingredient in Education," June 1984.

Kathryn A. Martin is the Dean of the School of Fine Arts, The University of Montana, Missoula, Montana.

A RESPONSE

The Role of The University In Arts Teacher Education

Lin M. Wright

I'll join the battle to see that our scientists study the arts and artists study the sciences. What a rallying cry--teach the arts to enable all students to see, to have insights about humanity that otherwise would not be possible! Dr. Martin's address is inspiring but also directs our attention to many issues related to arts education and the role of the university in the preparation of arts educators. Many forces join to create our educational structures--local and national attitudes towards arts, education, and the economy; knowledge about learning, developmental psychology and curriculum theory; current educational practices of administrators, supervisors, generalists, artists-in-residence; and, first hopefully, concern for the needs of the children within their particular culture. It is difficult to look at the education of teacher/artists without considering the whole. And to our credit, we in the arts, are usually more comfortable with a holistic approach. We are not willing to lose sight of the child or the art within the educational experience in order to teach concepts or skills in a solely liner fashion.

After having read Dr. Martin's paper, I discussed the "state" of arts teacher education with Barbara Andress, a colleague of mine. Dr. Andress is a co-author of The Music Book and given to doing workshops across the country. I felt that since the place of theatre, my discipline, in the K - 12 curriculum is very tenuous compared to that of music, I'd like the response of a practitioner in that more established field. Andress, like Martin, started her discussion with what children are learning in the classroom, and what is happening to teachers in the educational political arena. She then went on to discuss developmental psychology and finally discussed the current tug-of-war on our campus between the College of Music in particular. By the way, she's optimistic, cautiously, and a bit militant.

After the paper and the discussion I was reminded of a favorite quotation that reinforces this broad view of arts education. Harold Schonberg, in a New York Times (1978) article stated:

> "What is needed is a thorough examination of our priorities. If, for instance, we want to create a culturally literate American audience, we have to look at the inadequacies of the education of American children, who by and large grow up culturally deprived. Children have to be exposed to the arts as a natural process of life. That means constant exposure. It does absolutely no good to send a group of children once a year to some kind of condescending "youth concert." Listening to music or looking at a painting demands as much knowledge and concentrated effort as any of the three R's. Money on the local, state, and Federal levels must be diverted into long-range and consistently applied cultural programs for the young if they are going to grow up with any feeling for the arts. Only a few of the lucky ones get it at home."

This surely reinforces the idea that arts education must be more than the twice-a-week class in music. It does nothing to address the additional need for arts educators to identify and make possible special training for our talented young actors, authors, dancers, musicians, and visual artists. Having admitted the complexity of arts education and the resulting complexity of adequate pre- and in-service experiences for arts educators, I'd like to address several specific issues in the Martin paper, share with you an interesting but broadly applicable perspective on theatre education presented by Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi at a recent symposium, and end my remarks with a series of questions that may guide the redesigning of our arts education programs.

Let me begin with *my* synopsis of Dr. Martin's paper:

1) All arts education should be the individualized, curriculum based, sequential learning of skills to create and appreciate one's own and others' artistic work. The act of creation and criticism can lead to "pedagogical transfers" to general learning. The arts should be learned through discovery, experiencing, analysis and synthesis.

2) Arts educators, therefore, should learn to teach their own discipline. They must assist the classroom teacher, especially the primary school teacher, with the pedagogic use of the arts. Arts educators must become advocates for the arts.

3) To assure the development of such arts educators, current pre-service (and in-service) arts education curricula should be restructured to include more studio and history/criticism courses. More effective and integrated ways of teaching pedagogy must be found.

This is a very attenuated synopsis that reflects many, but not all of Dr. Andress and my informal perceptions of arts education. Let me point to areas of agreement and to a few we would question.

First, an assessment of the arts education arena as seen through Barbara Andress's eyes. Some excellent programs in music education have been lost across the nation. With the loss of specialists, associations are taking responsibility for in-service workshops formerly done by the schools. In reaction to cutbacks, parents have lobbied for the arts and a number of programs are being reinstated. Instruction within many programs is some of the best we've seen because the instructors are teacher/artists coming from college programs in which they had nearly as much music as the performance majors. Also, more is known about developmental patterns of children and the psychology of learning than ever before and many current curricula are based on this tested knowledge. She admits that not all programs are of this high calibre. Education and arts education are being criticized, but that is healthy. All curricula should be seen as evolving and all programs should be subjected to an intensive review at least every five years. In Andress's view, the only unhealthy situation at the moment is that at some sites the restructuring is being done without the input of arts educators.

From my experience, I know that in drama and dance--with but a few exceptions--no specialists have ever been employed at the elementary school level to teach the art form. The classroom teacher, the physical education teacher, or the artist-in-residence have had to be the instructors in these two fields. At the secondary level there are some dance and theatre specialists, but there are many junior and senior high schools across the country with no dance and not even a class play. (Waack 1982) Thus, in neither dance nor drama can we say, as can be said in music, that we know from both theory and practice what a good sequenced curriculum should be. The visual arts have a history of being taught in the schools and creative writing is usually embedded in the language arts/English curriculum. So in both these fields there are more prepared teachers and more knowledge about the curriculum.

Thus we take as a given, with Dr. Martin, that there must be arts specialists and these specialists must be teachers and artists. We'd say it is imperative that we all become adept advocates for the arts in and out of the school, but we must exert some caution with the claims we make for arts education. For example, last fall in Arizona, a number of groups joined to create an Arts Advocacy Day. We prepared a pamphlet for the day with content similar to what Dr. Martin suggests may be "pedagogical transfer" from arts education to general learning. The pamphlet promotes "Ten Good Reasons to Support the Arts in Education." The suggestions are that the arts: develop non-verbal thinking skills--perception, forming images and imagination; help us create; build self-discipline; supplement the other basic subjects; and cultivate social skills and social knowledge. Unlike Dr. Martin who suggests the need for more research, we quoted a number of studies that seem to promote these claims. But, in light of some of the most recent research on how the mind functions we may be making unsupportable claims concerning the transfer of skills and knowledge gained in the arts to a multitude of other areas.

The theory of multiple intelligences, for instance, suggests that we perceive differently, process information differently, communicate information differently in the several areas of "knowing." For example, learning to perceive, to be flexible, to create in theatre will probably not help one to perceive or create in the realm of numbers. Even the flexible or critical attitude acquired in the area of theatre may not "transfer" to math. In Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983) Howard Gardner hypothesizes seven "intelligences"-- linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily- kinesthetic, and the personal (including self and others). At a drama symposium held at Harvard in 1983, Dr. Gardner (1985) suggested that the visual arts may find transfer to or be a part of spatial intelligence; dance, the bodily-kinesthetic; drama, the personal, especially that of knowing others. He emphasized that these seven intelligences may not represent the right description or quantification, but that he is convinced that some form of discrete observation, processing and use of information does happen.

The jury is still out on this theory. but I mention it to underline two points that I believe must be paramount considerations to those of us who teach teachers. Curriculum must be evolving and must be based on the most up-to-date knowledge about the learner. There is a corollary, I believe. It is we who are responsible for integrating developmental and learning theory into arts methodology. We must help current and future teachers learn to synthesize these theories into appropriate practices for introducing children to the joy of the arts.

Mihalyi Csikzentmihalyi at a Fall 1984 drama symposium addressed this need for our having a sound view of what the artist and the appreciator do and the role of the teacher in this process. Dr. Csikszentmihalyi, after reading research in the drama field--almost all of it directed to proving how experience in the process of creating drama will increase the participant's ability to image, to create, to communicate--chided us for such a "functionalist" view of the art form. He admitted that some of these benefits might accrue to the participants, but he suggested that we had missed the point of making or appreciating the arts. The point, he contended, is to discover what really happens to the participant from the process of creating or appreciating an art form. He suggested that the work of Huizinga (1948) and Callois (1958) can give us an idea of what the arts experience is.

In this view, arts experiences are autotelic. The goals for doing the activity are contained in the activity. We become involved in the arts because we enjoy doing them, not for ulterior motives. The arts take us beyond what we are in daily existence. They are exhilarating because we become other than we are, more than we are. Quoting from his paper,

> Science, religion, art, and play are all avenues of escape from the baffling shapelessness of everyday life into a temporary space where actions and forms are meaningfully related...
>
> The point is that the autotelic activities Callois describes are all enjoyable, and even if nothing else followed from them, that would be reason enough to pursue them. After all, the constant goal of existence is to improve the quality of experience, so if certain activities are able to provide experiences that are superior to what life ordinarily offers, it makes sense to value them for their own sake.
>
> Fortunately, however, autotelic activities apparently succeed in doing both things at once: they provide an immediate experience which needs no justification outside itself, yet at the same time they serve to liberate us from the constraints of what has already been accepted as real. Thus it is not necessary to choose between a functionalist and an experiential perspective: the two reinforce each other as long as we take them both equally seriously, without trying to impose the superiority of one over the other.

He went on to discuss what could make a dramatic performance autotelic, a flow experience in his terms. This is the kind of experience people describe "as a state in which body and consciousness move together in harmony and without apparent effort." Some features that make a dramatic performance autotelic are, he suggested,

> When everything is right--the challenges and skills are well meshed, the concentration deep, the goals clear, feedback sharp, distractions minimized, self-conscousness absent--actors and spectators achieve ecstasy. That is, they step outside accustomed reality, and feel with all possible concreteness another dimen-

> sion of existence. For all they know at the moment, they are in a different reality. This feeling is what drama is about. Its other benefits, educational and therapeutic, are useful side-effects, but we should not let their importance overshadow the essential point

This kind of "ecstasy" can happen during the process of improving, performing or viewing the art. To achieve this goal, the teacher must carefully match the action to the student's skills. "This balancing act cannot be accomplished once and for all, but must change in a dynamic dyachronic interaction between the children's growing skills, and the growing complexity of the action system." In other words, the teacher must know the art form, children, and how to involve children in that form. She also must be in a situation that allows and encourages her to do so.

We don't achieve this kind of experience for our teachers or our children nearly often enough. The following is a set of questions to ask ourselves as we attempt to get closer to our goal of helping to develop teacher/artists who, in a supportive environment, bring quality arts experiences to our youth.

- Is the university a model environment in which the arts are a part of the daily life of the students, with artistic expression encouraged and on display? Does the university share its arts events with the community?

- Are all students required to include the arts, both studio and history/criticism, in their course of study?

- Are all arts majors given a sense of the importance of arts education and of the importance of their commitment to support arts education?

- Are all arts majors, arts education, and general education students learning to be articulate so that they can defend arts in society and in education? Are they having a quality general education so that they will be able to continually relate the arts to all areas of life?

- Are all education majors (including future classroom teachers and administrators) having quality studio courses? Are they attending performances and exhibitions so that they will have had a "flow experience" and will have learned to identify what is necessary for such an experience? Are they given the concept of how the arts can become a part of school life?

. Are the arts education specialists learning how to make, perform, and critique their art? In drama, this means they need to know the play wright's craft, have acted, designed and directed theatre and have enough theatre history to do this intelligently. Plus they need improvisational skills to "make" drama with children. (In other arts similar demanding requirements are needed.) Are the specialists introduced to developmental psychology, learning and curriculum theory? Are the guided to use this information plus their skill and knowledge of the art forms to design and teach the art to young people? Are they having the opportunity to see several master teachers work with young people? Are they given a carefully guided first teaching experience? (I must admit, parenthetically, that I believe arts methods classes must do more than introduce the novice to several teaching methodologies. Specialists, to become master teacher/artists, must have enough basic knowledge about the experience with the art form and education so that they can develop into creators of methodologies, not just imitators.) Are the future specialists efficiently, and quickly taught all the other state certification requirements?

. Are only talented, bright, caring students admitted to the program? Are they given individual advisement that will help them assess their strengths and weaknesses? Are they guided to design a college program that will help them, personally, grow into teacher/artists?

. Finally, is the faculty involved with the professional associations and publishings so that educators and members of the community understand what should be happening in arts education and the arts?

It is my hope that we can move closer, all of us, to evolving programs that will guide instructors to become the kind of tecahers Dr. Csikszentmihalyi envisioned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andress, Barbara and Eunice Boardman Meske. The Music Book. New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston, 1984.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi. "What's interesting in Children's Theatre." Unpublished speech delivered at Arizona State University, September 1984.

Gardner, Howard. Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publisher, 1983.

_____. Towards a Theory of Dramatic Intelligence, Creative Drama in a Developmental Context, Judith Kase-Polsini, ed. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985.

Schonberg, Harold. New York Times, February 5, 1978.

Waack, William Lee. A Survey of the Status of Curricula and Co-Curricular Theatre Programs in International Thespian Society Affiliated High Schools in the United States. Unpublished diss. University of Iowa, 1982.

Lin M. Wright is the Chairperson of the Theater Arts Department, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

VI. THE ARTS IN EDUCATION AND REGULATORY INSTITUTIONS/RELATIONSHIPS AND CONFLICTS

Art For Art's Sake and More

G. Leland Burningham

I'll begin by putting all my cards on the table, a sort of a "love it or leave it strategy"--a risky course because you may "leave it" before I get to what I really want to say. But it seems to me the logical thing to do is to define "the arts" before I start talking about "Arts Education."

As you know, there are four distinct theories about what comprises the arts and what does not:

The first is the mimetic theory. This view essentially states that the arts are anything that imitate reality or an improved view of reality. Although largely abandoned in some artistic mediums, it is still alive and well in most twentieth-century literature, such as the works of Saul Bellow, Norman Mailer, William Styron, and others (Sontag, 1966). If arts education in the schools were based solely on this position, students would constantly face the seedy and the seamy--fine for "Hill Street Blues", but I think questionable for five- and six-year-olds.

The second theory is usually referred to as the expressionistic theory which hypothesizes that art is anything that depicts the unique individuality of the artist, with a heavy emphasis on intuition rather than reason. Rooted in the works of Goethe and the Romantics, this expressionistic view of the arts still holds sway in many artistic disciplines today, although criticism of it is growing (Kinneavy, 1971). Arts education programs imbued with this philosophy run the risk of accepting students liberally "doing their own thing" as an adequate foundation in the arts.

The third generally accepted theory can best be categorized as pragmatic. While the mimetic theory of the arts emphasizes reality and the expressive artist, the pragmatic focuses on the observer/listener/reader--or, in general, the decoder of the arts (Kinneavy, 1971). That is, only creations that stimulate strong emotions in the decoder or provide new intellectual insight can be considered works of the arts. In other words, if you are sincerely moved by a creation or if it helps you expand your conceptions of reality, then it should be considered a work of art. If schools adopted the letter of this theory, then some of the worst of rock music would have to be legitimately studied as part of the arts, a result that would keep me awake at night.

The last common theory of art, the objective (for lack of a better term) centers on the product of artistic endeavor. Be it a novel or painting or anything else. We commonly know this theory as "art for art's sake." The reigning aesthetic philosophy during the Middle Ages, this theory still enjoys prestige in this century, particularly with literary critics (Kinneavy, 1971). In short, its proponents state that all art has a structure, one which is definable and knowable. A painting may have little to do with reality, nor depict the unique personality of the artist, nor stir deep emotion, nor provide intellectual insight, yet present a form that is unmistakably art. If we, as educators, fully accepted this approach, I think that we would find youngsters who were drilled, for example, in the literary idioms of protagonist/antagonist, conflict/climax, theme/symbol before they experience the sheer joy of reading Charlotte's Web and the like--an outcome I am afraid that has already happened to some students.

So which theory is correct? Which one should educators embrace? The mimetic with its emphasis on mirroring reality? The expressionistic with its paramount concern for the unique individuality of the artist? The pragmatic with its insistence that art should almost compete for souls? Or the idea, expressed in the objective, that art exists only for art's sake? As you may have guessed, I don't think that we can afford the luxury of philosophical musings. All theories have their merits and their applications in a solid program of education in the arts. At the risk of being equivocal, I think an eclectic theory of the arts is the soundest for educational purposes. Educators must have the general welfare of the public at heart and education in the arts must be fore everyone, not just the privileged or talented few.

Let me leave this somewhat philosophical plain that I've been on and try to give you a concrete example of why a varied approach to the arts seems to make the most sense in education. Children should enter school and soon come into contact with activities that let them express themselves visually and in movement, such as painting and moving to music. The kids should also learn simple songs and play rhythm and percussion instruments, learning the basics of tone and rhythm, as well as role-play simple situations, gaining some seminal knowledge of plot and character. They should also develop looking and listening skills as they begin to play the role of informed observers and listeners/critics. Finally, the students should encounter the arts in a way that wrenches emotions in their little bodies and extends their largely uncluttered minds.

Ideally, this multiple-purpose and cross-disciplinary arts program would continue throughout the student's education, spiraling into ever more sophisticated mirrors of reality, self-expressions, emotions and insights, and artistic forms. The students would continue to grow in knowledge, appreciation, critical perception, and talent. But what actually does happen in most of our schools?

Realistically, children probably sing a few songs "A, B, C, D, E, F, G,..." and cut out some snowflakes at Christmas, both general activities based on models and loosely related to the objective view of the arts. Soon thereafter, the children may express themselves visually (finger painting is a popular technique) and, in too few instances, physically (creative dramatics and interpretive movement take place in a few elementary schools across the country). And so goes most of the rest of many children's encounters with the arts during the elementary years. Such instruction resembles something akin to "fifteen-things-to-make-out-of-a-Clorox-bottle."

Sometime around the junior high/middle school years the objective theory of "the arts" lands full scale on most student's shoulders. In English classes, they learn basic literary formats and schemes. In elective art and music classes (if the child is lucky enough to live in an area where these are offered), they learn something of artistic form.

Students in high school may study literary pieces that provide new insights into reality or stir emotional conviction. Students who have stuck with music and art electives might have the same encounters, thus representing the first appearance of the pragmatic view of art. In a few courses, the child may even come in contact with art that seems to mirror reality, depicting the complex subtleties that normally escape the eyes of any but the artists'. In sum, throughout twelve years of general schooling, children, if they are fortunate, encounter all four theories of art. Yet all is not well, not even close.

So, if students are encountering all four general perceptions of the arts, what is wrong? I believe there are two major problems. First, few students actually do gain a broad, in-depth view of the arts. Second, even if students are exposed to multiple perspectives of the arts, the content of some arts courses or courses with components in the arts is questionable. The first problem is largely a result of the second.

Where the arts exist in our schools, the content of too many arts courses is poorly conceived, although most students enjoy these courses. The visual arts, particularly at the elementary level, are too often a series of gimicky projects that have no sequence and no valid reason for their inclusion. The cognitive aspects of the visual arts are essentially ignored and in many cases instruction is purposely withheld for fear of destroying the child's natural creativity. There are still many art teachers who cling to the myth that art must not be taught in a systematic or structured way. Music programs are better, but elementary teachers, who are not prepared to teach the basics of music education, simply have their students "sing along" with records and tapes. Even students who have sung in elementary school choruses and played various Orff or percussion instruments sometimes cannot read music and do not recognize the names of great composers or their works. Dance, if taught at all, is part of the physical education program, and drama, for the most part, receives token time in the language arts program, largely removed from the development of critical thinking skills. In general, the arts curriculum for some classroom teachers is the result of a simple methods course at the college level (whose content may or may not be valid) or what was passed on to them by their colleagues--activities that seemed successful for someone else even through what they did may have been at a different grade level.

To surveys of the arts in the public schools, completed by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 1981), support my position. Each assessment surveyed student achievement and attitudes toward the arts for 9- 13-, and 17-year-olds. The results showed that most students did not know how to perceive or respond to the arts in anything but a superficial manner. Few could make aesthetic judgments. As an example, in the visual arts almost half the 17-year-olds had never visited a museum. On only a few occasions did 17-year-olds, with four to six art classes, perform differently than others their own age. The students seldom could have recognized famous works of art or identify the artist that created them. The National Assessment of Music (NAEP, 1974) indicated that we're doing a little better but the results of dance and drama are unknown. If they were, they would certainly be unacceptable.

At the college or university level, we find that pre-servic programs for elementary teachers are not always required and when they are, teachers sometimes do not develop basic skills and understandings in the major artistic disciplines. At the secondary level, teachers are more than adequately prepared as artists (painters, sculptors, and performers), but they many times have no real skills in aesthetics and criticism and know little about curriculum structure or sequence.

I must conclude this section by giving credit where credit is due. Obviously, some teachers and teachers of teachers are doing a good job. The content of their courses is valid; the effectiveness of their technique is unquestionable. I just believe that more educators must do what these teachers and teachers of teachers are already doing.

The questionable content and processes of many existing courses in the arts probably has a lot to do with the first problem--too few students gaining multiple perspectives of the arts. From my experience, the arts are largely perceived by the general public--parents, teachers, and administrators--as "nice" but not necessary, as something which may be important to students who are gifted in the arts or who are highly motivated by arts experiences, but not critical for the average student and certainly not important for all students. A 1975 Harris Poll showed that the public viewed the arts as play, as techniques on what one can learn in a one-time workshop, as a talent one cannot learn or that the arts are simply what one likes. There is little understanding that the arts, like mathematics, are disciplines with their own history, curriculum structure, and evaluation principles. It's interesting that in trying to set curriculum priorities, school districts will frequently conduct a so called "needs assessment." Unfortunately, many needs assessments are nothing more than a reflection of parent "wants". They don't really try to locate student deficiencies or teacher deficiencies.

A 1979 Utah Parents and Teachers Association Survey, called Community Opinions on Education, was made to determine educational program areas citizens felt were most crucial for the public schools. Of the 34 courses and programs parents responded to, only junior high school athletics and summer school were perceived as less important than the visual arts. (Such things as senior high school athletics, extra curricular activities, agriculture, bilingual education, and community school all ranked higher.) Music had slightly more respect but still ranked below vocational education, career exploration, and driver education (Utah PTA, 1979). In general, the arts are perceived as non-academic and non-intellectual.

Most people are surprised to find that the arts are bona fide areas of study with a body of content, much of which is cognitive. Counselors and administrators too often view the arts a a "dumping ground" for students who are failing all of their so called academic courses. ("Give them something they can do with their hands.") Academically gifted students are frequently discouraged from taking courses in the arts, the assumption being that they shouldn't waste their time on such. Interestingly enough, surveys show that the percentage of schools offering arts courses decrease as the percent of students in a college preparatory program decrease. Yet they increase when gifted and talented programs are instituted (Brown, 1984). I just with that every parent and patron in Utah could have heard the words of Ernest Boyer, a former U. S. Commissioner of Education and Director of the Carnegie Foundation, when he said in Salt Lake City last winter: "It is a travesty, an insult to our dignity and our deity to say to our children, 'The arts are frills.' They are a demonstration of the symbol system that makes us truly human" (Boyer, 1985). In Utah, we believe, as Boyer does, that writing, music, art, and dance should not be just extracurricular options, but central to educational reform.

Let us assume for a moment that a round swell of support for the arts in education finally happens. What are some of the other problems we face? Martin Engel, Guest Editor of a special issue of Art Education called Art and the Mind (1983), stated: "Until and unless the arts are taught in the schools as the cognitive--that is, intellectual/mental disciplines that they are--there is no good reason for having them at all." If the content of visual arts programs is just a series of cotton ball snowmen and string-pull design projects, if music is having children mouth the words to a song because they don't understand pitch and tone, then those who view the arts as an unnecessary frill would probably be right.

Many programs, as they exist, are not meeting the needs of all students. They need not be that way. We know enough to change that condition and to offer arts programs that will enable all of our youth to become intelligent, discriminating, knowledgeable clients, patrons, and audiences of the arts. We can even do a better job in producing students highly skilled in the arts. "But," you are thinking, "how can this be accomplished?" I think several fundamental changes will help.

It is crucial that we change what is happening in the elementary school. Children need to master a core of foundation skills and knowledge in the arts. The content of the arts curriculum should be substantial enough to warrant their inclusion in the daily schedule of every student. Arts in general education must teach content, concepts, and critical appreciation skills in order to help students become educated, life-long consumers of the arts in society. We cannot gamble that students will eventually gain this sort of experience at the hand of a sophisticated friend or relative.

A complete elimination of elementary arts programs would be disastrous. Statistics (Benham, 1982) show that when elementary music is cut, there is a 65 to 70 percent reduction in music enrollment in the high school. In the visual arts, they decline by 77 percent in seventh grade to 16 percent in senior high school.

The required core at the elementary level should also provide students with opportunities to learn history, styles, techniques, concepts, vocabulary and methods in the arts. We want them to understand the role and value of the arts in society both past and present. At the secondary level, studio and performance experiences are important, but alone they are not sufficient to the study of the arts that students must acquire.

Such experiences may not provide the skills for informed and critical appreciation of works or performances of art, nor the aesthetic analysis of art and the environment that a more comprehensive program may provide. What is an example of "a more comprehensive program?"

In 1984, the Utah State Board of Education adopted a new Program of Studies and Graduation Policy for Utah's Schools calling for the arts to be taught in grades K-6, one unit of arts in grades 7 and 8, and one-and-a-half units of arts in grades 9 through 12 (Utah State Board of Education, 1984). These requirements are the result of the Utah Commission on Educational Excellence (1983) appointed by the State Board of Education.

One recommendation in the report, often referred to as the "Capener Report," called for additional emphasis on "higher level thinking skills" such as deduction, analysis, inference, induction, and synthesis, which are often neglected (Burningham, 1984). The Commission declared that the humanities and the arts are particularly conducive to the development of such skills. Eisner (1982) views the arts as essential to concept formation and therefore, to optimal cognitive and affective development of children.

In the past, we have verbally supported the arts for all students; however, the arts have generally ended up being taught to a select group of students because of undue emphasis on product or performance. The new Program of Studies and the Graduation Requirement (Utah State Board of Education, 1984) is a significant departure from the past, inasmuch as all students will experience the arts in diverse and meaningful ways.

The core for the arts is designed to develop students' abilities in each of three roles--participant, observer/listener, and critic. It takes all three roles to be an informed patron of the arts. We would likely be just as well off listening to a critique of Van Gogh's work by a house painter than that of an artist who knows nothing about the techniques of the post impressionists. Logically, students in our schools will be much better clients, patrons, and audiences of the arts if they participate, respond and judge. You may ask, "What are these three roles?"

As we have defined these roles, we take a participant role when we pain, write, act, dance, sing or play a musical instrument. In this role, students appreciate what it is like to be an artist, the joys and tribulations of expressing thoughts and emotions in the arts, and the unique character of each art form ((Utah State Office of Education, 1985).

We become observers or listeners when we respond to a work of art. Students become "informed" observers or listeners when they understand the concepts basic to each art form. What we get out of a work of art is determined by what we understand about it--how "educated" the looking and listening processes have become (Utah State Office of Education, 1985).

We become critics of the arts, going beyond the role of observer/listener, when we make rational judgments. This active role requires a more in-depth knowledge of the arts components. Rather than just appreciating careful harmonies of a good high school a cappella choir, the critic can, with some study, justify whether the choir's interpretation of a piece is valid (Utah State Office of Education, 1985).

It is the ability to work well in each of these roles, participant, observer/listener, and critic, that will encourage informed and appreciative responses to the arts. However, even if support for arts education wells and a cogent curriculum has been developed, there are still other problems to overcome.

Since pre-service programs are too often inadequate, proper training for prospective teachers could be another major problem for us, as well as for our colleges and universities. And if pre-service programs have not been adequate, the thousands of teachers who have been through those programs are not prepared to provide the sort of instructional programs I've described. In-service needs--at all levels--will be staggering. We have no doubt that the kind of in-service we have provided in the past will not work. We seriously questions whether the regular classroom teacher should (or can) be expected to provide the expertise needed to teach a core program in the arts beyond the third grade. A number of states provide specialists to teach art and music--some K-6, other 4-6. We are not sure whether specialists are more effective than regular classroom teachers, but it seems reasonable to expect they would.

Determining what the arts are can be an additional problem. In my state, as well as nationally, there has been some confusion about what we mean when we say "the arts." After much discussion and investigation, we have agreed with the majority view that the arts are: dance, drama (theatre), music, and the visual arts (Utah State Office of Education, 1985). Creative writing is certainly a viable art form, but in Utah, writing has been integrated as a vital part of our K-12 language arts program, reflecting our shared belief with Ernest Boyer (1985) and other that language is the basic of all basics and that writing is the most neglected of all language skills. So our students will have creative writing experiences almost on a daily basis (Utah State Office of Education, 1985).

Finding room for the arts in the classroom and the curriculum is another problem. In many states, the arts are not part of the basics in education. In Utah, they are. But some of our teachers still view the arts as unnecessary appendages because they are only accountable for student progress in reading, math, language arts, and so forth. They frequently avoid the arts, seldom scheduling them on a regular basis, instead reserving them for the last hour on Friday to keep the students busy while they prepare for Monday. Some others view time with the arts as a reward for students who have achieved today's goals in the basics or view arts classes as rewards for students who have worked hard in the so-called "academic" subjects. We expect to change some of those attitudes with statewide accountability in all subjects and that includes the arts.

Beyond teachers, it is true that the Back-to-Basics movement and the "Nation at Risk" report, along with technology, foreign language requirements, and computers have had a negative effect on school enrollments in the arts. With states increasing their graduation requirements, there may be some additional cuts. That's a problem we are having to look at most seriously in Utah. when there are fewer elective slots, the arts are bound to suffer.

Notwithstanding all the time, money, and effort it will take, we are determined that we try to solve all of the aforementioned problems--pre-service, in-service, attitudinal, pedagogical, and curricular--because the new benefits we can provide students will justify the costs in time, money, and human effort.

Aside from the problems that any educational programs in the arts are going to face and our commitment to solve them, it may sound like to some of you that we in Utah have fully embraced the objective theory of art, with its emphasis on the structure of art, many times leading to art which is patently snobbish and highly intellectual. True, there are some professional artists, college professors, and "culture vultures" in my state who would welcome such a program--you know the type, the ones who speak authoritatively in museum lobbies or the foyers of theatres dropping words like impressionism, cubism, and formalism, and relying on a prior reasoning. We are taking a strong stance that arts education must go beyond mimicry, self-expression, and moral truth. But we are also acknowledging that a solid foundation in the arts has to create in students an appreciation for mirrors of reality (no matter how embellished they might be) and moral and intellectual truth. Surely, such a foundation must also include space for unique expression. Like molecules in a hot air balloon, all four philosophies of what constitutes the arts should continually bounce off of each other in an effective arts education program, resulting in a synergy that far exceeds the educational merit of any one. Possibly Howard Gardner (1983), of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, best expressed our philosophy of arts education:

> Involvement with the arts proves one of the best ways in which children can come to know the greatest achievements of which human beings are capable; it is also an excellent avenue to allow them to contribute to their own culture. If children have these opportunities, they will certainly be using their minds to the fullest. At the same time, they may gain those emotional pleasures, those moments of inspiration, and those feelings of mystical involvement which commentators once thought were the special province of the arts (p. 47-48).

And if Gardner summarizes our philosophy, Boyer (1983) provides us with out motivation:

> ...(T)he arts not only give expression to the profound urgings of the human spirit; they also validate our feelings in a world that deadens feeling. Now, more than ever, all people need to see clearly, here acutely, and feel sensitively through the arts. These skills are no longer just desirable. They are essential if we are to survive together with civility and joy (p. 98).

With philosophy intact and necessary motivation in hand, we must now proceed, beyond the warp and weft of each artistic discipline, beyond a well spring of public support, beyond cogent, coherent curricula, beyond effective pre-service and in-service programs, beyond well-intentioned educational reforms; we must go toward truly sound education in the arts, education that must be "art for art's sake" and more.

REFERENCES

Benham, J. Fight cutback with figures. Music Educator's Journal, 69 (11), 47-48.

Boyer, E. L. Untitled address to the Utah Principals Academy, February 18, 1985, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Boyer, E. L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1983.

Brown, G. H. Course Offerings and Enrollments in the Arts and Humanities at the Secondary School Level (Report #85-200). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1984.

Burningham, G. L. The Case for Arts Education, in The Arts-A Call to Action. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Office of Education, 1984.

Eisner, E. W. Cognition and Curriculum: A Basis for Deciding What To Teach. New York: Longman, 1982.

Engle, M. Art and the Mind. Art Education, 36 (2), 1983, 6-8.

Gardner, H. Artistic Intelligences. Art Education, 36 (2), 1983, 23-24.

Kinneavy, J. L. A Theory of Discourse. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. Art and Young Americans (Repot #10-a-01). Denver, Co: Education Commission of the States, 1981.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. The First Music Assessment: An Overview (Report #03-mu-00). Denver, Co: Education Commission of the States, 1974.

Report of the Utah Commission on Educational Excellence. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Office of Education, 1984.

Sontag, S. Against Interpretation and Other Essays. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1966.

Utah Parents and Teachers Association. Community Opinions on Education. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Office of Education, 1980.

Utah State Board of Education. The Elementary and Secondary School Program of Studies and High School Graduation Requirements. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Office of Education, 1984.

Utah State Office of Education. The Utah Core Curriculum. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Office of Education, 1984.

G. Leland Burningham is the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A RESPONSE

Monolithic Structures and Teacher Training

Stanley S. Madeja

After reviewing Dr. Burningham's paper, I could discuss a number of different topics and ideas that he presented. For example, I could discuss his eclectic theory of art as a basis for the teaching of arts in our schools or his plea for a non-intellectual or less snobbish approach to the teaching of the arts, or his thesis that the arts are as much cognitive as they are affective in terms of learning, or expand on Howard Gardner's thesis that the arts are part of human development. Further, I could be supportive of and introduce an excellent rationale for Ernest Boyer's position that the arts are part of basic education. However, since Dr. Burningham covered these topics in detail and also with supportive arguments, I choose to concern myself with the issues from Dr. Burningham's discourse about teacher education and the role of regulatory and implementing agencies in the process of educating and certifying the teacher in the arts.

We have, in most states, two monolithic structures which deal with the training of teachers. The State Department of Education, the legislatively mandated body which regulates and sets standards for the certification of teachers in each state, and the universities and colleges responsible for teacher education and pre-service programs. State departments are also responsible for setting standards in curriculum which relate to and answer the question of what should be taught within the public school system. In addition, in most states they are responsible for implementing the curriculum mandates which the legislature has dictated by law. These vary from general course requirements for graduation from high school to non-academic requirements such as health education, driver education or drug education.

The second monolith, the universities and colleges, are responsible for educating the teacher to meet the state certification requirements and also grant students a degree in education with work in a discipline, such as art, music, dance and theatre. The duality which exists between the degree program and teacher certification is usually resolved by the State Department of Education approving a teacher education program within a given college or university. Thus, by the granting of the degree by the institutions the graduate also qualifies for teacher certification in that state.

The point is small but important in that the State Department grants certification, the college or university grants the degree, and they are two separate but related parts of teacher education. Having two related but different agencies in each state which has major responsibilities for the education of teachers but neither agency having complete control poses one of the most difficult problems for improvement and change in teacher education. The following describe the major issues which relate to this duality and some of the consequences for teacher education in the arts.

Because the two monoliths, for the most part operating separately from one another, are once removed form the central user group--the schools--the problem of interface and/or coordination is at times mind-boggling. One of the central issues in coordination in most states is the variance which exists between what a State Department of Education requires to certify a teacher in a given subject areas, i.e., art, music, dance, theatre and a B.A./B.F.A. degree in the subject area. Most colleges and universities who train teachers and have approved programs require for an art education degree at least sixty semester hours in the discipline they are to teach, plus a core of courses - about 23 hours in Education courses which meet state certification requirements. Usually the discipline-based courses are taken within the department which offers the academic work such as in the case of the art teacher in the art department. The education courses are usually taken in the College or Department of Education. There is no set pattern as to where the courses reside; however, the point is simple, that in the case of the Art Education degree as compared to the B.A. or B.F.A. degree in art, the student will take fewer courses in art, their major discipline of study, when pursuing an Art Education degree than of a B.A. or B.F.A. Furthermore, if the student pursues a Bachelor of Fine Arts, or a Bachelor of Music, which are professional degrees, he or she is usually required to take about 80 hours of work in art, their major area of study. If one were to use a simple comparison, a student needs only take about one-half the course work to teach art as compared to the professional program in which one can, as a result, practice the arts. The variance is disturbing because it opens the door for a number of non-qualified teachers, and ones with--let us say--minimal background in a subject area to teach. A major issue is how can these variances be resolved and how can we use the State Department of Education as a regulatory agency to assure that quality teachers and qualified teachers are in the classrooms maintaining a high-quality education arts programs.

A second major issue has been the eroding of the disciplines which have made the liberal arts core of our basic education programs. The combination of mandated curricula which have a non-academic base such as drivers education, drug education, et. al., and the fact that the disciplines themselves, because of curriculum re-organization have been subverted and submerged into a secondary role within the school curriculum has caused this erosion. Further, those administrations who are disciplined-based have been eliminated within the structure of various agencies which have the responsibility for both teacher education and curriculum in our schools. For example, at the Federal level there was at one time an Arts and Humanities Program which was made up of theatre, art, music, dance and visual arts specialists whose responsibility it was to carry out a national research and development program in the arts and to assist other agencies in the development of curriculum and teacher education programs. Their counterparts, the state directors of the arts plus the arts supervisors at the local school districts composed a network of people who had responsibility for coordinating the teaching of the disciplines in the arts at the local, state and federal level. The decline in the number of people in leadership positions in the arts who actually implement teacher education programs, especially at the in-service level, has been another contributing factor to the decline of the arts disciplines in our school curriculum.

A third major issue is how can we guarantee excellence in teaching in the arts and who is responsible for the qualitative teaching in our schools. Again, we have the two monolithic structures who have responsibilities for excellence. On the one hand, the universities and/or colleges who train the teacher must assume responsibility for the quality of instruction, the students knowledge of their subject area, and the rigor of the academic program. Teacher education should not be scraping the bottom of the academic barrel for students. Universities must address the problem of attracting the best qualified students for teaching in our schools, and especially in the area of the arts. On the other hand, state departments of education must become pro-active in both setting the standards for certification and for the continuing evaluation of teachers now in the classroom. The state departments have to become immune to the education lobby in most states which skew the certification requirements so that they fill the courses within the colleges of education. The state departments must insure that good teachers of the arts are recognized and rewarded, and they must provide a system by which local schools can evaluate both programs and reward teachers for meritorious performance and service. This is not a problem that is easily resolved as it must involve professional organizations, teachers unions, local school boards, administrators, and even universities in this evaluation process. However, if we are going to improve the quality of teaching in the arts, we must endorse some system of evaluation which can continually upgrade teaching performance in the classroom and set standards for entry into the field which insures qualified and quality teachers in the arts.

In conclusion, teacher education in the arts is part of this larger body politic of what we could generally call school reform. The redefinition of high school graduation standards, the upgrading of entrance requirements for universities, and state teachers examinations among others, are becoming major issues which are affecting how we educate teachers in general and how we educate teachers in the arts. The questions which these problems pose for the field are many, but among the most important are:

1. Can we provide the necessary training for the elementary teacher in order to equip he or she to teach the arts?

2. What are the degree options for new art teachers? What is the best model for training of new teachers?

3. How can we address the on-going problem of in-serivce education. Can this be the mechanics for upgrading the quality of teachers and teaching?

4. What is the role in teacher education of the teachers organizations such as the American Federation of Teachers and/or the National Education Association who consider the titles art teacher, music teacher, drama teacher, and dance teacher job descriptions for positions in our schools. If these positions or slots are redefined or altered, does this mean that we are eliminating positions? How do we work within the framework of teachers professional organizations and/or unions view of the arts teacher in the school?

In summary, the main question is how do we put the two monoliths, the universities/colleges and State Departments of Education together with the public schools to improve teacher education in the arts? How can we enhance the status of the arts in the public schools in order to attract the best people and further, how can we allocate resources to the teacher education effort? Training costs money. Retraining is even more expensive. Therefore, a resource base must be developed from local districts and state departments of education, and colleges and universities must be developed to support this effort. Teacher training in the arts can improve the quality of arts education in the school if we can address these issues and the time is now to start.

Stanley S. Madeja is the Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts, Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois.

V. WHAT ARTS TEACHERS SHOULD KNOW/PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Teaching The Arts

Gerard L. Knieter

> The material of esthetic experience in being human--is social. Esthetic experience is a manifestation, a record and celebration of the life of a civilization, a means of promoting its development, and is also the ultimate judgment upon the quality of a civilization. For while it is produced and is enjoyed by individuals, those individuals are what they are in the content of their experience because of the cultures in which they participate.
>
> John Dewey

What should arts teachers know and do? That is a comfortable question if one is not required to give more than a sociable answer. But to identify those skills, substantive areas, and values necessary for the preparation of arts teachers is the elusive challenge that has been with us since the beginnings of self-conscious professional instruction.

Traditional approaches to this problem generally lead to a carefully drawn list reflecting the latest thinking in the ongoing debate in teacher education. Such lists may be useful if they provide an orderly way of focusing and sequencing discussion on a variety of alternatives in a systematic way. It is tempting to be safe. What this approach, however, often fails to do is to provide the means necessary for the identification of deeper issues such as: (1) What is art?; (2) What esthetic theory is most compatible with art and the instructional process?; (3) Why do we teach the arts?; (4) What is the most effective way to teach the arts?; and , (5) How do we know when we are successful?

We know that American education is in trouble and that education in the arts shares in the plight. Since we are organically related to the entire process of schooling, teacher education in the arts will not be viewed in isolation from either the society or education in general.

Much of the disorder that has characterized discussions of teacher preparation in the arts is almost indistinguishable from those in other fields. One issue that persists is whether or not four years is sufficient time to produce the novice teacher. The same concern about length of time is also expressed by those who are responsible for masters and doctoral programs. The problem is similar for all professions. With knowledge doubling at seven-year intervals, the same avalanche of information descends upon the entire professional world. If one problem solves by analogue, the following question may help to focus our thinking: How long does it take to educate the best physician, lawyer, or engineer? The answer is simple; it takes a lifetime. Since the information flow is continuous, since our experience and maturity is expanding, since the social, political and economic factors in society are changing, and since individual as well as societal values are ever in transition, the structure and content of any program of teacher education should be responsive to all of the above factors while providing a sense of stability.

The emerging content and process of teacher preparation is not so much based upon the problem of time as it is upon choice, for the unspoken assumption that causes such unrest is, "how do we add all of this new information to an overcrowded program of study?" To this question the answer is also simple; we can not!

We need to view the curriculum in a fresh way, we should mobilize our social institutions to maximize the total learning environment, and we should recognize that there are no sacred cows. Furthermore, it may not be comforting to recognize that the first change must occur within ourself. Until we are free of stereotypical thinking, our programs of study will continue to embrace new fads while failing to address pervasive issues. For example, most of the lack of support the arts have been experiencing has been attributed to the national economic situation with a simultaneous concern for accountability. Yet, when cuts have to be made, the basics are held sacred while the arts are sacrificed. This is because the community preserves what it values. This observation may be dramatized more clearly when one comes to grips with the idea that professional athletes are the new millionaires. American society is willing to pay for that which it values. What this really tells us is that we have not been able to communicate the importance of the unique values that authentic experiences in the arts hold for the entire population. For us this means that the favorite educational sport--revising the curriculum--will have to evolve into a reconceptualization of the curriculum.

Substantive Areas

The Discipline.

One who teaches any of the arts should have maximum information in and experience with that art. An arts teacher should be able to explain to others what particular facet of human experience is captures through that particular art. We have observed that traditional courses in the history and theory (design, etc.) of the art may communicate significant information about style and structure, but such courses do not deal with why the art has a special impact on the individual. It could be held that such discussions are better examined in courses such as epistemology, philosophy, aesthetics, or psychology of the arts; and, this may be true. It has also been stated that those who teach the history and syntactical aspects of the arts are specialists in those fields with no interest beyond the course title. If this is the case, then we have to begin to build bridges between those who teach the substance and structure of the discipline with those who prepare the teachers. Likewise, it has been observed that a certain dissonance often exists between those who study the art and those who make (create, perform, etc.) that art. This fragmentation cannot continue or else we shall be embarrassed by the 21st century. If we who are in the universities cannot share the excitement of all of our special interests, how can we expect the young teachers to integrate the total learning experience. If emphasis has to be placed on one style or period, it should be the 20th century. It is not my view that older styles are not important, yet at the time of this writing, we are only fifteen years away from the next century. We have yet to really know ourselves!

Traditional instruction in the above areas is usually limited to Western civilization. This isolation can no longer serve the best interests of the profession of American society. The idea of the global village is not a cliche; television has brought Africa, India, and the rest of the Orient into every American livingroom. Therefore, future arts teachers should have the opportunity for both intellectual study and studio experience in the artistic cultures of the world. How much each institution can do will be limited by its human resources. But once we do not expect to create the fully mature teacher in four years, the opportunity to cultivate broad knowledge and experience in non-Western traditions is a realistic goal. Successful studio experiences (creating, performing, etc.) at a relatively high level, together with probing intellectual and theoretical understanding of the art, form the minimum foundation upon which the successful arts teacher can be developed. To the best of my knowledge, there are no polar constructs in any of the subdisciplines in the arts that will endanger the beginning teacher.

Related Disciplines.

Towards the end of the 1960's the interdisciplinary movement became viable in American education. Stimulated by government and foundation support, school systems all over the nation began offering interdisciplinary arts and humanities courses. Since that time, these courses have been growing in popularity at all levels of instruction. Simultaneously, various professional arts associations, advocacy groups, and state departments of education began to encourage what eventually became a splendid opportunity for educators in the arts to share their problems, strategies, and research. Yet, programs of teacher education in the arts have not kept pace with this movement. Under a wide variety of labels such as aesthetic education, related arts, multi-arts, etc., programs whose basic objective was to bring the arts to all students became a vehicle for experimentation for both teaching and curriculum development.

It should be understood that courses in the arts were primarily concerned with clarifying non-verbal aesthetic values, while humanities courses (using the arts) were focused upon social, ethical, and moral issues. Arts teachers were more comfortable in the related arts courses because they were able to use a structural approach to the cultivation of aesthetic perception. They were less able to make a significant contribution to humanities courses which were often concerned with issues like truth and democracy. As one of the founders of this movement, (I am a card-carrying interdisciplinarian), it has been exciting to offer workshops, seminars at institutes throughout this nation and Canada in order to assist colleagues in formulating approaches to teaching, curriculum, and evaluation that do not violate the integrity of each of the arts. Among the most unexpected and welcome results attributed to the cooperation that emerged among arts educators was a deeper understanding of their own arts discipline. For example, rhythm and color are different in music and the visual arts, yet they share the same name. Designations such as classic referred to totally different time periods in art and music. The stranglehold of the chronological approach (the most painless anesthesia known to man) was at last viewed as only one of many options for organizing the instructional process.

The boundaries between subjects in all areas are becoming more difficult to maintain and this is healthy. While each discipline has its own integrity, there are some unifying principles that cross disciplines, fields of study, and procedures for research. Ten years ago I would never have expected to be a faculty member in a department of behavioral sciences in a College of Medicine. Yet, the past several years have been spend teaching medical students as well as physicians how the arts may be useful in patient care. The course includes the research on creativity, studio experiences, the influence of the arts on stress reduction, and the implications for medical research.

This short summary of the emerging interdisciplinary movement in arts education highlights the need for all arts teachers to become familiar with the other arts. How much of each art should be studied, what level of proficiency should be expected, and how many arts should the teacher be exposed to, should be determined by each college faculty. What is important is that students who have spent most of their lives involved in visual thinking, for example, should begin to understand how aesthetic meaning is organized through time. It is equally important for art and music teachers to become sensitive to the demanding requirements of mind and body, which are imposed on the actor by the author and the audience.

Education.

Arts educators are teachers. It, therefore, follows that they should be knowledgeable about the generic substance out of which the entire enterprise emerges. This begins an interesting controversy. Those who teach primarily in the public schools find little or no value in the education courses they have taken. Those who teach specialized arts education methods courses at the college level will publicly admit the need for such courses and privately agree with their colleagues in the public schools. At the graduate level this situation improves somewhat. I suspect this mildly improved environment is probably reflective of the experience that most graduate students (public school or college teachers) bring to the course of instruction.

This problem is exacerbated by a seemingly endless debate over theory vs. practice which is fueled by the public's deep-seated suspicion of the intellectual. Hence, anti-intellectualism coupled with the need to succeed quickly has encouraged American educators to view each new fad as the road to glory. Educators in the arts are no different. We too have embraced all of the so-called "new ideas" more often because of our professional insecurity and our need to belong to the establishment than because of conviction. Yet, what are we to do? Can we turn the arts educator loose on an unsuspecting student population without the appropriate orientation? No, we can no; the various state departments of education, teacher-certifying agencies, and departments and colleges of education will not allow it. But neither do they address the problem in such a way as to alter the above perceptions.

In an earlier section of this paper I suggested that bridges had to be built among all faculty members concerned with both the substantive and process-oriented areas of the arts discipline. It is now also proposed that some formal communication be established between college arts educators and their colleagues in education.

The discussions which often ensure regarding theory versus practice seldom exhibit anything but the most shallow thinking. In the field of music it goes this way: Would you rather be taught by a good musician or a good teacher? The question, of course, is incompetent. A good musician who cannot communicate cannot teach; and, a good teacher who is not a musician has nothing to teach. In fact, the entire issue is what Dewey calls a fallacious dualism. It presupposes that the answer is either side one, or side two. Once again let us problem-solve by analogue. How would the theory vs. practice debate work in the field of medicine? The physician with no clinical experience and only a theoretical background would not be able to treat a headache because his encyclopedic mind would tell him of the several hundred diseases that offer the headache as a symptom. The practitioner with little medical theory would not hesitate offering an aspirin irrespective of the complications this medication might cause.

The function of theory is to provide a logical structure upon which current information may be organized and explained. The function of practice is to provide workable ways of coping with problems. Theory informs practice and practice alters theory. Both are evolving and necessary to the professional in all fields. For whatever solace it may bring, this feud exists in all professions.

What particular areas of information should the educationists visit upon our students? We may want to consider some of the material that is customarily presented at the graduate level. Why not expose bright young minds to Alfred North Whitehead, John Dewey, Lawrence Cremin, and Maxine Greene. They might gain a respect for the field of education because what has been said by all of the above writers contains sufficient wisdom and information for the creative education professor to relate the reading to contemporary classroom situations. While it may be totally appropriate to expect undergraduate students to understand the particular philosophical orientations the writer expresses, it would be very stimulating for them to find exciting and living ideas about people, values, and how both relate to society and schooling. What is being suggested is that an intellectually stimulating course be offered to undergraduates so that they may become excited about the ideas which are central to all human behavior.

Other courses which deal with either curriculum or instruction should be organized so that students would be required to apply the particular theoretical construct to a curriculum sequence or instructional strategy in the field of art in which the student will teach. Whatever undergraduate experiences are offered by our colleagues in education should be negotiable in all fields or they are open to question. This generalization would also hold in masters and doctoral programs. If the theory is legitimate, we should be able to illustrate it through an example. If a students can not do this, then either the theory is wrong, or the student does not understand it. It is my view that our students should be well versed in educational theory; in fact by requiring students to illustrate theory in their own fields of specialization, they will have engaged in transfer of learning. For them to be able to generalize a construct insures a fairly sophisticated level of understanding. Furthermore, the removal of the rote response brings an integrity to the process which will improve the image of the entire education area.

Psychology.

The study of human behavior has flourished greatly during the last few decades. There are more schools of psychology now than our language can sustain. Our view of human behavior, even though we are concerned with teaching and learning, must encompass the entire spectrum of development. Concepts like learning theory and educational psychology are no longer adequate. If we are to view the student as a total human organism coming form a unique family environment, from a neighborhood that has a particular subculture, with a cognitive learning style which is likely to be non-verbal, then we must know more than only one approach to human behavior. We must understand the entire developmental process of growth with particular attention to the social, emotional, psychomotor, and cognitive factors. Our teachers should become familiar with theories of personality so that they may approach their students with authentically humanistic attitudes rather than with mechanistic objectivity that depersonalizes the environment.

We have dealt with the psychology of teaching as though it was a formula that could be applied to all students. For example, young teachers are often encouraged to think of ways to motivate their students to learn. Yet, if a student comes to class hungry, Maslow's hierarchy takes precedence. If we prepare teachers to follow a set of rules we can ensure failure. Teachers have often been given the wrong models of behavior to encourage. Since conformity has been the basis for most success in school, we encourage and reward those students who conform. In the early years we know that it is important to help youngsters through the socialization process. But at what point do we encourage individuality, experimentation, and the search for novelty?

Teachers in the arts are no more familiar with the research on the creative personality than teachers in other fields. Hence, our teaching runs a bell curve distribution. In some ways this is a great embarrassment for it is assumed that teachers of the arts are naturally creative. To the contrary, I have it on good authority that certain teachers really know the "right" way to teach voice, painting, and acting. What is being suggested is that the study of psychology include an investigation of creativity.

It is also crucial that we recognize the importance of perception. Teachers of the arts have to develop in others the ability to perceive so that this basic data can lead to conceptual development. There is a great deal of literature on perception, but little of it is shared with those who are preparing to teach the arts.

By this time the reader may be wondering whether I am interested in the preparation of arts educators or psychologists. Please be assured, the above curriculum is too much for psychologist; they specialize in only one area. As teachers of the arts, we must be able to communicate effectively with people of all ages, and we should be able to stimulate their natural creative and artistic juices so that their lives can be significantly enhanced.

Arts Education.

This is the professional area which includes courses for the elementary classroom teacher, for teaching the arts at the various school levels, for specialized media, for observation, field experiences, intern and extern programs, student teaching, workshops, institutes, seminars, symposia, doctoral research, and post-doctoral inquiry. It is the one place in the total curriculum where area educators can exert maximum influence. If this is the area where the most concentrated emphasis has been placed on the development of the arts educator, and if public reaction to the arts in the nation has been less then enthusiastic, we have had our report cards. We face some of the same issues in the professional methods courses that plague our colleagues in education.

How much theory and how much practice should balance each course and the entire sequence of courses? I have seen junior high school general music teachers nearly come to blows debating whether such courses should start with notation (what some claim are the basics in music), rock, or folk music. When I am asked to commit wisdom on the issue, my answer takes the form of a question, "What music will the students be able to understand and enjoy by the end of the semester?" This response tends to cause an increase in blood pressure, pulse rate, and psychogalvanic skin responses. In order to maintain a certain amount of sanity at this point, the writer confesses to having taught junior high school general music and having asked students to bring to class a recording of the best piece of music they have ever heard and to explain why they thought it was good. These teachers soon recognized that it was my goal to develop aesthetic perception. My experience with young people is that the inability to read musical notation does not seem to inhibit their ability to analyze musical form. I am not sure that the converse is true with music majors.

The first decision that must be made for programs in the professional course work of the arts teacher is why they will be teaching the arts. The following is a proposal that is basic to arts instruction at all levels. It is the purpose of education in the arts to develop the aesthetic potential of all students. Every sequence of instruction should be thought of as an episode in the aesthetic development of students. Aesthetic education is the process which develops the capacity for expression in the arts. Expression may be viewed as encompassing three behaviors: creation, performance, and appreciation (evaluation). Expression in the arts also may be referred to as aesthetic sensitivity. Stated another way, aesthetic education is the cultivation of aesthetic sensitivity. With this view in mind, there is little difficulty in approaching the evaluation of classes in the arts. After any instructional experience, the question would be: To what degree and in what area have the students developed their expressive potential? If one wants greater specificity, cognitive, perceptual, psychomotor, or affective responses can be identified.

What the above position tends to insure against, particularly at the elementary level, is the mistaken notion that the manipulation of a medium (voice, instruments, watercolors, leather, etc.) or what are often called "activities" can be viewed as authentic encounters with the arts. For aesthetic education to have taken place, the student will have had to change (the simplest definition indicates that learning is a change in behavior). This view of education in the arts restores the teacher to the central role in the educational process.

During the past several decades we have been so concerned with the student that we have forgotten that it is the teacher who is primarily responsible for the sequential development of students' learning. Teacher should be viewed as the organization of the environment conducive to learning. The teacher is the facilitator who brings the art and the student together. While the students may be the focus of instruction, unless they have direct encounters with the arts, it is difficult for aesthetic development of flourish. This position does not change with the age of the student. With younger students, the scene may have to be presented, the painting may have to be exhibited, and the song may have to be sung. With graduate students, they can be asked to recall Hamlet's soliloquy, Rembrant's Nightwatch, or the Second Movement of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony. The principle is that the work of art provides the motivating force through which the teacher clarifies artistic content, aesthetic meaning, or stylistic constructs.

Whether we like it or not, teachers tend to teach the way they were taught. Hence, the instructional process in the arts education sequence must exemplify the highest level of excellence possible. Since the function of technology is to enhance the learning environment, to free both teacher and student from the mechanistic, whatever equipment is available to assist in this process should be employed. New technology and new delivery systems will not change the basic problems in arts education.

One of the best ways to educate the pre-service teacher is to provide as much exposure to the public school environment as possible. This experience should start in the freshman year and continue through student teaching. While the pre-service teacher is in a living laboratory, discussions that may have appeared to be theoretical will have been clarified through weekly college seminars. I am aware that this proposal is not entirely economically feasible. Yet with a series of closed circuit TV demonstrations, or live broadcasts from schools, the possibility of increased awareness for the live teaching/learning situation might be enhanced.

During the pre-service program, the arts teacher in training should be exposed to a wide variety of successful teaching models. It is important that young teachers do not come away with "one" approach even if a particular professor has a direct line to the divinity. What will unify the teaching approach is not method but purpose. It is one's philosophy of aesthetic education that will allow the continued expansion of professional development, and not the mere accumulation of teaching tricks.

It may also be advisable to consider some form of apprenticeship at the master's and doctoral levels. In the field of engineering all firms know that the first two years of work represent a learning phase. Clerkships in the legal profession and residencies in medicine are really advanced forms of apprenticeship. The practice of providing increasing responsibility under supervision allows for appropriately placed maturation of the professional. Those who need this experience most of all are college teachers. There is the strange notion among college teachers that the terminal degree provides not only the necessary scholarship but the operating credentials to teach. While it may not be possible to legislate such an activity for all who plan to teach at the college level, we can try to offer such opportunities on a voluntary basis. Some colleges have such programs and they do make a difference.

It may not be possible for us to make a comprehensive list of all of the characteristics of the master teacher. But those of us who have been exposed to such personalities have been touched for life. Among the qualities they exhibit are: (1) deep expertise in the subject; (2) unqualified commitment to the discipline; (3) interest in the student; (4) firm but fair standards which are always challenging; (5) a sense of humor; (6) flexibility; and (7) continuing professional development. Certainly there are more qualities and each master teacher is an individual, yet there is the pervasive sincerity, commitment, and scholarship that seems to permeate all fields of study. A master teacher approaches teaching the way a fine artist approaches the art. Experimentation, open-mindedness, and willingness to consider the unconventional are hallmarks. It may be worthwhile identifying and encouraging these qualities in our young teachers.

A profession is not a profession without research. Most of the research in arts education is carried out in colleges and universities employing a language which is unintelligible to our colleagues in the public schools. Those who manage to spend some time getting a master's degree often learn to use the language temporarily but hasten to abandon it as soon as they leave the halls of ivy. Those colleagues who continue their careers in higher education are able to communicate with each other and enjoy the stimulation of informed debate. It is, however, hard to find strong evidence to indicate that the research done in arts education has had a significant impact on teaching and learning in the public schools.

This problem exists for many reasons. Much of the research is basic and, therefore, seeks no immediate avenue for application. Some of the research which is meant to influence public education is not understandable to the practitioner (as previously mentioned). There is another area of research that represents the particular specialized interest of the professor and is not viable for practical application. However, we must find a way to educate the practicing arts teacher to comprehend the research.

One approach would be to use workshops and institutes whose primary function would be to explain the fundamental approaches to research, its vocabulary, method, and potential usefulness in the classroom. If we could get arts educators in the public schools to become interested in research, we could begin a program of collaboration that would provide a much bigger laboratory (hence, population sample) and stimulate the potential for ongoing action research.

Liberal Arts.

We have been accused of being as narrowly educated as the scientist. On paper this is not true since accredited colleges and universities require all teachers to have a fair percentage of their course work in the liberal arts. We study English, history, the sciences, and sometimes we even explore foreign languages. But we take none of it very seriously. Our students know that we want them to spend as much time as possible in the practice room, studio, and theatre. They know that the competition is hard in the arts and complain about the irrelevance of the liberal arts. We tend to endorse their position, encouraging them to "live through it." Often it appears that there is not enough time to master all that we have prescribed for them. They are anxious to please us and they are genuinely interested in their own artistic expression. In short, most pre-service arts teachers place little value on their liberal arts study and we collaborate in this view by our silence.

What all of us forget is that the future members of congress, leaders of the business community, and presidents of boards of education are sitting alongside of our students. What these other students learn is that arts teachers cannot think, do not write very well, and fail to be interested in the general political discussions that bind late adolescent rebellion and the college curriculum into the travelled tapestry of life. Our image in this regard is not good. We know now that liberal arts study is important but there will probably never be another chance for us to offer that opportunity again.

The reader does not need a lecture on the virtues of a liberal arts education and the important role that it can play in the education of arts teachers. What we need to know is that we must convey this message to our students. First, our students must see us as liberally educated for we are their first role models. Next, we have to make the case that in order to communicate the importance of the arts to others we will have to use the same tools--language, reason, logic, evidence, etc.--as others do to persuade all segments of society to support the arts.

One way to assist the arts educator is to try to help in the selection of electives; to personalize the curriculum. For example, a strong case can be made for the field of social anthropology as one of the most important social sciences for arts educators. Since the arts teachers of the 21st century will be dealing with the arts on a planetary scale, they will have to be able to understand how the other cultures--and, therefore, the arts of other cultures--work. Teachers may be surprised to learn that in most non-Western cultures, the arts are inextricably liked to religion. The gods in ancient China were musicians. The physicians in Africa use the arts as an integral part of the healing process. Study in anthropology raises questions that are often disquieting. For example, the problem of ethnocentricity comes into focus when one accepts the idea (Western) that man is created in God's image only to learn that seventy-five percent of the earth's population is nonwhite.

Furthermore, to learn to think in another discipline expands the intellectual abilities to problem solve. Let us move into the area of comparative religion, an elective I studied many years ago. One day the professor asked, "What does the parting of the Red Sea have in common with the resurrection?" When hearing this question for the first time I remember utter confusion. Looking around the room at most of the students who were professional clerics, I remember all eyes seeking sanctuary by looking down which was the time honored signal to the teacher for mercy. The professor had a twinkle in his eye when he told us that, "they were simply religious miracles." Then he asked, "Is there anyone in the room who is acquainted with the divine plan?" We all admitted having received no special communication. He then asked, "How, then, do we know which set of religious miracles to believe?" Again, there was silence. He finally explained it all to us by taking a short-cut through the field of epistemology demonstrating that philosophy was often needed to explain theology. It was the scholarship demonstrated by this master teacher that motivated me to read philosophy, anthropology, and sociology--all of which became part of my teaching arsenal.

We need the benefits of liberal education because it is essential that we are at least knowledgeable about where the wisdom of the world can be found. It is necessary for us to be partners with teachers of English, history, and the social sciences so that we hold membership in a larger intellectual community. Furthermore, with an expanded audience of colleagues in other areas of education, we have the potential to educate them to the various worlds in which we live. Our partnership with the liberal arts will be mutually enriching. The arts educator can only benefit from such a relationship.

Recurring Themes and Selected Issues

The Elementary Classroom Teacher.

This issue has been with us since the beginning. Most elementary teachers have no idea what the arts are all about; nor can they be taught very much in one or two courses. Most of what goes on can be described as "activities," which means that children are engaged in the manipulation of media. They are given instruction from the teacher's workbook and a certain amount of serious damage is sustained by a large number of students. Many adults will not draw, sing, or act today because of their experience in elementary schools. Yet, there are some classroom teachers who are quite capable of doing excellent work on a limited basis. It is educational folly to force a teacher to teach any of the arts with which they feel uncomfortable.

For what they will teach is their lack of enthusiasm for the art in question in addition to quite a bit of misinformation.

The haunting question for colleges and universities is whether or not courses in the arts should be given for these teachers. In many states the question is academic since courses in the arts and in teaching the arts are required. In such cases, we do the best we can trying to communicate the essence of the art while attempting to suggest ways to assist youngsters to express themselves. In cases where there is no such requirement, the problem is that if the elementary clsssroom teacher does not provide the art, there is no instruction at all. It should be noted that this is not necessarily a bad option.

Part of the generic problem in this situation goes back to our discussion on theory and practice. While it is true that there is usually not enough time to do either well, the stress is on practice. Hence, teachers do not know why they are doing what they are doing and feel somewhat abandoned or alienated. Students feel the lack of direction, classroom management suffers, and the image of education in the arts is once again set back.

The most sensible approach is to have professionally certified arts teachers in all of the schools do the teaching. When this is not possible, then an arts supervisor should be available to assist the classroom teacher. When this is not possible, teachers should not be forced to teach the art with which they are uncomfortable.

How Does One Keep Current.

The teacher is a self-instructional agent who is expected to do research so that professional development may be continuous. However, one should not confuse research with publication. Since knowledge in all fields is emerging, it is necessary for the teacher to do ongoing research in the field through reading, conventions, workshops, and institutes so that what is brought to class represents the most contemporary view available. There is another aspect to the idea of being current and that is creative production. One who teaches painting should be involved in studio problems. Similarly, one who teaches music history should be involved in the appropriate research. The fundamental principle is that for the teaching to be living, there has to be a personal commitment behind the work. Teachers have to continue to face the problems their students face in order to remain empathetic as well as scholarly and creative.

The Arts Educator vs. the Artist, Composer, Administrator, etc.

We find ourselves in a constant state of conflict with a wide variety of colleagues. In most cases our debates are often reduced to choices between alternatives which tend to alienate important groups of people. Such choices usually result in the further fragmentation of our relationships. We should realize that most of the groups with which we work can be helpful to us. But we have been taught that the idea of compromise is not only a sign of weakness but an indication that one has given up some high principles. This exaggerated view is not only politically naive, but it prevents us from forming alliances with colleagues whose potential support we need. It is our responsibility to identify what can be viewed as common ground. Rather than attempting to persuade our colleagues from their opinion to ours, why not try to identify what may be viewed as a shared concern. Our national conventions can be used as opportunities to explore ideas with administrators, guidance counselors, English teachers, and scientists. Since we spend most of our time talking to each other, we lose the opportunity to review what is special about the arts to those who are influential in education.

What I am proposing my be heresy. To try to change a music education or art education convention might upset the entire membership. Yet, as we approach the 21st century, unless we learn to communicate to our colleagues in a variety of disciplines and fields, our role in the educational arena is likely to decrease. Most economic predictions tell us that resources will continue to be scarce through the next several years. The old ways have brought us to the present. The time is right for us to open as many avenues of communication as possible. We need to work with those who are having difficulty teaching native Americans to read and to write. It is also important to let scientists know that their mode of abstract relational thinking is similar to artistic creation. At tow points earlier in this paper I suggested that we build bridges. I make it again! We may have information that could be useful to many segments of the community. For example, according to the Business Committee on the Arts, New York City enjoys added revenues of 4.5 billion dollars which are directly traceable to the arts. Medicine and law may also find that their professions can be enhanced through our efforts. It is time to talk about the arts to all segments of the community and it is also time to listen.

Excellence or Quality.

The newest password in education is quality or excellence. For us it is an idea that has dominated the fundamental disciplines we all represent, and it is a construct which we can champion. Quality or excellence is the highest level of expression possible from an individual or group which is characteristic of the normative criteria of a discipline or field. In this context, expression is understood to mean any act, event, or process in which teachers, students, researchers, etc., may be involved. Examples from our areas may be found in classrooms, studios, theatres, museums, and concert halls. We have been accountable in the marketplace of civilization throughout the ages.

Conclusion

What do arts teachers have to know? They should know the content of their art in all styles, periods, and cultures and they should have a working knowledge of the other arts. Arts educators should be knowledgeable about education and psychology so that they can share the common bond that exists among all who teach. They should be especially gifted as teachers so that they can model the best image for students to emulate. Such teachers should share the common wisdom of those who are liberally educated so that they can appreciate the significant contributions that others have made in the social sciences and humanities. They should be thoroughly committed to their profession while exhibiting flexibility in their interaction with the total society. Their sensitivity to individuals and groups should be the inspiration our of which functional scholarship will be incontinuous development.

What should arts teachers know? They should know everything!

Gerard L. Knieter is Professor of Music and Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts at The University of Akron and Adjunct Professor of Behavioral Sciences at the Northeastern Ohio University's College of Medicine.

RESPONSE

A Letter

Al Hurwitz

Dear Jerry,

This may be the longest letter you will ever receive. I know you too well to refer to you as "Professor Knieter", "my esteemed colleague" or some other kind of formal address. I have elected to "reply" in the form of a letter because it's more direct and because the informality of tone is more apt to get the juices of discourse going. As Marshall McLuhan once said of his writing, "I just let the left hemisphere take over and sit back and see what happens."

As I read your paper I thought about how the lives we lead within arts education influenced the ways in which we approach the subject of this conference. In addition to coming at the problem from music rather than art,--your vision as a Dean gives you a kind of breadth that I, as a Director of Teacher Education may lack. I began in the theatre, entered art education as a public school teacher, and ended up as a supervisor. For the past few years I've been trying to bring into some workable synthesis what I have learned from working with children and teachers over the past three decades. In trying to educate future art teachers, I have had to question and re-order some cherished beliefs. Consider my comments as a report from the classroom,--the one that turns artists into teachers without guilt.

Let's begin with your final statement: "Art teachers must know everything." I'm sure this was not meant to be taken literally. If you are serious in what you say, then you are asking more of arts educators than people like myself can deliver. I am not for less knowledge as much as I am for deferring certain kinds of knowledge in favor of others. Let's begin with what Othanel Smith[1] calls the "generic" component. You don't need a theory of vehicular operational psychology to learn to drive on the left hand side of the road in England. It's really quite simple--you learn it very quickly or you're dead. Nor do you need a theory to realize that one doesn't begin a class until everyone has quieted down and is ready to participate. This is the most immediate level of operation and includes such necessary but non-sexy times as classroom management, storage, preparing budgets, ordering materials, maintenance of equipment, structuring appropriate environments and so on. I think we do pretty well at this level because of the checkpoints that exist between the professor of education and the directing and supervising teacher.

The next area (it's probably a mistake to refer to these as "levels") deals with the kinds of knowledge which may not be acquired through direct experience. I refer to those varieties of planning which begin with philosophy and reach into a curriculum that is planned to embody goals which in turn take the form of activities, and which conclude with that time-honored scenario for success--the lesson plan. Oddly enough, it is possible to traverse all of the above without ever having spoken to a live child. I would go so far as to say that it is even possible to do very well at this level and still feel that one has failed after confronting one's first group of 27 sixth graders. (As you may recall, the classic example of the chasm that can lie between reality and theory was John Ruskin's bolting from his wedding bed upon discovering that warm, human flesh wasn't at all like the classic marble objects that graced the halls of the British Museum.)

Despite the fact that it encompasses both levels, classroom practice has never enjoyed the respect granted those theoretical studies which conventionally precede laboratory experience. It's my feeling that we should reverse the accepted sequence of studies. Common sense may tell us that the best way to set the stage for a future teacher is to begin by examining the "big" questions of arts education (What is the nature of art, music or dance? What role can it play in general education? etc.). The problem with this plan is that one cannot deal adequately with such problems unless one is prepared to do some reading. Every arts area has its own body of authority--scholars whose ideas should be discussed and understood before we can adequately attend to practical matters. Speaking for the visually-minded, I can tell you that few students in an art school are prepared to assimilate theory in their freshman and sophomore years and even if they can comprehend the import of the big questions, they have little or no basis of experience to which they can connect their reading. Undergraduates are very much like 12-year-olds who see a great deal of sexual carrying-on in film and video but have never been touched by any member of the opposite sex other than their parents. One can only speculate as to the degree and nature of fantasizing that must go on in minds where there is no consonance between what the mind sees and what one has actually lived. This is why I propose that in the training of arts teachers we place experience at the beginning, or if you will, at the center of teacher education. For example, the ideas which underlie actions which succeed or fail in the classroom setting can best be understood if the professor/mentor can say "the kids were inattentive because you were insensitive to the way you introduced the lesson. What could have been presented in three parts you broke up into six or seven sections. They found this to be confusing and this is what created a frustration level which in turn led to unrest that bothered you." This is when the teacher brings up the subject of the theory of frustration and regression and, if possible, discusses this issue in the presence of all the student teachers. Contact between children and teachers in training is replete with opportunities to invest theory with meaning. I might add that research can share the same role as theory in clarifying the pedagogical process. Example: if a teacher shows signs of rigidity in handling a particular problem, that is the time to acquaint him or her with how Torrance, Getzells and others have studied flexibility as a component of creative behavior. As Smith has written, "Pedagogical psychology...should be taught as an explanatory subject. This means, among other things, that theoretical principles should be taught in such a way as to enable practitioners to place a given practice in context and to understand why it is effective."[2] I am suggesting that pedagogy can be more effective if the "how" of teaching precedes the "why". In the former I may have to instruct by example; in the latter, Socratic methods would be more appropriate. In either case, the teachers of teachers should be someone who can work with children in multiple modes of instruction. Too many professors of Education have been far removed from the presence of young people. The relation between a professor of education to classroom experience is not unlike that of the art teacher to art--both parties should have spent some part of their lives immersing themselves in the heart of their respective professions. Earning a doctorate can turn an art teacher into a kind of snob; one who wants to cast off the past--(I've paid my dues in the classroom.")--in favor of the graduate seminar. It would help matters if we would get rid of all the pecking orders in art education,--secondary teachers who look down on elementary teachers, college teachers who feel superior to public school teachers, and, above all, professors who feel they lose face if they teach elementary classroom teachers or basic methodology courses. In my view everyone who trains teachers should schedule one-half day a week (a month? a year?) to see what it is like to move a child from point A to point B. It is a great feeling, and no professor of education should be denied its pleasures which are both bracing and salutary.

Early in your paper you remind us that arts teachers should "have maximum information about and experience with their art." This is what Smith refers to as the "content specific" domain and it is where arts students feel most at home. This is what brings them to us in the first place and takes us farther into their personal histories. I'm referring to the love of art--or dance or performance--that dominantly affective realm of their education which gives them an edge over the rest of the freshman class. (I can't imagine someone starting out in mathematics getting the same charge out of their studies as a classmate who's readying himself for his first dance or music concert.) This "edge" must be protected at all costs because it is this identification with an art form that will defer the doldrums which seem to await most teachers in their mid-thirties. The problem of course is that despite the fact that a major in an arts area can be negotiated in the maze of requirements needed for certification, college programs have a way of fragmenting this vital part of the student's training. Somewhere along the way--during a semester or summer--the future arts teachers must have an undisturbed period of time in which to totally immerse themselves in their chosen art form. For a certain period of time, they must have a chance to give themselves completely to the idea of mastery within their chosen art form.

This leads me to a proposal for an institute for young teachers which is probably impossible to achieve, but is still worth the odd reverie. There are no Camelots among art educators. There are no arts education equivalents to Jacobs Pillow (dance), Haystack (crafts) or the Actors' Studio (drama). It pains me to admit it, but arts students are turned on more by artists than by arts educators. Somewhere out there are artists who have worked in the schools (Mel Ramos, Duane Hanson, George Segal come immediately to mind). I often wonder what they would say at an institute for young teachers? To flip the coin, I would also add to such a faculty arts educators who would lead double lives as artists. There are arts educators who can inspire and excite young minds as effectively as artists. Why can't we get a few of them together for a summer to create greater parity between artists and arts educators? I am aware that these suggestions will not increase my popularity with my colleagues, but I think arts students will understand what I am trying to say.

The Expressive Dimension.

So far I have mentioned what Smith refers to as the generic, the content specific and the theoretical components. There is, however, something missing in Smith's priorities. It is possible to know your subject, to be aware of the deeper implications of one's decisions, to have control of the mechanics of running a program and still lack characteristics which are critical in gaining and sustaining the attention of a class. I'm speaking of teachers with problems of speech and voice projection, teachers who lack a sense of pace and verbal fluency, teachers who are, in fact, bores. It is one thing to be a bore in higher education. This is a common occurrence and students too often accept this as a fact of life since they are captive audiences. Paradoxically they actually pay good money to be bored. To be a bore in the public schools is more hazardous since art classes, not being required, can usually be avoided once students get in touch with the grapevine. My fourth component therefore, is one that covers speech therapy (if needed), and improvisations and formal exercises in acting. Drama majors shouldn't need it, but art majors and musicians are often in need of expressive skills because so much of their lives are spent in the isolation of the rehearsal booth or the studio. No acting course can change a personality or turn a shy person into an extrovert, but a good acting course can make a future teacher aware of possibilities of communication which lie latent within themselves. While micro-teaching, the use of video and tape recorders all relate to enhancing one's powers of expression, they may not be enough to inveigh a dull teacher with that needed note of lustre.

Critical Analytical Skills.

When a freshman takes a foundation course in design, it is assumed that they are mastering a vocabulary of form which they can recognize and use. Foundation learning does not cease at the need of the freshman year; it becomes incorporated into all future artistic efforts. A similar approach can be used in teacher education--one that is based upon critical processes as a model for studying the performance of others--directing teachers, classmates as well as a student's own first efforts at instruction. There is, or should be, a phase of Smith's content-specific component which deals with the development of critical skills on an ongoing basis. This usually involves personal response based upon the ordering of impressions (description, analysis, interpretation) as phases which precede judgment and which can be transferred to teaching situations. A student teacher working from a single example of child art should be able to analyze a learning episode in critical terms and be capable of making a wide range of inferences.

In pedagogical terms, we can extend critical processes into wider domains of concern.[3] A student should be able to look at any work, say a 10th grader's plan for a public sculpture, and address himself to the following questions: What was the purpose? Was it established by teacher or student? What was the context for the work--a course, a unit, or independent work? Was it worth doing in the first place? What was the grade level and how long did it take? How do we go about introducing such activities? When students accept such a mode of analyses as a regular part of a methods class, they begin to make connections between what happens in an art room and what awaits them in museums and galleries. I place the development of a critical/analytic stance among our students as the very highest level of objectives.

Research.

Towards the end of your paper, you voice concern regarding the low state of the use of research in arts education. I can't

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

speak for performing arts educators, but I can speak with some confidence regarding my own field. The reason research findings seldom see the light of day in our classrooms is because of the hurdles which lie between the researcher and the teacher. For a teacher to incorporate such information in a program, at least five conditions must be in order. First, the teacher must be a member of NAEA and secondly, he or she must subscribe to "Studies in Art Education" or conduct an ERIC search to review material that is available on the topic of concern. Thirdly, he or she has to read the report; fourth, he or she must understand what has been read. Having surmounted this obstacle course, the teacher is then prepared to make a decision regarding the relevancy of the research to the problem at hand. The teacher with the stamina and the professional curiosity to move from step one to step five will, in all probability, leave the classroom and enroll in a doctoral program. By the time he or she receives the degree, they will know how to read a research paper, having engaged in some form of scholarly investigation on their own. This teacher will then get a job in a department of art education and go about training other art teachers. What he or she probably will not do is sustain the pace and intensity of the reading required while in graduate school. If we are ever going to get research to have the impact it deserves, I think certain changes are going to have to come about and these changes are as follows:

Researchers need a broker, someone who takes it upon himself to act as a liason between the investigator and the teacher. Publications won't do it, nor, alas, will our own professional organizations. The major responsibility lies with those who educate teachers, since teachers for the most part live off the capital of their undergraduate training until they seek additional sources of education. Since the professors of art education are also too burdened with professional duties to maintain consistent reading habits, I suggest a series of post-doctoral institutes designed to update faculties of art education. Those responsible for keeping classroom teachers alert to current thinking are the art supervisor, the director of curriculum and the arts specialists on the state level. If no one assumes responsibility for searching, sorting and disseminating research findings, this discrepancy between research and practice will continue to remain in the state in which it currently exists.

Now let me briefly encapsulate what I have tried to say in my letter:

...That we ought to give serious thought to a possible reordering of those experiences and courses which deal with the three components of training--generic, theoretical and content specific and that a fourth component be added which concentrates on maximizing the personal, communicative powers of the future teacher.

...That we apply the processes of art criticism to develop a more effective sense of the classroom dynamic.

...That arts education programs be planned for periods of intensive study without interruption of any kind, even from people such as you and I.

...That we establish research "brokers" to update arts education teachers as well as teachers in the field.

...That we create Camelots of art education for students, teachers, and professors of art education.

...That professors of arts education be encouraged to periodically enjoy encounters with children or adolescents.

Jerry, it seems as though you were right after all. Arts teachers really must know everything, but "everything" may be a relative as well as a finite concept.

Thanks for listening. Regards to the family and may we meet in that great conference center in the sky--if not before.

Your esteemed colleague,

Al

FOOTNOTES

[1] A particularly useful and well-researched article on teacher education in B. Othanel Smith's "Research Bases for Teacher Education" in Phi Delta Kappa, June, 1985, Volume 66, #10.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Eliot Eisner's chapter "On the Art of Teaching" in The Educational Imagination (MacMillian, New York, 1979) adds innumerable new insights into what he calls the "artistry" of teaching.

Al Hurwitz is the Director of Teacher Training, The Maryland Institute--College of Art, Baltimore, Maryland.

VI. HOW WILL YOU KNOW A GOOD ARTS TEACHER WHEN YOU SEE ONE/ STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

Evaluating Teaching in the Arts: Scenes From a Complex Drama

Brent Wilson

What's the Purpose: This Teaching of the Arts?

The troublesome epigram, "Poetry is indispensable--if I only know what for," is attributed to Jean Cocteau. I find myself much less cynical than Cocteau, and more confident in the role of the arts in human affairs--and in the role of the arts in education--if they are well taught. Consequently, before I begin the task of outlining how I would go about determining if the arts are well taught--the evaluation of arts teacher, I need to present my view regarding the indispensability of the arts.

Humans spend a fair share of their lives attempting to determine what they themselves and the world in which they live are "really" like. Our conceptions of self, world, future, and norms are developed primarily through symbols--through symbol systems comprised of sounds, gestures, words, numbers, images, movements (Goodman, 1978, Kreitler and Kreitler, 1972). And schooling exists, I think, primarily to assist students in gaining a sufficient degree of mastery of the various symbol systems to enable them both to study others' ideas about the world, and to build their own symbolic conceptual models of the world.

The arts play a special and perhaps unique role in this symbolic world making process inasmuch as the arts provide a stimulating, pleasurable, and a more complete, a more holistic, and a more concrete working model of the world than is to be found in the world views of, say, mathematics or science. This is so because the arts seem to model themselves after the dramatic narrative that we take reality to be. (In actuality, I believe that life, more often than not, is modeled after art.) In either event, it is possible to think of works of art as "as-if" working models for the realities that we assume to exist within the world. In some types of art--literature, the theater, dance, and even some paintings and poetry--it is possible to see rather complete notions of what life is presently seen to be, what it was once like, and what it will eventually be. In the arts, it is possible to see mirrored, ourselves, our visions of the profound, the beautiful, the good, the desirable; our aspirations and our challenges, the problems and dilemmas that we feel that we must resolve.

This "indispensable" aesthetic/cognitive construction of the realities of our existence can, of course, only be realized in schools if arts teachers, (1) know which works from the histories of the arts are the most important for students to study; (2) know how to guide students through a knowledgeable study of these works, (3) guide students to make sensitive and insightful interpretations of the essential meanings of these works; and (4) successfully assist student to create or recreate their own artistic and aesthetic visions and versions of the world.

If arts teaching is a complex and difficult affair, then so is its evaluation. And who should be evaluating the knowledge, curriculum planning abilities, and teaching competencies of the arts? I think evaluation to be the responsibility and the obligation of the colleges and universities who educate arts teachers, the state agencies who certificate them, and the school districts who hire them. Lets examine some of the things that the evaluation of arts teachers might involve.

Evaluating Arts Teachers: A Complex Drama.

Think, if you will, of the arts classroom as a theater, or better still, as theater. Within theater a complex drama beyond the drama unfolds. There is the playwright's script with its specification of stage setting, roles, actors, acts, scenes, beats, and lines. There is the producer who interprets the playwright's vision. There are rehearsals, and there is the live performance which may be exhilarating--the one with a good play and the entire cast playing masterfully, or indifferently--the one with a mediocre script made all the worse by missed cues and a flat performance. There is the audience composed of some who have come for pleasure, some for enlightenment, some to criticize, and some who were dragged to the theater against their wishes. I have been asked to speculate regarding the ways that this very complicated arts teaching drama might be evaluated. It goes without saying that I have a difficult task. But not nearly so difficult a task as the arts teacher in this drama metaphor who finds himself or herself singlehandedly fulfilling nearly all the roles associated with theater. The arts teacher writes the script (prepares the unit and daily lesson plans, sets the stage (arranges the classroom), rehearses, speaks the lines and acts the parts (presents lessons), gives assignments (directs the performances of students), criticizes the performance and productions of the student cast; (and I should add, also plays the critic to his or her own scriptwriting, staging, directing, and performing.) In short just about the only roles that the arts teacher does not perform are those of audiences (students) and producer (the board of education representing the public shareholders (dare we call them angels?).

This drama metaphor should be useful in the evaluation of teaching in the arts. (Break a leg.)

What Kind of Play is This Anyway?: Role Conceptions and Misconceptions.

At the first class meeting of my course, "Art in the Secondary Schools," I asked my eighteen students to (1) "list the five major kinds of things, or classifications of knowledge about art and art education that you think essential for a prospective art teacher to know," and (2) "list five types of things that you think that it is most important for a prospective art teacher to know how to do.

The first thing I discovered was that students have difficulty in distinguishing between knowing something and knowing how to do something. Fifty-eight of their responses related to knowing something, and 119 related to knowing how to do something. Second, there were serious differences in our conceptions regarding what the drama of art teaching entailed. The students saw themselves as actors- and set-designers-to-be, and I wanted to see them as playwrights, directors, and critics as well.

For example, a substantial number--49%--of the knowing-how-to-do responses related to some aspect of the physical act of teaching or to what were essentially technical or management matters--things such as speaking clearly, giving precise assignments, motivating students, dealing with administrators, arranging effective displays, budgeting, relating well to students, etc. Only 2% of the students mentioned knowing about art curricula and only 7% mentioned knowing how to develop curricula. None mentioned curriculum evaluation.

Obviously my view of the art teacher as script writer and critic needed to be reconciled with my student's intuitively perceived roles of performer/director/stage manager. It is essential, I think, that arts teachers and arts-teachers-to-be possess a comprehensive view of the multiple roles that they must play in the theater of arts teaching. And of all the roles that they play, I believe that writing the script is the most important. Without a script there is no play, no performance, nothing to criticize no meaning--nothing.

Arts teachers need to possess lots of cognitive and aesthetic materials from which to form their teaching scripts. These scripts, like other works of art, are derived just as much from the artists' knowledge of art, style, theme, subject, and composition as from the artist's imagination and life experience. The teacher, like the artist, who is aware of the greatest number of works of art, who has been to the most places either in "reality" or in imagination, who has felt the most, and dreamed the most, is the one who potentially has the most material from which to create his or her plans for teaching. In any of the arts there is much to know.

In 1971, I developed a table of specifications in which the various components of the content of the visual arts were outlined (Wilson, 1971). Included were: (1) media, tools, and forming processes; (2) visual structure (composition); (3) subject matter (events, themes, symbols, allegories, expressive content); (4) art forms (types of art works); (5) cultural context (history--artists, dates, periods, locations, styles, functions); and (6) art theory and criticism. Similar sets of content could be specified, or has been specified, for each of the arts. I am convinced that one of the crucial aspects of teacher evaluation is to determine how much of the content of a particular art the teacher or potential teacher has acquired.

When I begin to size up a teacher, I ask questions and listen for signs that will tell me whether or not there is a sufficient base of knowledge and experience to enable the teacher to write into his or her arts-teaching scripts the broad content of art, and to authentically characterize the roles of performer, historian, critic, aesthetician, and connoisseur.

Picking Playwrights and Performers: How to Spot a Potential Success.

Anyone who has had the responsibility of hiring new teachers has probably developed key questions to provide insights into the art-related knowledge possessed by the candidate. Twenty-five years ago when I was an art supervisor, I used to ask candidates for teaching positions to name their "favorite" living American artist--one whose work they especially enjoyed viewing, or one whose work they would like their own art to be like. When candidates could not name a single American artist, or when they answered Picasso, Walt Disney, or Norman Rockwell, their chances for a position in my school district was greatly diminished. I was looking for teachers who lived in the contemporary world of art, who might provide suitable art-related role-models, candidates who also had an extensive knowledge of art history, were capable of having meaningful and insightful experiences with art, and who were dedicated to the production of art.

The Trivia-Pursuit of Art.

Recently I have devised a more systematic and comprehensive variation of my old "who is your favorite artist" question. It took the form of two art trivia quizzes. I use these instruments with my students to help them (and me) to see how cognitively-oriented they are to the world of art. If I were to either hire or evaluate arts teachers, I might use similar instruments. Let me tell you what they are like.

One of the best ways to discover how fully a student or an art teacher has immersed herself or himself in the world of art is to ask questions that are not likely to have been learned in an art class--the kind of knowledge that one gets from reading art magazines, visiting art museums and galleries, or otherwise searching through the contemporary "museum without walls" to find sources for one's own creations and resources for one's art teaching scripts.

I have a quiz titled, "Art Trivia Pursuit: The New York Art Scene, 1970 to 1985." In the quiz there are questions such as, "What is the 'newest and hottest' area in Manhattan for the establishment of art galleries?" (East Village); "Name two of the four art magazines that regularly cover the New York art scene?" (Art News, Arts, Art Forum, Art in America); "What British artist who lives and works primarily in the United States is currently re-exploring Cubist ideas through composite works made from scores of photographs of bit-parts of a single subject? (P.S.: He wears mis-matched socks and dyes his hair blond.)", (David Hockney); "What art museum located on Madison Avenue is devoted solely to American Art?" (Whitney); and "The most successful and most talked about New York Gallery of the 1970's and 80's carries the name of its owner. Name him." (Leo Catelli). On 14 such questions, the median score for my twenty students was zero. As a group the students answered 11% of the questions correctly. Twenty-five percent could name two art magazines, none knew of Leo Castelli's gallery, three of the students could name the SoHo area of galleries, and two could name the artist Frank Stella. So much for my students being carriers of the world of contemporary art. (Before my colleagues and I are finished with them, however, we hope that they will be. After the quiz we took them to New York and brought them into direct contact with most of the art and the places asked about on my quiz.) But knowledge of the contemporary art scene keeps about as long as unrefrigerated fish; they will have to learn to keep up. Art teachers who are well informed rate very highly in my book. I know a few who could answer most of the questions on my quiz.

I have a somewhat less trivial quiz titled: "American Art from 1900 to 1970". This quiz is designed to show my students how much or how little they know about the art of their own country and century. They do better on this quiz then on the "New York Art Scene", but still there are appalling gaps in their knowledge. Not one of my students could name a single artist from "the Eight" (the Ash Can School) and none knew of the Armory Show. About half, however, could name Jackson Pollack's painting technique, and Andy Warhol's favorite food. Nearly a quarter of my students knew that Abstract Expressionism was the first major art style to originate in America, and could characterize the work of Roy Lichtenstein and Andrew Wyeth. As a group my students could answer 18% of 38 questions about American art in this century. The median score was four points. Although I have not done any formal testing, numerous conversations with art teachers lead me to speculate that they would do little better than my undergraduate students.

The Timeline in Your Head.

One of the crucial aspects of the teaching of a history of any of the arts is for the teacher-guide to possess a reasonably well formed picture of the trail along which students will be led--to know what came first, next, and so on. (Nearly one-third of my students said that they thought that it was important for an art teacher to know "the history of art.") To discover just how well acquainted with the art history trail students actually were, I ask them to complete this task:

> The history of Western art has been depicted as a time-line with points showing dates, places, major works of art, and important artists. Show how much you know about the history of Western art by drawing a time-line with key dates, places, artists, and works.

In 30-minutes, students can average 50 dates, places, artists, and works--one about every 36 seconds. One student in a group of 17 produced 111 reasonably accurately placed elements, another produced a total of 14, and placed Rembrandt, Angelo (sic), and Picasso in the Renaissance. For comparison, I asked a high school art instructor, who teaches advance placement art history with phenomenal success, to do a 30-minute time-line. She produced 349 entries, all accurate. Which of these two is best equipped to teach art?

Criticism's Critical Function.

My testing of arts teachers would certainly not stop with what they can recall about the history of art. One of the primary functions of the arts teacher is to be a critic. We sometimes recoil at the term critic as we imagine some powerful arbiter of taste pronouncing what is good art and what is not. (And we do rely upon the drama critic to help us to avoid inferior plays and indifferent productions.) There is, however, quite another view of the critic; that which sees the critic as an insightful guide who uses words to point to features and aspects of a work of art that others, less experienced in art, might overlook.

I think that it is essential that an arts teacher have well developed critical skills so that they might fulfill the "educative function of criticism" (Stolnitz, 1960). Much of arts teaching is accomplished through the medium of words. Art criticism is essentially an act of recreating a work of art through the medium of words--words employed insightfully, and often metaphorically and poetically.

Let me point to a field other than may own to illustrate what I mean by good criticism. Whenever I can I listen to Karl Haas's "Adventures in Good Listening" on public radio. Here is a superb example of the educative function of criticism. Haas is like a wise and experienced guide who points out with words the musical trail over which we have just travelled or will soon travel. He notes the important features and qualities that I should look for and tells me why they are there. He relates the music to me, my emotions, and my life. My hearing is enhanced enormously through his efforts. Any teacher of the arts should aspire to be a good critic. If arts teachers had to take competency tests I would place the critical function among the most important skills to be evaluated.

Early in my research career, I compared art teachers' writing about Picasso's "Guernica" with that of historians and critics (Wilson, 1971). When I learned of the narrow set of features of the work about which art teachers wrote, of their absence of reasonable criteria, and of the fact that the average number of critical sentences written by art teachers about one of the most important works of the twentieth-century was six, I began to teach criticism and test for art critical competency.

I present to my students at least three distinct yet complementary philosophical systems from which critical criteria and practices can be drawn--(1) the synthetic criterion of "flavorful" qualification, vividness, and intensity of the experience of the aesthetic work of art (Dewey, 1934); (2) the analytic criterion of organistic unity (Bosanquet, 1931 and Pepper, 1945); and the criterion of essences of universals, cultural norms, and materials as drawn from Plato by Pepper (1945). I want my students to be able to write about a single work of art using each of these criteria. To test their critical accomplishments I present them with a single work of art, Kathe Kollwitz's "Death Reaches for a Child," for example. Students are asked to write a short paragraph about the work as a contextualist critic might. I analyze their writing to determine whether they can produce a paradigm example of each critical type; to determine the extent to which they have recreated the work insightfully, metaphorically, and poetically; and finally, to determine whether or not they have interpreted as essential meaning of the work.

Of course, criticism in the arts classroom is directed not just toward the works of artists, but also toward the works of students. Thus the critical act has two distinct foci, formative--while the student's work (often in response to a specific assignment) is in progress, and summative--when the work is completed. In both cases the criteria are the same. However, in the formative stages criticism is appropriately directed toward what is not yet in the work (the aspects of the assignment that have not yet been addressed) as well as what is there. The final criticism should, as far as possible, attend only to the features and aspects present in the work. Now every work can encompass everything.

In sh , the arts teacher should be able to critically explicate and evaluate the works of artists, and also be able to assess the productions of his or her students. If I were hiring a teacher I would want to determine whether or not the candidate was an insightful critic.

Evaluating Production.

We expect an arts teacher to be a producer or a performer of one of the arts. And, of course, the most reasonable way to judge products and performances is to look at them and to apply the appropriate critical criteria. I think that we should "require" candidates for arts teaching positions to carry their portfolios, tapes, video tapes and other evidence of their productive and performance competence with them to interviews. (At Penn State we have our undergraduates prepare portfolios as a part of their undergraduate program.) I would even go so far as to use growth in the areas of performance and production as criteria for the advancement of public school teachers just as we do for college professors.

And if a prospective art teacher came for an interview without a portfolio here are some tasks that I would give the individual in order to determine some basic graphic and compositional competencies:

Writing the Script.

Why is it that the arts teachers with the least experience as performers frequently think that they can wing it with improvisation? Improvisation--good improvisation--requires that the performer have dozens of scripts committed to memory, and literally hundreds of routines that can be combined and elaborated upon endlessly. Few if any beginning teachers possess such gifts. I am convinced, therefore, that successful teaching begins with good script writing.

Whereas the teachers of some school subjects can rely upon canned lessons from textbooks, most arts teachers either cannot or do not. Consequently, if they don't write their own scripts they must rely on improvisation. And if teachers rely too much upon improvisation there is a tendency for them to ignore concepts relating to art, while placing an inordinate emphasis upon the productive and performance aspects of the arts. The frequent result is that students make and perform art while learning little about the meanings of the things that they do (Taylor, 1957).

I spent a year observing a large school system that had an exemplary art program in which there was an unusual degree of parity among the creative, critical, and conceptual aspects of art learning (Wilson, 1985). I concluded that the primary success of this district could be attributed, first, to the fact that the district had a comprehensive set of curriculum guides that specified history and criticism along with studio activities, second, that all teachers were expected to follow their curriculum guides, third, that every lesson taught was documented by a fully developed unit and daily plan, and fourth, that these plans were checked by building principals and subject supervisors. I concluded that the emphasis placed on careful planning was the key ingredient that made the teachers as a group the most professional that I have ever encountered in art education. I am convinced that only when we see arts teachers writing comprehensive scripts will we see a general improvement in the teaching of the arts.

Script Specifications.

What expectations should we have for the unit and lesson plans that are to guide arts teaching? What should they contain and how should we judge their quality? I realize that to ask what arts lessons should be like is much the same as asking what works of art should be like There are many different kinds of art and these different kinds of art function in a myriad of ways. Perhaps expectations for art and lesson plans is mainly a matter of taste. Still, in order to evaluate I must take a stand. And here it is. I believe that all unit lesson plans in the arts should, first, have students encounter important works of art, and second, engage them in an inquiry into the meanings of the realities of their world(s) as reflected through those works.

Perhaps the best I can do is to specify and to justify some of my tastes in both art instruction and lesson plans. I'll do this by indicating some of the relationships that I think should exist between arts lesson plans and works of art themselves, and by outlining some essential characteristics that I think all lesson plans should possess. We should then be in the position of being able to judge how well teachers are able to perform as script writers.

Let me begin by indicating what I think arts lessons should not be, and then get to the should-be's. I believe that there are lots of silly school practices masquerading as art. (I must say that here I refer to the visual arts, I can only guess that the observation might hold true for the other arts.) Zillions of little exercises such as lessons that have as their sole outcome the blowing of paint through straws to make blobs with tentacles, lessons that have as their objective the "creation" of a design that has three kinds of lines, or the use of various media to create shapes. Gimmicky technical practices, and trivial design exercises have developed to such an extent that they comprise a genre of their own--school art--that has few connections either to the things that artists do or to the products of artistic and aesthetic inquiry.

How might arts unit plans avoid the trivial preoccupations of the school art genre? Perhaps there are lots of ways. I give my students a task with expectations and specifications so explicit that it is my hope that these budding script writers will be compelled to deal with the essential meanings of art, and with the fundamental behaviors associated with making, studying, and experiencing art. Here are some of the requirements excerpted from my assignments for the creation of unit plans in the visual arts (the assigned unit was to deal with some aspect of twentieth-century American Art.)

1. Your unit plan is to be organized around either a single work of art or a group of related works of art, e.g.:
    a. Works by one artist--Lichtenstein's paintings from comics; Grant Wood's America; Georgia O'Keefe's flowers; Claus Oldenberg's monuments; Christo's wrappings; etc.
    b. Works in one style by several artists--the abstract expressionist painting by deKooning, Gorky, Pollack, Klein and Rothko, etc.
    c. Works dealing with a single subject--the flower in art, 20th-century beauties and beasts: changing images of women in art; the self-portraits of Ivan Albright; etc.
    d. Works dealing with a major theme--imaginary cities: the prophetic reality in architectural drawings; joy and celebration; 20th-century war and peace; visions of anxiety and despair; etc.

2. At least one of the unit lesson should deal primarily with art history, one lesson primarily with art criticism, and one lesson primarily with art making.

3. You are to think of the unit plan and especially the individual lesson plans as a script that outlines everything that you the teacher-lead-actor will say, ask, read, show, perform, demonstrate, assign, accomplish, etc. Your script should also indicate what your students (the supporting-actors, and audience) will view, answer, learn, perform, feel. Your script should also describe the setting, the arrangement, the props (the visual materials) of the stage-classroom. And I say to my students, "since you are an artist--an individual who should be concerned with aesthetic and visual qualities--your plan is to be designed as if by a graphic designer. That is to say, try to make your plans into exquisite combinations of visual images and words that are both a pleasure to look at and easy to follow.

Additionally, I insist that the unit plans have: (1) a *descriptive title* for the entire unit and one for each of the *major components or groups of lessons* within the unit--"deKooning: from realism to abstraction and back again;" (2) *a rationale* which outlines the theme or subject of the unit, why the choice has been made to organize the unit around a particular set of works of art, why these works have been selected, information about the works and the artist who created them, (3) *the principle ideas and concepts about art the students are to learn, (e.g.,* that both realistic and abstract paintings reveal important information about the world; that artists extend and transform images derived from the work of other artists; that art critics use metaphors and analogies to characterize the qualities of works of art; that art historians trace the effect of earlier works of art on later works, that artists get their ideas for art from personal experience, from dreams, and from fantasies); and (4) *overall goals, and statements of writing that are to either be read by students, or read to them* (This *requirement enables the critic of the script to determine* how successfully the play might be received by specific audiences--whether it is too difficult or too simple.).

I am, of course, the critic of my students' unit plans, but I also try to teach them to be skillful critics of their plans and the plans of others. And it seems to me that the canons of art criticism provide the most useful criteria for determining the merit and quality of arts lesson plans. I apply the following four criteria:

1. How well does the script cohere to essential features of art? Does it convey important concepts about art? For example, (a) is there evidence that students will engage in the same general kinds of ideational, creative and skillful studio activities that artists might--that they will be led to resolve with some of the same essential problems that artists try to solve? (b) Is there evidence that students will engage in art historical-like inquiry--that they will be guided to develop conceptions of past, present, and future realities or self and world through the study of works of art? Will students investigate works of art in light of their historical context in order to see the way in which art both forms and is formed by culture?; will students be encouraged to develop theories about why works of art look as they do?; will they search for the influence that one group of works has on subsequent works of art?; will they interpret meanings of symbols and allegories?; and will they gain skill in classifying works of art according to artist, style, school, period, and location? And (c) is there evidence the script will help students to become skillful critics of art? Are there activities during which they insightfully, meaningfully, and imaginatively recreate works of art through the medium of words? Does it seem that they will be guided toward the appropriate metaphorical, analogical, descriptive, analytical, and judgmental means during the process of responding to works of art orally and especially in writing?

The first very long three-part criterion for evaluating arts-unit scripts can probably be traced to Plato and his insistence upon judging the particular according to the degree of its correspondence to an ideal, and essence, or a universal. In effect I am maintaining that, if art instruction centers upon works of art, and involves students in the same kinds of activities in which artists, historians, and critics engage, then we will avoid much of the wrong-headed silliness that I have already claimed frequently characterizes arts education. But I am not satisfied with leaving all my judgmental eggs in Plato's basket.

2. The organistic aesthetic criterion of Fry and Bell also provides a useful basis upon which to evaluate lesson plans. Do all of the individual parts of the plan--the works of art, the rationale, the goals and objectives, the concepts, the theme, the teaching strategies, the assignments, the evaluation procedures--cohere as a well organized unit? Does every part of the plan call for every other part of the plan? Are there no parts that mar the unity of the whole? Is there no part that could be removed without effecting the structure? Are there no demands left unfulfilled?

3. Dewey's Art as Experience also provides an essential evaluational criterion. Is there evidence that in the aesthetic transaction between the student audience and the performance of the script that there will be created a heightened and uniquely flavored feeling of vividness and intensity? Can the unit plan be grasped intuitively and synthetically as a rich fusion of quality?

4. And finally, the hedonists expectations can be applied to unit-scripts. Does the plan and the teaching that might flow from it give evidence or providing pleasure--for both performers and audience? Does it appear that the students being taught from the plan would become caught-up in a series of highly pleasurable experiences?

In effect, I have said that the best criteria for judging the scripts for arts teaching are the same as those applied when judging works of art.

Judging Scriptwriters.

The best way to judge typewriting skill is to put an individual at a typewriter, say type this, and time him or her to determine how many words the individual types a minute with how many errors. The valid way to judge arts script writing is to ask teachers and teachers-to-be to write unit and lesson plans. Let me outline the kind of task I expect my students to be successful at (If I were hiring an arts teacher I might give a similar task as a part of the interview process, and I would also look at the planning of experienced teachers to see if they were fulfilling the essential conditions of the task):

> The Task: You have been given a packet of materials containing a copy of Velazquez's painting, Las Meninas, and three pieces of writing (by Dale Brown, 1969; Michel Foucault, 1970; Jansen, 1963) about the 9-by-10 foot canvas considered by many to be the painter's finest work.
>
> Your task during the next three hours is to write an art unit plan and at least five individual lesson plans based on ideas developed from Las Meninas.

Although my students already know that the unit is to have title; be based on concepts; have lessons relating to history, criticism, and studio; have general goals and specific objectives; a detailed script outlining teacher and student actions, evaluational procedures, and they know the criteria by which scripts are judged--I remind them again anyway.

Some of the important things to be discovered about arts teachers and potential arts teachers who are asked to create a unit plan on the spot are (1) are they able to see the themes and concepts about art that might reveal themselves through a single work of art? (In the case of Las Meninas some of the themes might be: the artist in his studio, families, beauty and the beast, etc.; and some of the concepts about art might include: through portraits the artist interprets the personalities of those he or she paints; artists present several levels of reality simultaneously; the artist can compose works so that spectators become participants; etc.) (2) Are they able to take some of the themes and concepts revealed through the work and then organize them into (a) an art history lesson in which there is a locating of the work in context and a relating of it to other works of art, (b) an art criticism lesson in which the work is recreated in the medium of words, and (c) one or more studio lessons in which students are encouraged to work in ways similar to the thematic, formal, technical, and symbolic aspects of the work.

I think that any arts teacher should be able to take any important or significant work of art and infer from it 4 themes, concepts, and 4 sets of expressive, formal, stylistic and symbolic problems that would provide the basis for a unit of instruction in the arts. If I were to hire an arts teacher I would check to determine if the candidate possessed an ability of this kind.

The Performance

Stage Setting.

The curtain rises, finally, on the performance of our arts play. We are in an arts classroom about to observe the act of teaching. We look at the set in an effort to determine what the play will be like. Inasmuch as we have been recently awed by the majestic authenticity of Franco Zefferelli's sets for the Metropolitan Opera's Tosca, we look to see the kind of stage setting the teacher has built. And just as Zefferelli modeled his sets after the interiors of buildings in Rome, we look to see what our arts teacher has modeled his or classroom after. Has the room been made to look like an authentic rehearsal hall, dance studio, museum, gallery, or artist's studio; or does it appear merely as another institutional setting, where the hardness of brick and tile model nothing more than other school rooms, or worse, other institutions such as prisons and hospitals?

Classrooms teach. I once spent the better part of two years studying working class British secondary modern school students who had spent three years in an art room that looked very much like the Victoria and Albert Museum. There was a Jocabian refectory table and chairs (that should have been in the V and A), tiles, crockery, carvings, objects and fragments from the whole history of Britain. By living in that setting some students learned to play the role of the connoisseur, and remain connoisseurs today.

In my recently completed study of the art program in Virginia Beach City Schools, I concluded that a significant proportion of the outstanding knowledge of art history possessed by the students in the district could be attributed to an unusually high quality of the well labeled, continually changing displays of reproductions of works of art in 70 art classrooms of the district (Wilson, 1985). I would evaluate arts teachers on the basis of the sets that they design. My judgments would be based on the degree to which the rooms modeled the essences of the places in which art is made and performed.

Acting.

It is finally time to move to the performance of the actors--the dimension of teaching that my neophyte teachers think counts more than anything else. And of course my students are right in at least one respect; the best play in the world, badly performed, is a failure.

What do we look for in the performance of actors? There have been numerous instruments developed for analyses of the interaction of teacher and student, and for determining the level of inquiry to which the teacher leads the student (give references and descriptions). We could observe also how well the teacher has learned the lines of the script, and how clearly and with what authority the lines are spoken. Of course we should expect that the lines and actions have been sufficiently rehearsed that there need not be a continual looking at the script. And we should expect that the actors follow the script--to a degree. We must remember, however, that no teaching performance can be so carefully scripted as to account for all lines and all actions. Teaching is a play in which there is audience participation, or perhaps more accurately stated, the students frequently join the troop. Students are, in effect, actors who have some general notions about the roles that they are to play even though they have not seen the script before the production. We might look to see how skillfully the teacher/lead actor provides student/supporting actors with their cues and how well he or she reinforces their best performances.

But more than anything else, I would look at to see the degree to which the arts teacher is able to play multiple roles--the success with which he or she convincingly assumes the character of the artist, the composer, the conductor, the choreographer, the critic, the historian, the aesthetician, the connoisseur. Each role is demanding; the playing of each requires getting inside the skin of another. But there is more, playing these roles requires knowing at least something of what each of these characters knows. More importantly, it requires knowing how each goes about his or her disciplined inquiry, production, performance, or direction. In short, if learning in the arts is assumed, as I assume it to be, learning to create as the artist, composer, choreographer, or playwright does; perform as the actor, dancer, or musician does; inquire as the historians of the arts do; and analyze, interpret and judge as critics of the arts do, then the teacher should be the model for each role that is appropriate to his or her artistic discipline.

And how are we to determine if arts teachers are playing the multiple roles that I believe are required of them? Earlier, while making the case for the importance of script writing I said that initially arts teachers should not be overly reliant upon their improvisational abilities. Now I wish, for a moment, to maintain that watching an arts teacher improvise provides one of the best means of determining the performance capabilities of our actor-teacher. When I watch an art teacher move around the advance placement art classroom and hear her say to one student, "You're trying to use light and shadow almost like Caravaggio; let me show you a reproduction of his Calling of St. Matthew;" to the next student, "I can't help but respond to your painting as Ruskin might at his hedonistic best. I'm delighted by the sensuousness of your luscious paint, and by the delicate pinks against the roses;" and to a third, "You are using almost the same circular composition that I'm using in the painting that I worked on last night;" I know that the teacher can successfully play the several roles of the visual arts teacher. I know too, that the teacher has numerous set historical, critical, and productive routines available for on-the-spot modification and performance. I know also that from this teacher students will learn important things about art.

Final Bow.

I have attempted to characterize art teaching as a dramatic whole. Our formal attempts at arts teaching evaluation have been meager to date. Most attempts, it seems to me, have been to look at small bits of the production, and consequently to miss the entire drama. The theater to which I have tried to call attention is one in which the worlds of the arts are recreated for an audience of students by a teacher who can play all of the important roles in this complex drama. And if the teacher is skillful, creative, and insightful in script writing, stage setting, acting, directing, and criticizing, then students will acquire the cognitive and aesthetic fruits of art unobtainable from any lesser productions.

REFERENCES

Dewey, J. Art as Experience. New York: Capricorn, 1934.

Goodman, N. Ways of World Making. Chapter I, "Words, Works, Worlds", Indianapolis: Hacket Publishing Co., Inc., 1978.

Kreitler, H. and S. Kreitler. Psychology of the Arts. Durham, N.C.: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Stolnitz, J. The Educative Function of Criticism. Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966.

Taylor, J. C. Learning to Look. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Wilson, B. Relationships Among Art Teachers', Art Critics' and Historians' and Non-Art-Trained Individuals' Statements about Guernica. Studies in Art Education. Vol. 12, No. 1, Fall 1970.

Wilson, B. Tight Structure, Discipline, and Quality: Art Education in Virginia Beach. Art History, Art Criticism and Art Production. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Publications Series, 1984.

Brent Wilson is a Professor of Art at The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

A RESPONSE

Reviewing Scenes From a Complex Drama

Carol Kuykendall

Before responding to the dramatic theme of Professor Wilson's presentation, I'd like to qualify my status in this symposium. I'm not an art educator in the sense of discipline training, yet I am responsible for administrative support of the arts in the Houston Public Schools. Consequently, in my job as the school system's Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, I spend as much time on the arts as on reading, writing, and arithmetic--and I am committed to our city providing an arts education for it's children.

So much for scene-setting. Just keep the Houston scene and my supporting role in it in mind as I respond to Professor Wilson's remarks in a monologue laced with comments reflecting my own perspective as well as the position of my large urban school system. Also keep in mind that I speak as a supportive and enthusiastic interloper in this group--a non-arts educator who can speak with cavalier abandon of an amateur, perhaps the only person here who can afford to be brash.

I'd like to begin rather mildly by seconding at some length Dr. Wilson's first point about the indispensibility of the arts. Here, I'm in good company. You'll be heartened to know, if you didn't already, that the arts have been declared by no less august a body than the College Board on basic academic subject--one of only six; right up there with English, mathematics, science, social studies, and foreign language.

So strongly are the arts advocated in the College Board's recent publication _Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and be Able to Do_ that our Director of Art Education sent a copy to every guidance counselor in the District. In the brief section I'd like to read aloud, you'll hear echoes of Dr. Wilson's case for the indispensibility of the arts:

> The arts--visual arts, theater, music, and dance--challenge and extend human experience. They provide means of expression that go beyond ordinary speaking and writing. They can express intimate thoughts and feelings. They are a unique record of diverse cultures and how those cultures

> have developed over time. They provide distinctive ways of understanding human beings and nature. The arts are creative modes by which all people can enrich their lives both by self-expression and response to the expressions of others...
>
> Preparation in the arts will be valuable to college entrants whatever their intended field of study. The actual practice of the arts can engage the imagination, foster flexible ways of thinking, develop disciplined effort, and build self-confidence. Appreciation of the arts is integral to the understanding of other cultures sought in the study of history, foreign language, and social sciences.

This section continues by listing major competencies that should be developed in the arts--first generically, then more specifically in the fields of visual arts, music, drama, and dance. I understand from Tom Wolf, who coordinated work on this section of the book and on its sequel, that a full booklet on the arts will be released this month or next along with companion booklets on English, mathematics, science, social studies, and foreign language. That's encouraging.

There is a great deal more to say about the importance of the arts as disciplines, about art for art's sake. Since in this group that would be preaching to the choir, let me go beyond what's obvious to all of us and talk about the arts beyond the arts classroom, about how the arts seem to support academic learning and perhaps cognitive development itself.

It is here that I risk crossing the line into brashness and perhaps parting company with a few of you. In early 1983 when commissioned by my superintendent to comb the literature for any available evidence that the arts might enhance academic learning and the development of thinking, I dredged up the published proceedings of a conference held in San Antonio, Texas, back in 1978--a conference featuring presentations by distinguished leaders in your field, names that most of you would know. Indeed some of you may have been here. This conference, titled "The Arts in Cognition," yielded some of the most promising theory and recommendations for further study that I have been able to find to date. It pointed in a direction that is only now gaining wide currency. When I kept asking what came of that conference, why the impetus was not sustained, why nothing much seemed to happen as a result, I got politely vague answers. All of those answers pointed in one rather embarrassing direction: apparently it was art educators themselves who scuttled the actions proposed by conferees, art educators who resisted the notion of arts in education or arts in cognition. Rumor has it that some art educators in my state and beyond are even today determined to protect the sanctity of their disciplines by keeping them the pristine province of arts classes taught by arts specialists--not, God forbid, mainstreamed so that the arts permeate the curriculum.

Yet it is exactly the latter that we want to happen in Houston--not to lessen emphasis on the arts as specialized disciplines but to extend their influence and capitalize on their power. That is why fourteen of our elementary schools will be participating next year in the Texas Institute for Arts in Education, an adaptation of the Lincoln Center model. That is why the arts will figure prominently in the summer leadership workshop for principals titled "Creating a Support System for Higher-Level Thinking and Learning."

At this point, let me double back and explain why we are so committed to this direction. A little more than three years ago, it was my superintendent who asked other leaders in our district to ponder a striking phenomenon. For more than a decade, Magnet schools have attracted students from every part of Houston. From the very beginning, the drawing power of fine arts programs has been especially powerful. Through the years, it has become increasingly apparent that such schools have more in common than a strong concentration on the arts: all maintain exceptional levels of academic achievement. Geographically, ethnically, and socio-economically, students in these schools are as diverse as the city itself. Yet their academic achievement consistently exceeds that in their home schools.

What factors, we asked ourselves, account for this academic success. Is motivation the key? Certainly students want to be in Magnet schools where they can pursue special interests in music, drama, dance, and the visual arts; so do teachers. Even parents must make a commitment. But is motivation the _only_ key? Are there other elements in these schools that enhance learning? Is it possible that the arts themselves develop the capacity to learn, indeed develop those higher-order thinking skills we hear so much about these days?

It was this question we set about to research--not just in the literature but in our own school district. No, we haven't yet found definitive answers; but we have found some promising evidence and at least a few fellow travelers. Consider this statement by British educator John Coe in discussing a survey of schools in his country:

> The survey found that basic skills were highest where the curriculum was _widest_.... If the basic skills are embedded in a web of direct experiences on the part of the child that engage many facets of his personality and being, then the basic skills grow most _strongly_.

Doesn't that sound a lot like the arts? I think so. I also think that such words need to be heard on this side of the Atlantic. In well-intentioned attempts to insure academic rigor--the slogan of the '80's is *excellence*--states across this country are mandating time allotments in elementary and middle schools and credit requirements in high schools that threaten to squeeze fine arts completely out of the curriculum. Given our observations in Houston, that's quite an irony.

Maybe our belief in the indispensibility of the arts will be more compelling if we can at least begin to explain it--not only in the terms Dr. Wilson used a few minutes ago, art teacher to art teacher--but educator to educator. What is it about the arts that seem to make them so fundamental to learning?

Since I heard him speak just last week and his words are still ringing in my ears, let me quote Tom Wolf, artist, art teacher, and art advocate. Better yet, let me read briefly from his book *The Arts Go to School*. Tom makes the point the arts are more like those quintessential basics--reading, writing, and arithmetic--than most people think:

> Past the second month of Kindergarten, most basic-skills learning absolutely depends on the ability to handle letters and numbers fluently. Learning to use these and other symbols (like maps and equations) is possibly the biggest task any school-age child faces. Symbol-using skills are just as essential in the arts. Knowing what words to use in what order is as important in writing science fiction stories as it is in writing lab reports. Getting the numbers right matters just as much in musical composition as it does in word problems.
>
> The arts do not offer more "practice and drill" in symbol use; instead, they offer children some unique opportunities to figure out how symbols work....Experience with artistic symbol use often provides important, if unrecognized, support to basic symbolic learning.

Here, let me be very careful. I am *not* suggesting that teaching the arts will raise standardized test scores in reading, or for that matter in anything else. What I *am* suggesting is that the arts support and perhaps enhance academic learning, that they embody a process fundamental to the three R's themselves. The commonality of that process struck me anew last week as I heard Tom Wolf claim that artists in all fields follow steps I had previously thought of only in terms of my own specialty, writing, and its flip side, reading. These shared steps Tom defined as planning, drafting, editing, and polishing.

In writing, that process is obvious. A piece starts in the head with a period of discovery, germination, planning. The first attempt at putting words on paper is tentative; the first draft is seldom the last. As Yeats said, making poems takes lots of scrubbing and polishing. All writing involves trying things out, discarding, keeping, reworking, refining. Is that really so different from perfecting an oil painting, a fugue, a ballet, a dramatic scene?

One value of the arts is that they they seem to develop what Tom Wolf calls "stick-to-it-tiveness," the ability to work through those intricate processes we just talked about, to stay with a task, to pay attention to detail. The connection between such sustained effort and good study habits is clear.

I am convinced that the arts do more intellectually than teach good study habits. They teach us to see. Here, I am using the word see very broadly, the way an artist used it when he said, "Learning to draw is really a matter of learning to see--and that means a great deal more than just looking through your eyes." What another artist calls "the intelligent eye" applies also to the intelligent ear. It is really perception, a kind of thinking much neglected in the schools--that despite the fact that in Neisser's words perception is where cognition and reality meet.

If you doubt the importance of perception--which I maintain can be most directly taught through the arts--let Rudolph Arnheim explain: "The cognitive operations called thinking are not the privilege of mental processes above and beyond perception, but the essential ingredients of perception itself. I am referring to such operations as active exploration, selection, grasping of essentials, simplification, abstraction, analysis and synthesis, completion, correction, comparison, problem solving."

I make such a point of the need to cultivate perception partly because I find it so blithely assumed and therefore so terribly neglected in the schools and partly because I think it is becoming more and more important as we move deeper and deeper into the Age of Technology. Edward de Bono, a psychologist whose speciality is training people to think better, says this: "Most thinking takes place in the perceptual stage. Only very rarely and in very special circumstances is complex logical progression or mathematical processing required. As computers come to take over more and more of our second-stage thinking, the burden will fall more and more on the first stage, perception."

Let's leave that thought hanging in the air as I sum up our school district's commitment to the indispensibility of the arts. Let me do so by saying "amen" to everything Dr. Wilson said, but go further by reaffirming our hypothesis that the arts support academic learning and cognitive growth by developing the ability to use symbols, to make meaning, to handle intricate processes, to stick with tasks, to perceive. The list could go on, but let me cut it off there and dash a little cold water.

Young people will develop none of these abilities unless they are taught. Indispensible as the arts are, they are not magical. As Dr. Wilson says, the arts must be taught and taught well.

The booklet from the College Board makes that point this way:

> Works of art often involve subtle meanings and complex systems of expression. Fully appreciating such works requires the careful reasoning and sustained study that lead to informed insight. Moreover, just as thorough understanding of science requires laboratory or field work, so fully understanding the arts involves first-hand work in them.

Where I come from, it's fashionabble to pay lip service to the arts but a bit less fashionable to teach them; I mean really teach them. Too often I heard that being interested in the arts or being good in one of them is really just a matter of exposure; some have had it and some have not. I'm convinced that all students need to be taught--those whose mothers are dancers and fathers are symphony conductors as well as those who have never been inside a museum or theatre. So it is with what we call talent. Regardless of exposure and regardless of talent, students need to be taught art. They need to learn how artworks work.

Howard Gardner, whose work with Project Zero at Harvard many of you know, is very clear on this point. His ten-year studies of artistic development in children leave Gardner convinced that only very young children (ages two through seven) should be left alone to let their artistic abilities unfold naturally. After that, even before adolescence, he believes in a more active, interventionist stance by teachers--what he terms a "rigorously structured educational program," in other words, the kind of teaching our previous speaker looks for when he visits classrooms.

Concurrence on the indispensibility of teaching as well as the indispensibility of the arts brings us to the real Crux of Dr. Wilson's presentation, that complex drama of teaching and his criteria as critic in that classroom theater.

Here, most of my questions are questions of emphasis rather than substance. At times, issues I would place front and center with full spotlight seemed relegated to the shadows upstage. Then, as an observer of many classrooms, I have a major question of casting. Let me start with that.

It makes me edgy when teachers script lesson plans in which they have most of the lines, in which they are the stars and students the audience, only occasionally invited to join the troop. When I observe classes, I can tell most by observing the students, by listening to what they say, watching what they do. Learning is seldom a spectator event, and I'd rather see the teacher directing--indeed coaching--than performing.

In one of the better education reports we've been deluged with the last couple of years, Theodore Sizer insists, "Education's job today is less in purveying information than in helping people use it." Show me a teacher with the starring role in a classroom, and I'll show you a purveyor of information.

Now I realize that the kind of information Dr. Wilson wants teachers to have and to teach is important. I agree that teachers should know and that students should learn art history and art criticism as well as art making--though to me the latter should always have top billing. But most people do not learn just by being told, no matter how brilliantly. And most students will lose interest if art sounds like artifact.

Maybe I can communicate my concern more clearly if I shift into my own discipline and use it as analogy to art. After college courses stressing literary history and literary criticism, too many novice English teachers teach straight from their college lecture notes. That's what my student teachers at Rice always wanted to do: teach their senior seminar on the Victorian novel or the New Criticism, to six-graders, yet. I still see instances of that today, and the result is just as dismal. Students in such classrooms study about literature, but they do not participate in it. They just admire it from a respectful distance and never make it a part of their lives.

That analogy is not meant to imply that art history and art criticism should not be taught, but that teaching them takes a careful script--one that gives students principal roles, not bit parts. I'm thinking of one of those delightfully complex dramas in which Gabriella Rico of San Jose State had her students view slides of works from the Middle Ages and invent their own metaphors for Medieval Art. I'm thinking also of that virtuoso teacher Dr. Wilson described as she moved about her art classroom making those remarkably apt and richly substantive comments about student work. That, to me, is the key: focus on the student whether that student is making his or her own art or responding to someone else's.

Again let me draw a parallel to my own discipline. Louise Rosenblatt, perhaps our foremost expert in the study of literature, has long held that the reader is not just "blank tape registering a ready-made message....The reader," she says, "brings to the text his past experiences and present personality. Under the magnetism of the ordered symbols of the text, he marshals his resources and crystallizes out from the stuff of memory, thought, and feelings a new order, a new experience." Not coincidentally, Rosenblatt calls this kind of transaction between reader and text aesthetic reading.

It is the opportunity for that aesthetic transaction I'm urging. What I am discouraging is the presentation of art as something fixed, hermetically sealed. Certainly, it is not Dr. Wilson's intent that it should be. I am shamelessly exaggerating to make a point--the point that learning is by definition active. The teachers I give rave reviews are coaxers, coaches, and consultants. Their students are the stars.

To conclude, let me throw a couple of bouquets across these imaginary footlights--to Dr. Wilson and to you. One of those bouquets if for not shrinking away from evaluation, evaluation of that complex human act called teaching, made even more complex by the very nature of your discipline. I especially endorse the rigor Dr. Wilson requires of prospective teachers in his recommendation to audition teachers of the arts, to examine portfolios of personal work. I like the way Dr. Wilson refuses to flinch from the term "behavioral objective," though I must say that he is the only one I've ever heard introduce such objectives "It would be nice if..." In making sure that prospective teachers can script good lessons plans, I like Dr. Wilson's essay test requiring students to write such a script on demand. A student favorably evaluated by Dr. Wilson is one we would hire in a minute!

The other bouquet I'd like to toss is more generic and it goes to all arts educators. It is for being arts educators during these very trying times, for enriching not just students but whole schools and the very quality of life beyond. My superintendent and many of us on his staff are learning a great deal from art educators and their colleagues back in Texas.

REFERENCES

Arnheim, Rudolf. Visual Thinking. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Berthoff, Ann E. The Making of Meaning. Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 1984.

The College Board. Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do. New York: The College Board, 1983.

de Bono, Edward. "The Direct Teaching of Thinking as Skill," The Fourth R: Reasoning. (ed.) Richard M. Bassone. New York: Center for Advanced Study in Education, 1983.

Gardner, Howard. Art, Mind, and Brain. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1982.

Neisser, Ulric. Cognition and Reality. San Francisco: W. H. Freemand and Company, 1976.

New England Foundation for the Arts and Amercian Council for the Arts. The Arts Go to School: An Arts in Education Handbook. New York: American Council for the Arts, 1983.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. The Reader, the Text, the Poem. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.

Sizer, Theodore R. Hoarace's Compromised: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984.

Carol Kuykendall is the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum in The Houston Independent Public School District, Houston, Texas.

VII. BREAKOUT SESSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Orange Line Group Recommendations

Shirley Trusty Corey

(1) State boards of certification and the appropriate educational accreditation agencies should set up certification criteria and standards, similar to those that exist for music and visual arts, for both dance and theatre specialists, K - 12. Rationale: At present, provision for certification of dance teachers exists only under the banner of physical education as a "movement specialist," and theatre is generally recognized, for purposes of certification, only as part of English and speech at the secondary level. This lack of certification causes schools to neglect these arts or to hire temporary visiting artists in dance and theatre, if they want to provide students with comprehensive arts experiences. But such sporadic exposure cannot constitute a non-going, sequential program of instruction in these areas, nor do elementary classroom teachers have, at hand, the assistance they need in order to incorporate these arts into their general subject matter teaching.

(2) Colleges and universities should institute a new advanced degree for classroom teachers -- Master of Education, Specialist in the Arts. This degree would begin to compensate for the notable lack of attention afforded the arts in the education of prospective elementary teachers and, at the same time, begin systematic development of a core of classroom teachers with capability in the arts. The specialization in fine and performing arts would permit classroom teachers to provide their own students with an enriched and vital experience in the arts. At the same time, their general expertise in the arts would permit them to assist other classroom teachers in integrating the arts into the total educational program. This new degree would allow sufficient concentrated emersion in the arts to provide the experienced classroom teacher with a general expertise, a level of understanding not now possible to offer through most baccalaureate or in-service programs.

Shirley Trusty Corey is the Director of the Arts in Education, New Orleans Parish Public Schools, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Red Line Group Recommendations

William R. Detmers

The breakout sessions during the symposium were small group interactions scheduled for the purpose of amplifing and extending the ideas set forth in the general sessions. Participants in these discussions were members of the audience who frequently interpreted the general comments of the major presenters in the context of the specifics of their own professional situations. Principals, superintendents, and classroom teachers looked at the ideas in terms of the day to day realities of public school teaching. Arts specialists looked at the ideas from the standpoint of teaching the arts in the context of general education. Higher education personnel looked at these same ideas in the context of teacher training programs. Hence, the breakout sessions provided a practical test of, and a contextual base for examining the ideas presented in the general sessions.

That agreement could be achieved and recommendations made by this diverse group of respondents is somewhat surprising in that there is a popular illusion that those in the classroom, those in administration, and those in higher education do not communicate all that often or all that well. Indeed, if the newspapers are any indication of public opinion, these professionals are often viewed as working at cross purposes. Thus the breakout sessions were an important aspect in the symposium because they provided a forum for communication on substantive issues in arts teacher education.

Comments from participants in the breakout sessions indicate that there was general agreement on the following four major themes:

1. The issue of quality. What constitutes quality is not so much the problem as is the question of achieving and measuring quality. Participant comments make it very clear that existing tests and measuring vehicles are problematic because they are not administered in a consistent manner, nor are they necessarily used in a manner consistent with their intent. Further, existing tests and evaluation procedures may not provide evidence of the full scope of what makes for a "good arts teacher". Recommendations included suggestions that school systems and arts teacher training institutions work together to provide qualitative pre-service educational experiences, and to continue to upgrade and improve arts instruction through workshops, in-service, and graduate programming designed for specific audiences (elementary classroom teachers, secondary teachers, supervisory personnel, etc.). That outreach may be difficult is

recognized, but it does not alter the fact of need. Evaluation may contribute directly to the achievement of qualitative pre-service and in-service programming. Evaluation can be administered and viewed as being diagnostic and prescriptive rather than perjoritive and punitive. The outcomes of such evaluative procedures can provide a basis for the achievement of quality arts instruction.

2. The need for a clearly articulated sense of purpose. Knowing why we do what we do is not so much the problem here as being able to state these purposes in a rational and clear manner. Any rationale must respond to the need for those outside the arts to be able to understand it. Thus, language is an issue here. It is time for us to stop talking to ourselves. The whole issue of articulating a sense of purpose is related to the achievement of quality. Vague and abstruse statements of purpose suggest that we are not clear in our own minds about what we are doing and why. Few outside the arts have the time, energy, or inclination to make clear our roles in contributing to a qualitative education. In this sense many participants seemed to see that a more pragmatic stand regarding the function of arts education should be a part of pre-service arts education programs. The indication here is that such programs should consider the purpose of arts education in the context of general education.

3. The need to clearly recognize the arts as disciplines for study. This is not a qualitative issue. It is a substantive issue. The distinctness of the disciplines as well as relationships among the disciplines (such as coincidental commonalities of language, and productive partnerships) must be perceived. Hence, the need for qualitative and in-depth subject studies in pre-service training programs. However, it is also clear that there is need to translate artistic experience into educational practice. Pre-service and in-service training programs cannot take for granted that students can turn their personal experiences in doing and responding into something useful for students, nor can it be assumed that teachers can "language" their experiences so as to make them understandable to students. Several participants felt that it should be made very clear that this "languaging" of art--the translation of experience into useful instructional information--is the function of methods courses in pre-service and in-service educational programs. Several participants presented ideas which, summed up, indicate that advanced degree programs in the arts are not adequate substitutes for quality teacher education programs. However, it was also pointed out that many teacher training programs include general requirements that are virtually useless to the arts teacher. Thus, programs which address the uniqueness of the disciplines should include a thoughtful consideration of all requirements and respond to the nature of the discipline.

4. The issue of dialog. The question here is not one of communication between arts teachers and others to establish and make reasonable arts programs. Rather, the problem is one of working from qualitative instruction--that is saying what we are doing and why--rather than saying what we are supposed to be doing and then attempting to justify the rationale in deed. The need to be clear about what we are doing is patent. Hence, pre-service arts education programs train arts teachers to enter the schools. Masters level programs (including in-service training) train master arts teachers. Doctoral programs produce teacher trainers. Programmatic issues become much simpler this way. With respect to the teacher trainers it was pointed out that in many arts disciplines, especially in the visual arts, subject-matter instructors do not have training which addresses instructional methods, let alone doctorates. It was suggested that an examination of the acceptability of a subject speciality masters degree (ex.: M.F.A. in studio art) as a terminal degree in higher education ought to be reexamined.

William R. Detmers is an Associate Professor of Art Education, The University of Hawaii-Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Black Line Group Recommendations

Neil Mooney

This breakout group met from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Thursday afternoon and from 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on Friday afternoon. Discussion followed the major presentations, which were stimulating.

Status. The group assessed the general feeling that was being reported at the symposium by speakers and attendees. Consensus was that a feeling of deterioration of art teacher training throughout the country was in progress and that a recall to higher quality was in order. Many trainers of art teachers expressed a decline in the quality of art teachers applicants and a decline in the quality of teacher training programs. In essence the general feeling of the group was that the art specialist is not as well trained as we had hoped they were. Quality is the question and what are we to do about it?

Recommendation. Reevaluate art teacher training programs and make sure that the course of study includes: an understanding of "what we, the art teacher is about." We must know ourselves, who we are, why we are art teachers, and what does the arts contribute to life itself.

We must teach the art teacher how to sell the program to non art administrators and political figures in curriculum decision positions. Assure that the young art teacher is equipped with the knowledge to justify the arts in the school curriculum, and that he/she truly believes it.

The course of study or the undergraduate art educator be well grounded in studio as well as psychology and art education methodology. This will include a strong knowledge-base of art history, criticism and aesthetics.

Graduate studies should be for specific specialities such as: supervision, administration, and preparation for college teaching and higher education.

It is strongly suggested that students be required to have actual teaching experience in the schools before they progress to graduate levels in degree pursuits. No one pursue the Ph.D. without three years teaching experience of children.

It is recommended that college art education and fine arts staff establish closer report and that supportive efforts be established. Studio models should be of the highest quality and that cross purposes be compromised.

Coordination between fine arts and art education should be increased. Both fine arts and art education instruction relate closer to the public school system for all to grow and maintain the highest quality.

"There is a difference between training an artist and educating one."

Recommend that a strategy be espoused for starting art programs in public schools where they do not exist; for the school district to hire certified art specialist to teach the art in the elementary schools as well as the middle and secondary schools. That the elementary art specialist be assigned to one school to teach the art and serve as a resource for the classroom teacher. The elementary art teacher never to serve more than two schools or a total of 350 students on an itinerant basis. (The NAEA Guidelines be used as a guide.) If the school system feels it cannot hire art teachers in all the schools, that an art supervisor be hired first to plan and coordinate the infusion of art teachers into the system.

How much methods and practice should balance the curriculum?

Why will you be teaching the arts?

To develop the aesthetic potential of all students.
Aesthetic education.

Without encounters with art the teacher will have difficulty in the teaching of art, as through the arts.

Since we have a tendency to teach like we were taught, we must be the best model we can be.

(h) The art teacher must continue keeping up with research in the field.

(i) The art teacher should have a broad liberal arts foundation (L.A. are very important). It should be as broad as possible. We must be knowledgeable of where the "wisdom of the world can be found."

It is educational folly to insist the elementary teacher teach anything they are unprepared to teach. It is better that art not be taught at all than to be taught badly.

When art teachers are not available, have art supervisors. Add specialist teachers when possible. Don't insist all the classroom teacher teach what they are unprepared to do.

New York can trace 4.5 billion directly to the influence of the arts. What should art teachers know? Everything.

To be an art teacher one must know art, who are and were the best artists, where they are and why.

Spotting potential success. Ask questions that are not likely to be learned in a university class - from contemporary art magazines, from art gallery magazines, etc.

Art teachers also have to keep up! You can't get all your knowledge from a university, you have to find out things on your own.

Criticism is a recreation of our art wants in words.

Good teachers are good scrip writers - they can write curriculum lesson plans and organize their planned activities. Careful planning results in better teaching.

A new teacher should have a portfolio, samples of lessons and plans, work experience record.

There were three dialogs going on at this conference:

1. Teacher to teacher.
2. Artist to teacher to artist.
3. Teacher education in the arts.

A. Quality must be apart of all that art teachers do and are about! Discipline based arts education.

B. Interdisciplinary methods and concepts are to be considered.

C. Remember that arts are taught in other places then in schools. We may be thinking too narrowly about art education. Leading by example is a very good way.

This conference is for naught if action does not result. People must return to their respective places and begin something. Lead, follow or get out of the way. Let's get on with it!

Neil Mooney is the Supervisor of Art Education for the Florida State Department of Public Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

VIII. SUMMATION AND EVALUATION

Reflections and Projections: A Symposium Examined

Harlan Hoffa

As I listened to the proceedings of this symposium it became increasingly evident that I was hearing not just one kind of dialogue at any given moment. There were, in fact, three separate and distinct kinds of exchange underway almost simultaneously, none of which are everyday occurrences in most of our professional lives. There was, first, a dialogue between those who teach the arts in elementary and secondary schools and those who teach in the colleges and universities where most such teachers have been educated. Second, there was a dialogue between teachers in the several arts disciplines--art, music, theatre, dance--regardless of the age of students that they dealt with. And, third, there was a dialogue between those teachers who supported conventional arts instruction with its emphasis on performance or studio production and others who wanted to see more emphasis placed on the cognitive content of the arts--more history, criticism and aesthetics. It was also noteworthy that these exchanges were conducted, insofar as I could determine, without rancor and, equally important, with no sense of academic hierarchy. I do not mean to suggest that it was all sweetness and light every moment because some of the discussions were very spirited and every conceivable point of view had its advocates at one time or another. At the same time, there was little in the way of self-proclaimed expertise and most of the participants found themselves to be quite knowledgeable on some points and admittedly naive on others.

At the risk of seeming to fall into a pattern of threes in my summary remarks I cannot help but mention a small bit of political folklore about how to give a speech that seems equally relevant to this conference (or perhaps any other). First, you tells 'em what you're gonna tell 'em, then you tell 'em and, finally, you tell 'em what you told 'em. Or perhaps it would be more appropriate for me to use a metaphor drawn from the theatre. David Baker's opening remarks were analogous to receiving the playbill directly from the producer. As we took our seats he presented the cast of characters in order of appearance, told us the number of acts we would witness, announced the intermissions and gave a list of credits.

The first act was a one-man show by Charles Fowler--with a credit for assistance on the script by Emily Feistritzer, who provided much of the statistical information he presented. He told us what we should expect to hear and, most importantly, he told us why it was important to hear it. He focused our collective attention on the issues of the symposium and, at the very least, he grabbed us by the ears and turned our heads around so we were all facing in the same direction. He provided the drum role, the prelude and the working drawing all wrapped up in one package.

To continue with the analogy from theatre, the second phase of the symposium closed with the classic second act cliff hanger. If dramatic plot involves first, characterization and setting, then conflict and finally resolution, then the presentations by Kathryn A. Martin and Marilyn Price, Leland Burningham, Gerard Knieter and Brent Wilson and the rejoinders by Lin Wright, Stanley Madeja, Al Hurwitz and Carol Kuykendall presented a fitting second act curtain. The conflict was not so much between the speakers, or even between speakers and those who had been charged with responding to their papers. The conflict was in the minds of the audience who were undoubtedly stimulated but almost equally uneasy about what to do about what they had heard. They had heard the opinions, judgments, perceptions, beliefs and stated values of a state superintendent of education, a city superintendent, three deans, one department head, two professors and the program officer of a foundation, but they still faced the inevitable "so what?" question. "So what," not in the sense of "so who cares?" but "so what" in the sense of "so what next--where do we go from here?" To a large extent, the break-out sessions provided a much needed opportunity to deal with that question and, to the extent that some solutions were voiced, they represented the hoped for third act curtain in our little dramatic plot--the resolution, the closure, the striking of some equilibrium between the problem and the solution. They brought that sense of homeostasis which probably lies at the root of much aesthetic pleasure, whether in a play, a concert or, as in this instance, a symposium.

My role in our docu-drama is essentially that of reviewer and critic; the reviewer in that, like a political speaker, I have come to tell you what you have already been told. In that sense I am the "summer upper." I am also going to play the role of critic, though not in the sense of being critical but, rather, in order to be evaluative and in an effort to place the events of the symposium in some sort of perspective. I will also try, as well as I can, to draw some common themes from the various ideas you have heard. I will divide my remarks into three fairly discrete parts (that rule of three again!); I will review the presentations that were made by Kathy Martin, Lee Burningham, Jerry Knieter and Brent Wilson and the responses that were written by Wright, Madeja, Hurwitz and Kuykendall then I will try to deal with what was not said; with the sins of omission rather than the sins of commission and third, I will try to suggest "next steps" in the process because I am all too aware of what will happen if all that we have talked about these past two days here in Baton Rouge fails to root itself in practice in Pennsylvania or Montana or Utah or Ohio or somewhere in between. In short, I will try to be the neutral but selective filter through which the distilled substance of this symposium is pressed in an effort to identify some of the commonalities that are apparent among the presented papers. I will then try to stand apart from those papers and survey the teacher education scene from some of my own biases and prejudices. Third, I will presume to be the sooth sayer, the mystic, the prognosticator, the diagnostician and the navigator- cartographer who not only sets the course but also draws the map about where we might go from here.

As I read the symposium papers that were prepared by Kathy Martin, Lee Burningham, Jerry Knieter and Brent Wilson I was struck with one or two common themes--some of which (perhaps coincidentally) were echoed in Marilyn Price's remarks as well.

The first of these was an insistence that teaching students to paint pretty pictures or sing pretty songs was no longer enough--if indeed, it ever was. They said, if I heard them correctly, that the history of the arts--and especially the development of refined critical skills--had to be emphasized if the arts were to take their rightful place among "the basics" and they insisted that a more systematic and orderly approach to arts curriculum planning had to be undertaken. And, finally, they seemed to agree that teachers of the arts have suffered from the results of their inability to communicate clearly, convincingly and effectively with almost anyone except their own peers and colleagues--with other teachers, with parents, with those who govern and control education and sometimes, it seems, pith students themselves. In effect (though no one except Marilyn Price used the term) they were making a concerted case for something that looked and sounded very much like the "discipline based arts education" that the Getty Trust has recently been promoting. "Discipline based arts education" does, in fact, seem to be the rallying cry of the 1980's in much the same way that "aesthetic education" was the buzz word of the 1970's and "creativity" was in the 1960's and it is all too easy for cynics--like me--to put it down on that account. It is, therefore, commendable that none of our speakers used that jargon through they did, in fact, deal with the underlying premises of a critical and historic emphasis in arts education. It is perhaps a more radical idea than it may at first appear because the artist-teacher idea has so dominated arts education since the 1950's that there has been little room in our professional landscape for other approaches. Indeed, there has been so little awareness that other approaches to arts education might apply that, they have literally not existed in teacher education programs until recently. I do not for a moment disparage the artist as a prototype for teachers of the arts because it is probably the one model that most accurately reflects the ideals of individualism and independence of thought and of action that have permeated our society for generations. John Wayne and Vincent Van Gogh may seem to be distantly related types in most respects, but on a second glance, they do, in fact, have much in common--one individual standing firm against all odds, unswerving dedication to an ideal and the will to prevail at all costs. In each there was a certain iconoclasm and a defiance of convention that reflected the national spirit of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and that spirit has had its effect on arts education. All of that rugged individualism is well and good as far as it goes but, as our speakers have so forcibly reminded us, it is not enough in these times and it does not go far enough. Not every student in our schools is comfortable with the idea of behaving like an artist or an actor or a dancer or a musician (nor are their parents) and, for the majority, it is probably a terrifying thought--however much they may empathize with the romanticized image they perceive. To have a Van Gogh painting on their living room walls may be one thing and to see a movie about the man writ larger than life is perhaps only a little less attractive. I suspect, however, that the idea of having Vincent Van Gogh, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Tennessee Williams or even John Wayne, smelling of sweat and horses, in for tea or cocktails would scare the bejeezus out of most upwardly mobile suburbanites and that they would be equally unsettled at the prospect of their offspring modeling themselves after such unconventional characters. It is, therefore, not surprising that the arts are viewed with a jaundiced eye, if not out and out hostility in most schools if, in fact, the only evident purpose of arts instruction is to transform nice kids into those social misfits known as artists. The appeal of what is euphemistically called "discipline based" arts education is therefore inescapable because it offers an academically respectable avenue to arts education, based on the concept of educating tomorrow's audiences rather than tomorrow's artists. In effect, our speakers have told us that arts education ought to re-orient itself and offer some other models that are clearly different from artistic production and performance--which have the multiple liabilities of being a terrible way to make a living, a socially unacceptable life-style and an ineffective method of dealing with the needs and interests of most students--and to substitute in its place the model of the critic, the connoisseur and the scholar. The problem--to which I will return shortly--is that the professional infra-structure in arts education is geared almost entirely to artistic performance and production and to remake fifty sets of state certification requirements, hundreds of teacher training programs and the curricula, the classrooms, the libraries in thousands of schools demands more than a recognition of the problem or even the will to do something about it--so much more that the prospect is absolutely mind boggling. Even so, perhaps the first and most essential step is to call attention to the problem and this, at least, our speakers have done.

The second point to which our speakers addressed themselves is that of sequential steps in the arts educational process. Kathy Martin's paper focused most clearly on this problem but so too did the others--though perhaps less specifically. As an arts educator (with an S) I must inevitably agree that the educational process ought to lead, in incremental steps, from the simple to the complex and from the specific to the general. At the same time, as an art educator (without an S) I cannot help but point out the differences between the linear art forms such as music, theatre and dance, and non-linear art forms, such as the visual arts and architecture. It seems to me that linearity in curricular constructs is much easier to obtain in time bound art forms then it is in art forms that are essentially non-linear. A concert, a play or a performance in dance or film must, by its very nature, be perceived from one end to the other; from act one to act three or from prelude to the final movement. A painting or a cathedral are, however, immediately knowable in their totality and there is a kind of immediacy of the perception in which every part of the work is available to the senses instantaneously. This difference--which is endemic to the art forms--must, I believe, be taken into account in curricular concepts. For those who have, as their disciplinary base, a time bound art form, linearity and sequential thinking is probably a natural and even an inevitable way to organize teaching strategies. For those who deal in other kinds of art forms, linearity is by no means the natural order of things, however. All that is ever going to exist in a painting is immediately apparent (though not necessarily immediately knowable) and the upper left corner does not lead inevitably or inescapably to the lower right. The natural order to a painting--if there is such a thing--is quite different from the natural order of a concerto. The eye can hop-scotch over the surface of a painting almost at random and zoom in or pan back at will in a way that is impossible when listening to music where the musical line prescribes and controls how the work is perceived. I do not contend that one mode of perception is necessarily any more right or more accurate or more fullsome, but I do believe that each is different from the other. Moreover, I also believe that curricular concepts must, in some respects at least, reflect the discipline that is being taught. Sequential curricula may, therefore, be highly appropriate to teaching students about theatre or music but not at all suited to teaching them about painting or architecture. Having said that, I must also concede that there is, in fact, an unconscionable lack of structure in much of arts education--unrelated gimmicks, games and exercises by the score, none of which are related to anything else and none of which lead to anything else--including, most specifically, any significant gain in understanding the arts themselves. I certainly advocate structured teaching, but, at the same time, I must raise a note of caution about buying into linear thinking as the one and only kind of curricular structure for all of the arts, everywhere and for all kinds of learners. In this I think I am echoing an inter-disciplinary theme that several speakers voiced because if the essential differences between the modalities of the several arts cannot be understood at this most basic level, I find it difficult to understand how any other kinds of interaction can take place between them except at the most superficial level.

I would also like to call renewed attention to another point that was repeated by several of the speakers; that most vexing problem is how to prepare elementary classroom teachers to do a credible job of teaching the arts. As we all know, at the elementary level, most teaching of the arts is done by teachers who can scarcely tell black piano keys from the white ones and who don't know which end of the paintbrush has the hair on it. Moreover, for all too many students there is no art or music beyond the sixth grade anyway, so all they ever learn about the arts is what that poor, over-worked and artistically naive classroom teacher presents. Maybe there are no good solutions to the problem but I think we might seriously consider an option that Jerry Knieter mentioned in a throw away line tacked onto the end of another thought. How outlandish would it be, he asked, if we abandoned all pretense of arts instruction in elementary schools except by fully qualified teachers of art or music or theatre or dance? Is the on-going mockery of arts instruction in such schools all that much better an alternative or is it, in fact, worse? We can argue endlessly about discipline based art education or developing better critical skills among arts teachers or redressing the balance between arts, liberal studies and education courses for teachers of the arts but none of that will affect what happens in most elementary classrooms one iota unless we somehow either attack the problem head-on or abandon the pretense altogether. Not every subject that is taught in the middle or secondary school is available at the elementary level and we may want to consider what would really happen if we, as arts educators, took a hard-nosed stand about unqualified teachers mucking around with our discipline and making a mess of it?

I would now like to turn to a couple of sins of omission, at least insofar as the presented papers are concerned. I fully recognize that the charge that David Baker gave to the speakers loaded the dice in favor of attending to a prescribed, certainly an important but none the less a fairly conventional kind of arts education which had the effect of limiting our speakers almost exclusively to the arts and schooling. They did not extend their concerns (except by implication) to consider the preparation of arts teachers in social or cultural agencies other than schools--in arts councils, recreation programs, museums, senior citizen centers, custodial or health care institutions and such. Nor, did they attend at all to concepts of learning in the arts except by children. Do we really believe that there are no avenues for arts education beyond the 12th grade? Do we really believe that teachers who are specifically prepared to teach the arts in schools are automatically qualified to deal with adults in other kinds of places? I doubt it. But none of our speakers dealt even peripherally with that issue. I contend that if, indeed, we are to think seriously about developing informed and discriminating audiences for the arts and about developing critical abilities--which can be fairly sophisticated concepts--we may be dealing with too narrow a conception of teaching and learning. Our school systems and universities have not ignored the idea of education continuing beyond adolescence and such programs are very real and extremely popular among a broad spectrum of the population. If, indeed, we are addressing the concept of teacher education in the arts, we may have blinded ourselves unnecessarily by not looking beyond the traditional arena of children and schools.

The second sin of omission I must point to deals rather more with implementation than with conceptualization. Considering that we have heard from three deans, one state superintendent, one city superintendent and two former city arts supervisors turned professor, I find it curious that no one has addressed some of the stickier wickets of transforming their high flown ideas from the realm of abstraction into reality. Let us suppose that Louisiana State or Penn State or Montana or Northern Illinois or any other university really bit on the idea of preparing a new breed of arts teacher that was based on the model of the critic, the historian, the theorist and the connoisseur rather than the producer or performer. Let us further assume that new curricula were implemented, that new courses were designed, that some new "discipline based" faculty were hired. Three years later that university is prepared to send out its first crop of student teachers. Where in the world would they be sent since there are no schools in the region that offer arts courses of the sort that these students have been prepared to teach?

Let us also assume that our newly minted graduates somehow have completed their student teaching and that they proceed to apply to the state education department for teacher certification in art or music, only to be told--as they surely will be--that they do not qualify because their academic background does not conform to state certification standards. And then, if by some minor miracle the state bureaucracy parts like the Red Sea and finds our graduates worthy, where are they going to find a job? But suppose that they do find work through the good intentions of a clutch of sympathetic city arts supervisors, high school principals and superintendents who have seen the light. They then hire these new teachers but what resources will be available to them in the art or music rooms? Certainly the pianos and potters wheels that clutter most such spaces are not the sort of equipment they need, nor, in fact, are the libraries likely to be supplied with the appropriate books, records, tapes or journals either. My point is that if we are to plunge ahead with some very attractive ideas we have heard presented here in the past day or two, we must in fact, revamp much more than the teacher education programs themselves. Nothing less than a wholesale reconstruction of the entire arts education system would be required--not specifically to replace the existing enterprise (which, after all, does some things very well for some students) but to add something quite new and different to it. How many deans and how many city or state school executives are willing to make the necessary commitment of time, staff and resources that will be required? When put in that frame of reference, it is not at all curious that the administrators who addressed us have studiously avoided such issues in their presentations.

The final sin of omission I would point to is that, except for Brent Wilson, none of the speakers dealt with the specific realities of how to teach new or returning teachers how to think about the arts. All of the other presentations blue skyed around at a level that was at least once removed from the actual act of teaching--as, perhaps, our speakers themselves are at least one step removed from such a role. Obviously, it is the responsibility of educational leaders to lead but I would suggest that leading by example is often the best way to assure that one has followers. What plans are underway in Utah or Houston, in Montana or Akron to lend credibility to the admonitions for changes that we have heard? I would hope that in a year or two or three we might gather together once again and hear some case studies of successful programs that have been undertaken in the arenas where our distinguished speakers prevail.

The education of teachers of the arts is, I suspect, a far more labyrinthine process than most observers (including some from within our profession) will readily admit. Professional associations, accrediting agencies, state education departments and the bureaucracies of colleges and universities all have vested interests in teacher education and each is more than ready to shoot it out with anyone whom they suspect of tampering with those interests. In addition, the school administrators who employ teachers of the arts have legitimate concerns and so do those who employ such administrators--tax payers in general and school boards in particular. Book, film, slide and music publishers have their interests and so do the suppliers of instructional equipment and supplies ranging form those who make paint and paper to those who sell musical instruments and band uniforms. Architects who design school buildings have to know what kind of arts activities they must plan for and building superintendents have to know what they will have to contend with at the end of the day in order to properly maintain school arts facilities. The local arts community has special interests in teacher education as it affects audience development, the identification of talent and the never ending process of sustaining a foundation of firm community support for the arts. Teachers of other subjects, ranging from industrial arts to literature and history may share at least part of their subject matter with arts teachers and many business people have come to realize that a lively cultural scene is essential if they are to attract and retain the best and the brightest of their employees in any given community.

If those who teach the arts were solely responsible for what is taught in the name of their discipline--and if, in turn, those who teach such teachers were primarily responsible for assuring that they were prepared accordingly--the problems associated with teacher education might seem far simpler. The irony is that that is precisely what has happened in the past several decades and, to some extent, that kind of tunnel vision has created many of the problems which we now confront--a failure of interest in the arts in schools even as they have enjoyed a well spring of support at the local, state and national levels, isolation from real-world arts ideologies and a turning inward in ever-tightening circles of self-doubt and painful self-analysis. Perhaps the most real of all the problems associated with teacher education is, therefore, to identify (or at least to acknowledge) the several constituencies of arts education. What should be taught, to whom and for what purpose? Admittedly, such an approach smacks of a marketplace mentality and I do not for a moment advocate a passive "give 'em what they want" approach to either arts education or to teacher training. At the same time, I think it is clear that we have suffered the consequences of burying our collective heads in the sand for far too long and parallels between the plight of arts education and that of the American automobile industry are all too apparent. By ignoring the needs and the interests of those we serve we have abdicated some very real opportunities for change and growth and, moreover, we have probably seemed fairly arrogant in the process.

Obviously we cannot expect our varied and multiple constituencies to speak with a single voice and, in fact, it is probably safe to assume that they will not do so. The challenge, I think, is for arts educators to attend to all of the interests of our constituency and to refine--or if necessary to re-define--what we offer to meet that collective expression of need--with an emphasis on the concept of merging and melding those needs into a coherent whole.

We have already witnessed what happens when one such voice is singled out for special attention. The good folks at the Getty Center for Education in the Arts have used their resources to promote a concept of what arts education ought to be (more art history, art criticism and aesthetics) and maybe they are right. I don't really know that what they espouse necessarily reflects what our other constituencies want or need, however. Nor do I know that it does not because none of them have the clout or the resources to promote their interests as effectively as do Mr. Getty's minions. I do not mean to criticize the Getty folks for what is really an admirable show of initiative that has been undertaken with some very real measures of professional responsibility but their hidden agenda is undoubtedly tied to developing informed audiences for museums and we would be naive not to recognize that fact. No one can really argue with developing the sensibilities of museum audiences or, by extension with developing better informed, more perceptive and more discriminating audiences for the theatre or the concert hall either. It is, however, a limited concept of arts education--though no more so than much of what we presently accept without question. The point is that as a profession we really ought to begin to question our own practices. Should the high school art room be a mini-art academy with a "no talent/no admission" sign on the door? Do marching bands really have much to do with learning about music? Is the senior play worth its grease paint? Why, in fact, do we do such things? Is it because we really believe in them and they are truly the best ways to know to teach the arts or could it be that we are the victims of our own limitations. If that is true (and I do not claim that is is) we must then return to the very real and very difficult issue of how to prepare teachers of art, music, and theatre to provide their students with the best possible arts education according to our informed judgment regarding the nature of the disciplines that we represent.

The nominal focus of this symposium has been on teacher education in the arts but I think we all recognize that a prior question has to be addressed before we can seriously deal with that issue. What kind of arts education do we really want such teachers to provide? It is fortunate that neither our speakers nor our discussion group leaders felt constrained to deal exclusively with teacher education because the searching exploration of the many problems confronting our profession proved to be far more stimulating than the single issue of educating arts teachers could possibly be. Of these, the most persistently recurring theme, variously expressed, was that of identifying the focus of arts education--what should be taught, to whom and for what purpose. Until that issue can be settled, it goes almost without saying (though I shall say it anyway) that it will be difficult, and perhaps impossible to deal seriously with teacher education. How can we possibly say that this is what an arts teacher should be unless we can first agree on what such teachers will be expected to do in the classroom. Thus far, we have not come close to such an agreement though we have, I think, begun to ask some of the right questions.

The last part of my summary of this symposium is to suggest some next steps and the first point that I feel must be made in this regard is to plead that there have to be some next steps. Some years ago when I was on the staff of the Arts and Humanities Program in Washington, I attended and participated in seventeen conferences, symposia and seminars in a two year period. All of which were similar to this one. After I returned to the slightly more real world of academia, I wrote a report on those conferences and in that paper (which has come to be know as my revival meeting report) I noted that the one characteristic that distinguished those conferences that made a difference from those that didn't was the fact that they led to something beyond a report and some warm fuzzy memories. They were, in short, conferences that initiated action. If we all leave LSU today or tomorrow and return to our cluttered end-of-year desks and take no steps to implement reforms in the education of arts teachers in our own institutions I can assure you, absolutely and without the shadow of a doubt, that this conference might as well not have taken place--except for the memory of a couple of days of edifying conversation. Many of us have the clout back home to rattle a few cages and that, I suggest, is exactly what ought to happen if we are to put our money where our mouths are. Maybe we should plan to meet next year--or at the very latest a year after that--for some progress reports. Maybe there ought to be an occasional newsletter to help sustain the sense of community that has developed. Maybe our respective professional associations--at the national or at the state levels--ought to deal seriously with the issue of reforms in teacher education. And, conceivably, maybe the art, music, theatre and dance associations ought to get in on the act by sponsoring follow-up meetings, joint publications or lobbying efforts in the fifty state education departments which will permit--if not actually encourage--such reforms. Those, then, are a few next steps that we might work toward.

In closing I would like to repeat one of the sentiments often expressed by Joe Paterno who, as you may recall, is the bespectacled guru of Saturday fun in the sun at Penn State. The good coach Paterno has been know to tell his players to "lead, follow or get out of the way" and I believe that each and every one of us can contribute to the much needed reform of teacher education in the arts in one of those ways as well. Some will lead and other may follow, but those who do neither can aid the process almost as much by simply getting the hell out of the way. So I say, let us get on with it.

Harlan Hoffa is the Associate Dean of the College of Art and Architecture at The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.