MUSEUM AND SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS
FOR VISUAL ARTS EDUCATION IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES

A Thesis submitted to the faculty of
San Francisco State University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree

Master of Arts

In

Museum Studies

by

Ruby Ming

San Francisco, California

January 2021

Copyright by
Ruby Ming
2020

CERTIFICATION OF APPROVAL

I certify that I have read Museum and School Partnerships for Visual Arts Education in Underserved Communities by Ruby Ming, and that in my opinion this work meets the criteria for approving a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree Master of Arts in Museum Studies at San Francisco State University.

Edward M. Luby, Ph.D.
Professor

Christine Fogarty, M.A.
Lecturer of Museum Studies

MUSEUM AND SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS
FOR VISUAL ARTS EDUCATION IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES

Ruby Ming
San Francisco, California
2020

Children living in low-income and underserved communities have experienced a persistent academic achievement gap for decades. This thesis discusses how art museum-school partnerships can help boost learning in the arts and across the curriculum through multi-visit programs that employ arts integration and focus on thinking skills. A literature review of the history of public and museum education, educational standards, educational theories, and visual arts pedagogy is presented to provide context for the partnerships. Three art museums with several robust multi-visit programs were identified and researched as case studies, and the program directors were interviewed as content experts, which revealed high levels of organization and meaningful academic improvement. A major conclusion is the key role of collaboration in promoting active participation by teachers. Recommendations include ensuring museum staff is highly-qualified, a vigorous teacher training component, utilizing professional evaluators, and securing adequate funding in order to ensure measurable improvement in student achievement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this thesis to my mother, Pen-ming Lee Ming, M.D., a brilliant woman of remarkable resilience who helped birth hundreds of babies as an obstetrician, contributed to understanding sickle cell anemia as a genetics researcher, inspired thousands of medical students as a professor, was a cherished wife, and lovingly raised six children. You have always been my role model.

I thank my beloved husband, Rodney Z. Wong, M.D., and sons, Patrick, Hunter, Dillon, and Kelly, for their love, patience, and good humor.

My deepest appreciation goes to the Museum Studies faculty and staff, Karen Kienzle, M.A., Paige Bardolph Laduzinsky, M.A., Julie Bly Devere, M.A., Gina Caprari, M.A., M.L.I.S., and Lissette Jiménez, Ph.D., for sharing their extensive knowledge. I extend special thanks to Christine Fogarty, M.A., for her encouragement and insights. And I will be eternally grateful to Edward Luby, Ph.D., for his sage guidance and keen perception.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
List of Appendices	x
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Purpose and Organization of the Study	5
Chapter 2: Public Education and Museum Education	8
Evolution of Public Education	8
Educational Standards.....	14
Evolution of Museum Education	17
Chapter 3: Learning Theories and Art Education	25
Learning Theories and Museum Settings	25
Museum Education and Visual Arts Pedagogy	32
Art Museum School Programs.....	42
Summary	43
Chapter 4: Methodology	45
Chapter 5: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.	53
Museum Mission and Background	53
Museum-School Partnership Programming.....	55
Summary	64

Chapter 6: Barnes Foundation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	65
Museum Mission and Background	65
Museum-School Partnership Programming.....	67
Summary	78
Chapter 7: Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.....	80
Museum Mission and Background	80
Museum-School Partnership Programming.....	83
Summary	94
Chapter 8: Discussion and Analysis	96
Chapter 9: Conclusions and Recommendations	105
Conclusions.....	105
Recommendations.....	109
Final Thoughts	113
References.....	116
Appendices.....	125

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Piaget’s Four Stages of Cognitive Development.....	27
2. Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences.....	31

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Page
1. Locating the Zone of Proximal Development.....	28
2. Arts and Curriculum: Three Variations.....	40
3. Wall Ensemble.....	70
4. Students Create a Tableau.....	100

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
1. Appendix A: National Gallery of Art Website Sources	125
2. Appendix B: The Barnes Foundation Website Sources	138
3. Appendix C: Philadelphia Museum of Art Website Sources	158
4. Appendix D: National Education Data.....	175
5. Appendix E: Educational Standards	188
6. Appendix F: Additional Website Sources.....	203

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Perhaps imagination is only intelligence having fun.

– George Scialabba, *Harvard Magazine* (1984)

Early museums were private places, where only scholars and the privileged were allowed to enjoy and study valuable texts and cultural objects (Alexander et al. 2017). Art was amassed by the wealthy and displayed in their private residences. In the eighteenth century, these private collections became the basis for public museums in the United States. Over the past two hundred years, the ideals of democracy and the enlightenment have encouraged museums, as public institutions, to focus more on public service (Alexander et al. 2017).

In 1992, the American Alliance of Museums (AAM, formerly the American Association of Museums) published its first report on the educational role of museums, *Excellence and Equity: The Public Dimension of Museums*:

This report ... stresses the significance of museums in the educational complex of a democratic society. Museums have a vital place in a broad educational system that includes formal institutions such as universities, schools, and professional training institutes and informal agents of socialization such as the family, workplace, and community (10).

Since 2007, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has included education as one of the core purposes of a museum's existence in its definition of museums:

A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment (ICOM 2020).

Over time, a significant shift has taken place in museums. Education is now at the center of today's museums, and, as providers of education and in service to the public, museums have developed robust partnerships with schools. These partnerships, however, must be available to all groups in society, including those living in underserved areas or in places experiencing pervasive poverty. In the context of diminished time for arts in the curriculum, teaching to the test, and underfunding, how are schools in such areas best served by museum education programs?

This thesis examines how museum-school partnerships help fulfill educational objectives and the museum's goal of service by activating learning through the arts at Title I public schools, which serve low-income children. In order for a school to qualify for Title I federal funds, at least 40% of students must be enrolled in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), which provides free and reduced fee lunches (Malburg 2008).

The study focuses on multi-visit programs with a teacher professional development component at art museums: the museums partner with the school district and provide services to many schools and thousands of students. The programs are designed to help students at Title I schools meet curricular goals and develop critical thinking skills, such as observation, reasoning, and problem-solving. An important secondary goal for the museums is to make the world of visual arts and museums accessible and enjoyable for underserved students.

The need in Title I schools is clear. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which is a "continuing and nationally representative measure of trends

in academic achievement of U.S. elementary and secondary students in various subjects” (NAEP 2020) evaluated eighth grade student performance in visual arts in 2008 and 2016, based on a scale of 0-300. While the percentage of students achieving the average score increased significantly, the raw score barely improved and continued to be markedly lower than students in higher income groups (NAEP 2016a).

NAEP also asked students if students think they have a talent for art; students eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) were less likely to consider themselves artistic than other students. Unfortunately, the majority of all eighth graders, regardless of economic level, did not consider themselves artistic, and, most alarming, more students did not consider themselves artistic in 2016 than in 2008. NAEP data also shows that Title I schools had fewer full-time visual arts specialists (difference of five percentage points), was less likely to provide district or state curriculum in visual arts (difference of six percentage points); and had fewer dedicated art rooms with specialized equipment (difference of ten percentage points) (NAEP 2016b).

In addition, only 38% of low-income students took an art class during the surveyed academic year, compared to 44% of other students. However, 56% of all students, regardless of background, stated that they made artwork on their own, not for schoolwork (NAEP 2016b). This discrepancy shows that students are interested in art but their options for more advanced learning is limited, even for more advantaged students.

Low-income students lag behind in all academics, not just the arts. NAEP data reveals achievement gaps in all subject areas for all years studied at the reviewed grade

levels of fourth, eighth, and twelfth. For eighth grade students who were eligible for meals through NSLP, math scores were approximately six percentage points lower; in reading, U.S. history, and geography, approximately five percentage points; in music, civics, writing, technology, and science, approximately nine; and in the visual arts, the scores were approximately seven percentage points lower. These gaps may increase or decrease slightly, but the gaps continue to persist over time (NAEP 2016c).

In sum, data and research regarding the academic performance of low-income students shows a clear disadvantage. Can arts education help ameliorate this tenacious inequity?

Over the past thirty years, research studies have consistently shown the positive value of arts education. A concise, comprehensive review of research findings about arts education outcomes and best practices was published by The President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities (PCAH) in 2011. Their review determined that high quality arts education was instrumental in four crucial outcomes:

- Student achievement, typically as represented by reading and mathematics performance on high stakes tests, including transfer of skills learning from the arts to learning in other academic areas;
- Student motivation and engagement, including improved attendance, persistence, focused attention, heightened educational aspirations, and intellectual risk taking;
- Development of habits of mind including problem solving, critical and creative thinking, dealing with ambiguity and complexity, integration of multiple skill sets, and working with others; and
- Development of social competencies, including collaboration and team work skills, social tolerance, and self-confidence (PCAH 2011, 16).

Many studies have reported instrumental links between arts integration models and positive academic and social outcomes for students, increased teacher satisfaction and professionalism, and improved school-wide culture (PCAH 2011; A+ Schools 2020; Kennedy Center 2020). Arts integration is an efficient instructional model because it effectively addresses several outcomes concurrently. Most significantly, the greatest gains are often among the most hard-to-reach and economically disadvantaged students (PCAH 2011; Kennedy Center 2020).

Given the efficacy of arts integration, how are art museums working with Title I schools to address the stark and unambiguous achievement gap in education?

Purpose and Organization of the Study

There are two primary purposes of the study. The first is to describe the beneficial outcomes of learning through the arts for underserved students and to demonstrate the need for these types of museum-school partnerships and multi-visit programs. The second is to describe the most important features of successful collaborations between museums and schools in order to offer recommendations to art museums that are considering developing partnerships with public schools. The study is supported by a literature review and case studies of three art museums that provide the types of multi-visit programs described above.

A review of the literature is presented in Chapter 2 and 3. Chapter 2 reviews the history of public school in the United States in relation to art education, and the evolution

of the role of education in museums. Chapter 3 discusses learning theories, including developmental stages, constructivism, multiple-intelligence, and the social dimension of learning. Also discussed are how the learning theories are applied in museum settings and visual arts pedagogy.

The methods used in this thesis are presented in Chapter 4. Key sources for the literature review, criteria for selecting the case study museum programs, and the interview questions asked and their purpose are outlined.

Chapter 5, 6, and 7 explore multi-visit programs at three art museums serving as case studies here: the Barnes Foundation, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and the National Gallery of Art. Each case study chapter explores the partnership programs for Title I schools, including how the partnerships were established, program descriptions, pedagogy, school demographics, staffing, funding, and program evaluation.

Chapter 8 analyzes the common features of the programs at all three case study museums in relation to the museum education background, learning theories, and visual arts pedagogy presented in the literature review. The thesis then closes with Chapter 9, which presents conclusions drawn from the analysis; offers recommendations for establishing successful multi-visit programs in partnership with Title I schools; and reflects upon the importance of the arts in the educational journey of underserved children.

The multi-visit programs provided by the art museums described in the following chapters are able to provide a solution for generating enthusiasm for learning and

quantifiable academic improvement among disadvantaged students, delivering exemplary teacher professional development and improving school climate. As examined in this thesis, learning through the arts can help close the achievement gap and bring joy to learning.

CHAPTER 2. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND MUSEUM EDUCATION

The evolution of education in the United States encompasses not only the development of the public school system, but also that of museums (among other institutions) as significant partners (Hein 1998). A literature review of the history of public and museum education in the United States, plus educational standards, and current issues and trends in art education, will be presented in this chapter.

Evolution of Public Education

Public education has been a cornerstone of American ideals for over 150 years. Citizens expect local, state, and federal government agencies to accept primary responsibility for educating the nation's youth, and the public accepts the civic duty of contributing tax dollars to the effort (Tyack 2001). In the United States, public education is considered a manifestation of democratic idealism that should provide high quality instruction, equal access, and a wide range of opportunities to all young people, regardless of their background or abilities. However, the reality is very different, and always has been (Tyack 2001).

Community sponsored education for all youth began in the mid-nineteenth century. Before the Industrial Revolution, when societies were mainly agricultural, formal education was not a priority and was managed within each family. Wealthy parents could afford private schools and tutors (Kaestle 2001). Believing a well-educated populace would benefit the new nation, Thomas Jefferson proposed a state-funded system

in Virginia to provide three years of schooling to most white boys, regardless of family wealth. He brought his plan to the legislature three times between 1779 and 1817, but each time, his plan was rejected, and the idea that education was a family matter persisted (Mondale and Patton 2001). In 1821, limited art instruction was included in some public-school curricula and met with opposition (Whitford 1923).

By the 1840s, many new immigrants were arriving in the United States, expansion westward was underway, urban areas were growing rapidly, and the economy was shifting to industrialization. These changes prompted the development of new institutions to address issues regarding common public values, moral education, and rapid economic growth (Kaestle 2001). Industrial design and the arts were being added to school curricula because they were considered practical skills. In 1870, Massachusetts became the first to include provisions for art instruction in state law (Whitford 1923). By the late 1800s, all states had established schooling systems that were funded by property taxes, which eliminated tuition costs, but resulted in wide funding gaps based on location that continue to impact school districts today (Kaestle 2001; Duncan, 2011).

These “common schools” that were established by Horace Mann and others, typically ended at eighth grade, and taught what they considered to be the common moral and civic values that all Americans should possess (Kaestle 2001), including basic appreciation of the arts (Whitford 1923). At the time, these ideas were meant to be nonpartisan and encourage active civic participation of the citizenry—excluding women, Blacks, Indigenous peoples, and most people of color (Kaestle 2001). While

nonsectarian, these values were still based on the Bible, and schools were generally only for white boys. The “common values” were based on the nation’s founding principles set forth by the Founding Fathers (Mondale and Patton 2001).

In 1883, The National Education Association, which was established in 1857, created a Department of Art to provide educators with guidelines and ideas. Educational approaches focused on skills for creating artworks solely for their expressive and aesthetic value (The Art of Education 2020). By the early 1900s, art was once again considered part of craft and industry (Raber 2017).

In the early twentieth century, experts were lauded, and formal education was entrusted to their care, while lay school boards supervised and were responsible for on non-educational aspects of the public school system. At the same time the experts worked to centralize and standardize education, they also moved away from a single, common curriculum. They believed that different types of students and different subjects needed different knowledge bases and different modes of instruction, and only specialists could understand how to effectively breakdown the information for student consumption (Ravitch 2001).

As a result, students were divided into several learning tracks and were offered dozens of distinct elective options, including arts electives. This was especially the case in high schools, which were proliferating, and which began to offer vocational as well as curricular tracks. Offering more choices was meant to provide greater equity of opportunity for students of varied abilities and backgrounds (Ravitch 2001). In reality,

children's interests and abilities emerge unevenly (Holt 2017) and placing students in "tracks" sometimes resulted in limiting their opportunities for further education or employment. Although supposedly objective and science-based criteria were used to shunt students into rigid tracks, in practice sexist, racial, and classist stereotyping was used to limit student opportunities (Mondale and Patton 2001).

The main successes of public education in the first half of the twentieth century were its ability to grow rapidly, expand offerings, and provide a gateway for large numbers of immigrants to participate in American society (Ravitch 2001). A main failure was the inability to address racial segregation. A continuing, intense emphasis on local control enabled municipalities and school districts to make their own rules regarding who could go to which schools and how to distribute funding (Ravitch 2001).

During the 1950s to 1970s, issues related to equity, including desegregating schools, busing, gender bias, ethnic discrimination, and accessibility for disabled students came to the forefront. The federal government became more involved—Congress provided billions of dollars for disadvantaged students and passed Title IX to address gender discrimination; Head Start and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) were launched; and the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. the Board of Education* to end segregated schools (Mondale and Patton 2001). During the 1960s and 1970s, the civil rights movement also impacted curriculum, with students and families demanding courses that reflected the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the student population, included the contributions of women, accommodated differently abled students, and were

taught in students' primary language (Mondale and Patton 2001).

Another impact on curriculum occurred in 1957 when the Russians successfully launched Sputnik. The American public was shocked that another country was more technologically advanced than the United States, and the education system was the scapegoat. In 1958, the National Defense Education Act was passed and massive amounts of federal money was sent to public schools to boost math and science learning with the hope of producing more engineers (Mondale and Patton 2001). And in 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) provided billions of dollars to aid disadvantaged students under its first statutory section, known as Title I (Mondale and Patton 2001; Klein 2015). Low-income status for students is determined by enrollment in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) which provides free and reduced fee lunches. At least 40% of students must be enrolled in NSLP in order for an entire school to qualify for Title I funds (Malburg 2008).

In 1983, the federal report *A Nation at Risk* indicated that the efforts of the previous twenty-five years were ineffective and educational achievement was on the decline. Although many contested this conclusion and pointed to more comprehensive data that showed modest improvements while improving the educational climate for many groups that had faced discrimination, once again, education was blamed for America's perceived lack of innovation and sagging economy (Cuban 2001). High schools began to focus more on college preparedness and less on vocational options. There was a renewed emphasis on math and science, and a push for more testing. This led

teachers to let go of progressive methods that focused on integrated, hands-on, child-led learning, such as project-based learning and portfolios. Instead, teachers continued the traditional model of adult-led teaching of discrete subjects, focusing more and more on “teaching to the test” (Cuban 2001). In spite of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994 that included the arts as a core subject area, emphasis continued to be on math and science (U.S. Dept. of Education 1994).

This approach was epitomized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB), an update to ESEA of 1965, which had undergone several updates and renewals by then. NCLB exerted more federal control over public schooling and attempted to focus on outcomes and accountability—both tied to test scores (McMurrer 2007; Klein 2015). Teachers and districts felt even more pressure to focus on the tested areas, math and reading skills. Consequently, history, social sciences, physical education, and arts curriculum continued to be less emphasized and less funded (Klein 2015; McCluskey 2015), even though NCLB included them as core subjects (U.S. Dept. of Education 2009). By the 2006-2007 academic year, the fifth year of NCLB, 12% of elementary districts that did not include any Title I schools had reduced their time spent on art and music by an average of fifty-five minutes per week; however, 30% of schools identified as needing improvement reduced art and music by an average of sixty-one minutes per week (McMurrer 2007). In addition, annual funding for Title I schools was expected to increase to \$25 billion to help offset increased costs, but fell far short. In 2015, Title I schools received about \$14.5 billion (Klein 2015).

Gaps between schools with lower and those with higher poverty demographics (as measured by eligibility for free or reduced fee lunches, an oft-cited measure for Title I schools) continued in arts education, although some improvement was made (Parsad and Spiegelman 2012). From 1999 to 2010, visual arts instruction was taught in approximately 94% of elementary and 96% of secondary schools with the lowest poverty concentration, and in approximately 80% of elementary and 82% of secondary schools with the highest poverty concentration (Parsad and Spiegelman 2012). The number of art specialists teaching in elementary schools with the highest poverty concentration increased from 67% in the 1999-2000 academic year to 81% in 2009-2010. However, this still lagged behind schools with the lowest poverty which increased from 80% to 89% in the same years (Parsad and Spiegelman 2012).

McCluskey concluded that, “Based on the federal government’s own tests, there is little evidence that the No Child Left Behind Act has spurred significant, lasting improvements in academic outcomes” (McCluskey 2015). The failure of NCLB to reach its stated goals prompted the federal government to essentially abandon it by 2012, and a new update to ESEA, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), took its place. While it continued some testing requirements, ESSA loosened federal control over education (Klein 2015; McCluskey 2015).

Educational Standards

As NCLB was failing students, reformers sought to create more meaningful

education standards, and state education policy makers began to work on national standards in English-Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics in 2009 (Common Core 2020). Nearly all of the nations with the best-performing education systems have national standards (Duncan 2011). Common Core State Standards (CCSS) attempted to delineate general skills and concepts that all students across the country could master. Despite initial controversy, by 2020, forty-one states, the District of Columbia, and four territories have adopted CCSS. In addition to English language and math skills, there is an emphasis on college- and career-readiness, including public speaking, active listening, inquiry, and collaboration (Common Core 2020).

At the same time, state and national science associations partnered to develop the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), which were completed in 2013, based on the National Research Council's 2011 *K-12 Framework for Science Education* (Next Generation Science Standards 2020a). By 2020, twenty states and the District of Columbia have adopted NGSS and another twenty-four have adopted standards based on the same framework (National Science Teaching Assoc. 2020). In addition to content knowledge, NGSS stress skills such as evidentiary reasoning, applying knowledge to new situations, applying theory to practical situations, inquiry, problem-solving, and flexibility (Next Generation Science Standards 2020b).

Arts educators also developed national standards. In 1994, a consortium including the American Alliance for Theatre & Education, Music Educators National Conference, National Art Education Association, and National Dance Association published national

standards for dance, music, theater arts, and visual arts. The standards were meant to affirm that a worthwhile future included a vital relationship with the arts, which would require, like every subject, skill development and study. Following the trends of the late twentieth century, the standards were discipline based and focused on skills and knowledge in the arts as a discrete subject (U.S. Dept. of Education 1994).

In 2014, a new generation of standards was released for visual arts, dance, music, theater and media arts called the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS). As of November, 2019, forty states have revised their arts standards, two have made some updates, and four are in the process of revising (National Core Arts Standards 2019). The standards are written to be instructional and aspirational, focusing on Philosophical Foundations and Lifelong Goals that address long-term expectations for arts learning, including the arts as communication; creative personal realization; culture, history, and connectors; community engagement; and means to wellbeing (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards 2014a). The standards matrix includes the Artistic Processes of Creating (skills to make art); Performing, Presenting, Producing (interpreting and demonstrating understanding and skills); Responding (interpret and analyze artworks); and Connecting (relate art to personal, cultural, and historical contexts) (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards 2014b). These ideas overlap with those of CCSS ELA and Math, and NGSS, with a focus on communication, connections, critical thinking, inquiry, and personal responsibility for learning.

Today, arts education continues to be marginalized and underfunded. The Department of Education's Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) report, *Arts Education In Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1999-2000 and 2009-10*, stated that there is a robust infrastructure of arts education in some American schools. Unfortunately, it also revealed extreme inequities in access to arts education. Visual arts education is not universally available, and is inconsistent across grade levels (Parsad and Spiegelman 2012). Consequently, lackluster student scores on the 2008 and 2016 National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) in music and visual arts reflect these inequities in learning opportunity (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards 2014b; NAEP 2016a).

It is clear that students' access to arts education continues to be uneven across our nation's nearly 14,000 school districts. Sadly, too many schools face serious funding challenges and feel forced to narrowly focus on subjects that are tested, resulting in minimal, if any, arts experiences for children. There are local school districts that are able to offer a full, balanced education that includes rich and varied arts opportunities for their students (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards 2014b). However, the need for more support for comprehensive, quality arts education for all the nation's youth is imperative.

Evolution of Museum Education

Museums today can trace their origins to ancient Greek "museaeums," which functioned more like archives, full of texts with some objects, and mainly places for

study and reflection by elites and scholars (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017). In ancient Greece and Rome, the general public could view artwork displayed in other venues, such as temples and public forums. During the Middle Ages, the concept of museums almost died out in the West. Churches and monasteries maintained libraries, copied and translated texts, and kept valuable objects, some brought back from the Crusades (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017).

In the sixteenth century, galleries for displaying art, long halls lit from the sides, began to appear in palaces and government buildings in Western Europe. Display rooms called cabinets, or Cabinets of Wonder, were usually more square-shaped and contained natural phenomena, such as geodes, taxidermy animals, and preserved flower specimens, as well as small art objects and other unusual and rare items from location near and far. These collections were still the private purview of the wealthy upper-class and nobility, and rarely available to the public (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017).

In the late seventeenth century, universities began to establish museums for study and research by their scholars and community members. In the eighteenth century, museums began collecting more natural specimens alongside scientific and artistic objects. Several Vatican museums, the British Museum, and the Louvre were all opened between 1750 and 1800, and on some occasions, the middle-class was welcome to visit (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017).

As the British colonies were forming the United States, museums were being established to collect and study local natural history materials. Public hours allowed

visitors, who paid an admission fee, to see rare and exotic artifacts and samples (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017). Around 1800, Charles Wilson Peale founded the Philadelphia Museum as “a space for curious engagement” (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017, 7). In 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was established “for the increase and diffusion of knowledge” (Smithsonian 2020).

Museums have always had an educational aspect, even though access was originally limited to the wealthy upper-class, advanced scholars, and elite researchers (Hudson 1975). The enlightenment of the eighteenth century and the democratic ideals of the nineteenth century “produced an enthusiasm for equality of opportunity of learning” (Hudson 1975, 6). This resulted in the expansion of public education and museums in the United States (Hudson 1975).

In the second half of the nineteenth century, as industrialism and urban centers grew, museums were considered one of several types of institutions that could help educate the masses (Hein 1998). Museum exhibitions exposed the populace to cultures and natural phenomena from around the world, often collected through imperialist endeavors (Hudson 1975). In 1857, the South Kensington Museum of London (now the Victoria and Albert Museum) opened with the mission to educate the public through its collections, exhibitions, and programs. In 1870, both the Metropolitan Museum of Art and Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (MFA Boston), were founded with aspirations of providing instruction and knowledge. In 1877, MFA Boston began free admission on Sundays to allow the working class to visit on their day off (Tuchfeld 2010).

In addition, museums provided support for public welfare campaigns, such as health education (Hein 1998). Many of the basic tools and programs that promoted public access were developed, such as didactic labels, lectures, special events, school tours, youth programs, and outreach to various audiences (Hein 1998).

As noted in the previous section, art courses were included in public schools as means of providing training for industrial arts and design. This was also true of art museums, which established “museum schools” that provided similar practical instruction (Tuchfeld 2010). Charles Wilson Peale’s school still exists today as the Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017). The Philadelphia Museum launched with a school of design after the Exposition of 1876 (Philadelphia Museum of Art 2020a). Such schools thrived until the early twentieth century when universities established art departments. Most museums then began to shut down their schools and moved their attention to general public engagement (Tuchfeld 2010).

During this same time, high schools were proliferating and accountability systems were implemented, including government and community oversight, testing, and standardized curriculum. These types of measures were not developed within museums, and few reliable studies of the educational impact on museum audiences were conducted in the first half of the twentieth century. Instead, museums focused on expanding their collections (Hein 1998).

Around 1900, John Cotton Dana, founder and director of the Newark Museum (now The Newark Museum of Art), forwarded the idea that libraries and museums should

be “a center of public happiness first, of public education next” (Dana in Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017, 8). Museums were popularly considered places for public education and enlightenment (Hein 1998; Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017). However, public school and museum education practices were diverging. These differences are sometimes broadly referred to as “formal” and “informal” learning settings (Hein 1998).

Schools provide “formal” education, with specific, typically hierarchal, curriculum and often rigid assessment parameters. There are rules about attendance, acceptable types of resources and activities, time spent in class, and time spent on learning tasks (Hein 1998).

“Informal” learning is more open-ended, with no rules for attendance or time spent learning, no specific content goals or evaluation requirements. Museums and many other places and experiences provide opportunities for informal learning (Hein 1998). “Formal” and “informal” describe the “administrative attributes of educational settings; the terms should not be used to describe pedagogic qualities” (Hein 1998, 7). Some schools or school activities could be inquiry-based with a range of learning goals and a flexible timeline, similar to museum interactive displays and galleries; and some museum programs might involve a didactic lecture or specific learning goals with assessment, much like a traditional school setting (Hein 1998).

By the 1960s, museums were examining their role as education institutions (Hein 1998). *America's Museums: The Belmont Report* was commissioned by President Lyndon

Johnson (Alexander, Alexander, and Decker 2017) and published by the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) (formerly American Association of Museums) in 1969, and defined the mission of museums as “two-fold: the advancement and diffusion of knowledge, and the enhancement of that awareness which affords pleasure and delight” (AAM in Hein 1998, 8). The report describes museums as institutions conducting research and providing education. In 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson began the national “war on poverty” and the Belmont Report recommended museums as potential collaborators in the effort to provide "education for disadvantaged children in slum areas" (AAM in Hein 1998, 8).

In 1973, AAM established the Education Professional Network (EdCom), which “advances the purpose of museums as places of lifelong learning, serves as an advocate for diverse audiences and educators, and promotes professional standards and excellence in the practice of museum education” (AAM 2020a). In 1984, AAM published *Museums for a New Century* which expounded on the educational function of museums, making this institutional role as important as other museum functions (Hein 1998). In 1990, AAM’s EdCom approved a “Statement on Professional Standards for Museum Education” that was intended to provide practical guidelines to strengthen professional excellence as museum staff carry out their educational responsibilities.

In 1992, AAM published *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums*, which spoke to “a new definition of museums as educational institutions that carry out their public service in the spirit of excellence and equity” (15).

The report posited that the “community of museums in the United States shares the responsibility with other educational institutions to enrich learning opportunities for all individuals and to nurture an enlightened, humane citizenry”... (28). These ideas are expressed in the report’s first two calls to action:

1. Assert that museums place education—in the broadest sense of the word at the center of their public service role.
2. Reflect the diversity of our society by establishing and maintaining the broadest possible public dimension for the museum (AAM 1992, 8).

Republishing the report virtually unchanged in 2008 (AAM 1992), implies that the recommendations for achieving equity in all facets of museums, from staffing to exhibitions, have yet to be achieved.

By 2000, a need for a document that would be “more descriptive of the complexity of engaging a diverse audience in vital and meaningful learning experiences” (AAM 2005, 2) was apparent, and in 2002, EdCom published *Excellence in Practice: Museum Education Principles and Standards*. Updated in 2005, it organized the principles for best practice in museum education and professional standards for museum educators into “three functional areas: accessibility, accountability and advocacy,” (AAM 2005, 6) reinforcing public service aims.

In 2013, American Alliance of Museums’ Center for the Future of Museums (CFM), and The Henry Ford convened “over four dozen educational policy experts, practitioners, funders, education innovators, reformers, student activists and others” to launch “a national dialogue about the future of education” in the United States and

explore “how leaders from the worlds of education and museums can work together to integrate the nation’s educational assets into a vibrant learning grid” (CFM 2014, 7). The next year, CFM published *Building the Future of Education: Museums and the Learning Ecosystem* to share ideas from the convening about using “museum resources to their fullest advantage in 21st-century education” (2014, 8).

AAM’s EdCom formed a Task Force in 2019 to determine if the field would support a core document that “clearly states their educational philosophies and principles and/or guides their decisions about the development and delivery of their educational role” (AAM 2020b). By December, 2020, the Task Force will determine if survey results, a literature review, and existing examples “indicate a general field-wide agreement on a guiding education document” (AAM 2020b).

These actions and publications indicate how museum professionals view the role of museums in society, placing their educative value as one of the primary purposes of museums. Given the inconsistency of art education across the nation, especially in Title I schools, museums are well-situated to partner with schools to provide meaningful art experiences that support all curricular areas.

CHAPTER 3. LEARNING THEORIES AND ART EDUCATION

Psychologists, neurologists, biologists, social scientists, and educators have all developed theories about how humans access information and knowledge, how we learn and advance, and how to teach effectively. These ideas are based in biology, psychology, and human behavior. Educators have taken these concepts and developed learning programs and activities to create meaningful learning experiences and environments in museums. A literature review of learning theories, the development of pedagogy and teaching strategies in museums, and types of museum education programs, plus current issues and trends, will be presented in this chapter.

Learning Theories and Museum Settings

Theories about knowledge and learning developed before World War II, such as constructivism and social context, were tried in schools, but were largely abandoned by the public school system by the end of the war. However, post-war, these same ideas began to influence museum education (Hein 1998).

In the early twentieth century, psychologist John Watson (1878-1958) developed the theory of behaviorism, arguing that our minds are a blank slate and children's development and learning are based almost entirely on their experiences alone. For Watson, this meant that with appropriate techniques, almost anyone could learn almost anything (Kail 2001), a sentiment prevalent in museum education today.

Philosopher and education reformer John Dewey (1859-1952) also believed that children's experiences shaped them (Dewey 1938). Regarding learning, Dewey noted that "not ... all experiences are genuinely or equally educative" (1938, 25). An educative experience "arouses curiosity, strengthens initiative, and sets up desires and purposes that are sufficiently intense to carry a person over" (Dewey 1938, 38) to the next educative interaction in the future. The effect of the experience was paramount, because "every experience lives on in further experiences" (Dewey 1938, 27). Future learning is built upon past learning and knowledge, and is a continuous process (Dewey 1938). Museum education texts frequently mention Dewey, and museum educators strive to create engaging, educative experiences for visitors, recognizing that visitors bring with them their past experiences (Hein 1998; Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011; Yenawine 2013; Falk and Dierking 2018).

Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget (1896-1980) developed a comprehensive cognitive-developmental theory in the 1920s (Kail 2001). He argued that in order to understand their world, children construct theories about how the world works. As they mature, children reach a stage where they realize there are discrepancies between what they think and new discoveries. As a result, they make adjustments and construct new, more advanced understandings. Piaget posited that there are four main stages of cognitive development, described in Table 1, that are marked by a distinctive way of thinking and understanding, and that all children follow the stages, essentially growing out of one stage and then progressing to the next. This progressive reorganization of thinking is

based on biological physical growth and personal experiences; in other words, both nature and nurture (Kail 2001).

Piaget's Four Stages of Cognitive Development

Stages	Age Ranges	Characteristics
Sensorimotor	birth to 2 years	Knowledge of world is based on senses and motor skills
Preoperational	2 to 6 years	Learns about world through symbols (words and numbers) from an egocentric viewpoint
Concrete operational	7 to 11 years	Understands and applies logical operations and thinking to current, personally relevant experiences
Formal operational	Adolescent to adult	Thinks abstractly, speculates about hypothetical situations, able to infer and reason deductively

Table 1. Piaget's Four Stages of Cognitive Development, adapted from Kail 2001.

Researchers over the years have elaborated and updated Piaget's theory. These theories have three main commonalities. First, they emphasize that each successive level of cognitive development builds upon elements of the previous level, and that the development does not usually occur in the specific, step-like progression that Piaget described, but seems to be more continuous. Second, as children's memory capacity improves, their thinking becomes more complex. And third, the theories recognize that each child's personal experiences and culture contribute to variations in cognitive development (Kail 2001).

Museum educators consider Piaget's stages when designing learning experiences for children in order to align the activities with developmental stages. They often design activities that will also be appropriate for different levels of cognitive development so

that a wider range of visitors can enjoy and learn from the experience. In addition, educators strive to take into account the cultural backgrounds of their audiences (Falk and Dierking 2018).

A very different theory was introduced by Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) who argued that children's cognitive development and learning begins in a social setting and then gradually moves to a child's independent control (Kail 2001; Lui 2013; Falk and Dierking 2018). There are three key aspects of Vygotsky's theory. One is the *zone of proximal development* (ZPD), which is the learning space between what a child can do with assistance and what a child can do on their own, as illustrated in Figure 1. Children's learning advances when they collaborate with others who are more skilled (Kail 2001; Lui 2013).

Figure 1. Locating the Zone of Proximal Development (Lui 2012, 2).

Vygotsky's second important contribution is the idea of *scaffolding*, which refers to a teaching method that matches the amount and type of assistance with the learner's needs. Children learn most effectively when they are provided with only the assistance required, and they are allowed to progressively take on more as they master different tasks (Kail 2001; Liu 2013).

The third key idea is about *private speech*, that is, talking aloud to oneself (Kail 2001). Vygotsky posited that children first begin to learn by listening to the speech of others. Then, children use private speech to help themselves regulate their behavior or puzzle through a problem when no one else is present. Finally, as their skills grow, children internalize their private speech, which become their thoughts, and which Vygotsky called *inner speech* (Kail 2001; Falk and Dierking 2018). Adults also engage in private speech (Falk and Dierking 2018).

Museum educators consider the zone of proximal development when they design activities that have multiple opportunities for progressing from what visitors can do on their own to learning new skills (Falk and Dierking 2018). Activities foster exploration and might include a way for visitors to compare their own interpretations with the intended learning goals (Hein 1998). Unfortunately, intergenerational learning opportunities are still an area that needs expansion (Johnson et al. 2017). Educators are working toward signage, interactives, activities, and programs that are designed to promote discussion, information sharing, and collaborative learning among families and groups (Johnson et al. 2017).

In the early 1960s, psychologist Albert Bandura (1925-) developed the social cognitive theory, which argues that learning is an active thinking and reasoning process that takes place in a social context (Kail 2001; Falk and Dierking 2018). Children learn by imitating what they observe others doing, and by responding to positive and negative consequences of their actions (Kail 2001). Learning is influenced by a mix of cognition (how we think and reason), experience (our environment and social interactions), and behavior (how we react and what we do) (Kail 2001). Museum educators are aware that they model behaviors of listening, questioning, touching, and so forth, and that much of the modeling is non-verbal (Falk and Dierking 2018). Museum experiences built on social cognition theory often include didactic elements that describe learning goals, and have components to reinforce and reward appropriate responses and correct answers (Hein 1998).

In the early 1980s, psychologist Howard Gardner (1943-) developed his *multiple intelligence* (MI) theory, arguing that humans possess not a single intelligence, but instead, a set of relatively independent intelligences. Gardner defined intelligence as “a biopsychological information-processing capacity to solve problems or fashion products that are valued in at least one community and culture” (2005, 6). Gardner “looked at criteria from neurology—which brain regions mediate particular skills; anthropology—which abilities have been valued in different cultures across history and pre-history” (2005, 6); evolutionary biology; psychometrics; and psychological studies of prodigies and savants (Davis et al. 2011). His research resulted in a list of eight intelligences,

described in Table 2. Although distinct, the intelligences always work in concert, since every activity requires use of more than one intelligence (Gardner 2005; Davis et al. 2011).

Gardner's Multiple Intelligences

Intelligence	Characteristics
Linguistic	An ability to analyze information and create products involving oral and written language such as speeches, books, and memos.
Logical-Mathematical	An ability to develop equations and proofs, make calculations, and solve abstract problems.
Musical	An ability to produce, remember, and make meaning of different patterns of sound. The capacity to create, perform, and appreciate music.
Spatial	The capacity to recognize, form, and manipulate large-scale and fine-grained mental images.
Bodily-Kinesthetic	An ability to use one's own body to create products or solve problems.
Naturalist	The ability to make consequential distinctions among organisms and entities in the natural world.
Interpersonal	The capacity to notice distinctions among others, such as contrasts in their moods, temperaments, motivations, and intentions.
Intrapersonal	The capacity to draw on knowledge of one's own emotions, motivations, and intentions to understand and guide one's behavior.

A possible candidate that deserves further research to qualify as an intelligence

Existential	The capacity for considering "big questions" such as life, death, love, justice, and being.
-------------	---

Table 2. Gardner's Multiple Intelligences, adapted from Gardner 2005; Davis et al. 2011.

Gardner highlights two primary scientific claims. First, all individuals possess the full range of intelligences, which define human cognitive ability. Second, each individual possesses a unique profile of intellectual strengths and weaknesses (Gardner 2005; Davis et al. 2011).

For Gardner, there are two main implications of MI theory for education. First, *individualization*, which means that teaching “should be based on our understanding of the intellectual profiles of individual learners” (Gardner 2011, 6). Second, *pluralization*, which means that the educator should present concepts and skills in a variety of ways to engage more students (Gardner 2011). Museum educators work to create programs and activities that appeal to a variety of intelligences in order to spark interest for all audiences.

Although these various theories of human cognitive development were not developed with the goal of influencing education systems, public schools have incorporated these theories to varying degrees. Teachers recognize a change from concrete to abstract thinking in middle schoolers. Students are sometimes encouraged (or expected) to help their peers reach the next level of understanding, and teachers often assign group projects for collaborative learning. Some schools have based their curriculum on MI theory (Gardner 2011). However, it is in the informal learning setting of museums that constructivism and sociocultural learning have been embraced and form the basis for many museum programs (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011; Falk and Dierking 2018).

Museum Education and Visual Arts Pedagogy

Since the Museum of Fine Arts (MFA) in Boston launched the first docent program in 1907 in order to provide regularly scheduled gallery tours for the public, the purpose of education in art museums has been debated (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011).

Benjamin Ives Gilman (1852–1933), the MFA’s secretary, believed that the role of the docent was to assist visitors in appreciating artworks for their aesthetic value, that is, artworks’ beauty and ability to transport us beyond the everyday. He suggested that docents ask about the visitors’ interests in order to effectively adapt the tour for each group, and use an approach that was less didactic and more conversational (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011).

At the same time, there were others who thought that objects should be studied for their art historical significance (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). John Dewey believed that art needs context (1934). Dewey argued that artworks reflect the ideas and emotions that are associated with the community in which they were created and are part of everyday life, not part of a separate, philosophical experience (1934).

As other museums began their own gallery tour programs led by docents, training was not provided, which contributed to uneven programming (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). In 1918, the American Association of Museums discussed training in a special session. This brought to the fore the question of the purpose of museum-based art education: should the goal be to foster aesthetic appreciation or to provide sociohistorical context (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011)?

One way to bridge aesthetic and art historical aims was through *formalism*, which holds that aesthetic appreciation is achieved through understanding the formal elements of artworks, such as line and color (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). Artist and educator Arthur Wesley Dow (1857-1922) wrote a practical, systematic approach to creating art,

Composition, first published in 1899 and last reissued in 2007. Hugely influential in art education, the book presents exercises for making artwork by focusing on compositional elements, such as contrast in colors, rather than simply observing and copying what is seen. Dow suggested that art was a means of self-expression. Therefore, in order to appreciate an artwork, you needed to understand the artist, and that meant knowing something about the artist's life and times (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). However, Dow was primarily interested in teaching art making, and his focus on personal expression and compositional elements placed his ideas in the aesthetic appreciation camp.

These two general approaches—personal aesthetic appreciation and interpretation, and cultural-historical context and understanding—continued to be the philosophical basis for museum education programming (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). In the 1930s, school teachers and administrators began focusing on using museum objects to reinforce classroom learning, and began to consider art appreciation as irrelevant. With World War II came an increased interest in understanding artworks as the embodiment of historical and cultural values, and how the past connects to the present. In the 1950s, a variety of gallery discussion techniques and hands-on art making were tried, but there continued to be a lack of educational theory and pedagogy to support these experiments. In the 1960s, museums became more focused on their social relevance. The AAM's 1972 "Credo for Museum Education" stated that museums would be involved in their communities and "take positive steps to combat social injustices" (AAM in Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011, 35). In the 1970s, many new activities were a variation of aesthetic

formalism, understanding the object through direct observation rather than its historical context (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011).

These ideas about focusing on the object were organized into a learning theory in the early 1980s. Patterson Williams (1942-), who retired in September, 2020, after forty years as director of education at the Denver Art Museum, developed her theory of *object-based learning*, specifically for art museums (Williams 1982; Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). Williams argued that the “primary aim of museum education must be to bring together people and objects, not people and information about objects” (1982, 12).

Williams posited four mental-emotional operations that educators could teach visitors to help them engage in personally significant experiences with artworks. The first operation is looking, which involves taking the time to focus on different aspects of the artwork. Visual perception is subjective, and people will observe different details based on their emotions and past experiences. The second is reacting, which is responding honestly to an object and interpreting meaning. Reactions can be very wide-ranging, they can be emotional, intellectual, or trigger a memory. Viewers are sometimes overly influenced by the opinions of others, which can interfere with an honest, personal reaction. The third is cultural context, which regards the artwork as a cultural object and primary source that can communicate a diverse array of information to the viewer. The educator needs to carefully consider what information viewers might need to be able to explore and understand the cultural and historical context of the object. The fourth is making judgments, which can include a wide variety of multiple subjective and objective

evaluations. Judgments of any type take time and should be postponed until after a full exploration of the object. Even simple judgments, such as liking the colors, reflect a complex mix of values, reactions, and perceptions (Williams 1982). In general, object-based learning centers the learner as the instigator for learning, and encourages inquiry based on close observation and personal interest. Today, museums, universities, and schools use object-based learning to deepen student learning by observing details, making comparisons, and posing questions.

Also in the early 1980s, a formal education approach to art became popular. In 1982, the J. Paul Getty Trust established a center for arts education, and brought to prominence *discipline-based art education* (DBAE), comprised of four disciplines: aesthetics, art production, art history, and art criticism (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). DBAE approaches teaching art in the same way as other academic subjects, through a formal, structured, sequential curriculum across grade levels (Greer 1984). This approach appeased those critics who considered art as frivolous craft in the classroom (Greer 1984). Although museum educators teach similar skills, in practice, they use a more holistic approach in the galleries, not the delineated four disciplines of DBAE (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). Today, DBAE's disciplines have been deconstructed and reframed, and can be detected in the National Core Arts Standards as part of Creating, Presenting/Performing/Producing, Responding, and Connecting.

In 1987, the Education Committee of AAM and the Museum Division of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) convened a meeting in Denver to establish a

definition of museum education and define important issues and trends. The group recommended teaching that was object-based, and emphasized students as active participants in learning. At that time, most museum educators believed that knowing art history was more important than understanding educational pedagogy, and DBAE supported these ideas (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011).

The concept of *visual literacy* also emerged in the late 1980s. At first, being visually literate meant being able to understand the formal aspects of artworks, such as color and shape. Museum educators realized that the formal elements were based in cultural perceptions, and that perhaps DBAE would be a more comprehensive way to consider visual literacy (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). Today, there is no predominate definition of visual literacy, although most museums refer to being able to read, comprehend, and write images, likening images to a type of language (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011; Toledo Museum of Art 2020). This understanding of visual literacy encompasses both personal interpretation and understanding cultural-historical context.

In the 1990s, the emphasis on visitor-centered experiences continued. The concept of interpretation as something museum professionals do to make objects and exhibits understandable for the public, shifted to include a visitor's personal meaning-making (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). The idea that visitors create their own interpretations aligns with constructivist learning theory, and became the norm in art museums (Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; Yenawine, 2013).

Constructivism is a theory about learning based on the ideas of Dewey, Piaget, and Vygotsky, which argues that learners actively construct knowledge for themselves, on their own or in social communities (Hein 1998; Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). It is also a theory about knowledge which argues that knowledge does not exist independently of the meaning constructed by the learner, or community of learners (Hein 1998; Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). Research suggests that learning is a transformation of one's mental constructs that requires the active involvement of the learner to build upon prior knowledge and understanding with additional information and experiences (Falk and Dierking 2018). Learning is not simply the memorization of facts transmitted by a teacher, or the improvement of skills repeated over time. Neuroscience research confirms that as memories are created, they are combined and recombined, constructed and reconstructed. This results in personal *constructs*, or understandings, and enables people to respond to new events, to interpret, to imagine, to theorize, and to create (Falk and Dierking 2018).

In the early 1990s, Philip Yenawine and Abigail Housen at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, developed a constructivist, entirely viewer-centered pedagogy which they called Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) (Yenawine 2013). VTS uses art to “teach visual literacy, thinking, and communication skills” (Yenawine 2013, 19) through three activities: students look carefully at art of increasing complexity; participate in peer group discussions; and answer developmentally appropriate questions to support their reasoning. Discussions are carefully facilitated by educators who do not provide

information. Instead, educators paraphrase student responses, encourage closer looking, and ask questions (Yenawine 2013). Educators use three key questions: What is going on in this picture? What do you see that makes you say that? What else can you find/see? (Yenawine 2013). These questions are object-based and require students to notice details, verbalize their thoughts, provide evidence for their assertions, consider the opinions of others, hypothesize, and promote curiosity. While not content focused, these thinking skills are transferable to other curricular areas and everyday situations (Yenawine 2013).

As No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reduced time spent on the arts, a more curriculum focused approach emerged. In 1999, the Kennedy Center began providing professional learning experiences about *arts integration* to teachers at partner schools in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area through its Changing Education Through the Arts (CETA) program (Silverstein and Layne 2020a). The Kennedy Center developed a comprehensive definition of arts integration to clarify how it differs from teaching the arts or using the arts in the classroom:

Arts Integration is an approach to teaching in which students construct and demonstrate understanding through an art form. Students engage in a creative process which connects an art form and another subject area, and meets evolving objectives in both (Silverstein and Layne 2020a).

The arts integration approach to teaching is based on constructivist ideas that learning is actively constructed, experiential, collaborative, reflective, and requires problem-solving (Silverstein and Layne 2020a). A distinguishing feature of arts integration is its interdisciplinary connections between a specific art form and a specific

curriculum area. When students are engaged in learning in one subject, their learning in the other subject is reinforced and extended, creating a mutually-reinforcing cycle (Silverstein and Layne 2020a). This is different from DBAE, formalism, and other methods where art is taught as a separate and equal curricular area. Arts integration is also separate from arts-enhanced curriculum where the arts are used to support other curricular areas, but no arts education objectives are defined, such as drawing a state bird for a report. These distinct approaches can also overlap, as noted in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Arts and Curriculum: Three Variations, adapted from Silverstein and Layne 2020a.

Arts integration is generally a classroom-based pedagogy. Art museums generally provide arts-focused or arts-enhanced programs. Since arts integration requires deep knowledge about multiple curricular areas, art museums typically do not provide such programming, unless the museum can partner with a school or class for an extended period of time.

Another approach developed for regular classrooms is the Artful Thinking Program. In 2004-2006, Project Zero at the Harvard Graduate School of Education developed the Artful Thinking Program to teach “high-level thinking dispositions in and through the arts” with the goal of “integrating the arts into the core elementary school curriculum as a means for improving reading, writing, and general academic achievement” (Tishman and Palmer 2006, 4). The idea of dispositions is that people’s behavior is guided by prevailing tendencies and inclinations. Attributions, such as curiosity and open-mindedness, “address what people are inclined to do within the range of their knowledge and capabilities” (Tishman and Palmer 2006, 7). Artful Thinking focuses on a set of six synergistic thinking dispositions: “questioning and investigating, observing and describing, reasoning, exploring viewpoints, comparing and connecting, and finding complexity” (Tishman and Palmer 2006, 8-9). People form dispositions by regularly engaging in specific patterns of behavior. To help students develop desired thinking dispositions, the Artful Thinking program employs activities called *thinking routines* (Tishman and Palmer 2006). An important feature of Artful Thinking “involves making students’ thinking visible by documenting their unfolding thought processes as they use thinking routines” (Tishman and Palmer 2006, 10).

Because the program focuses on exploring and appreciating artworks, rather than artmaking, the thinking routines are well-suited for use in galleries, and are an example of object-based learning. The goal of the Artful Thinking program is to help students develop thinking dispositions that support thoughtful learning not only in the arts, but in

all curricular areas, which makes them useful for arts integration (Tishman and Palmer 2006). The variety of thinking routines supports building on prior knowledge, constructing meaning, and working in groups, which are aspects of constructivism. These attributes of Artful Thinking routines make them common place in many museums and useful in classroom settings.

Art Museum School Programs

Over one hundred years ago, John Cotton Dana was able to list many publications by others from the late 1900s about maximizing the educative value of museums for the general public, especially school children (Dana 1917). He also lists several museums that prepare exhibits and collections specifically for lending to schools (Dana 1917). Today, art museums offer several types of programs to students and teachers.

One of the most ubiquitous is the single visit school tour. Teachers request a gallery tour for their class, which is usually sixty to ninety minutes in length. Typically, school tours are guided, either by a professional museum educator or volunteer docent. Tours are often content-focused and used to supplement classroom learning, for example, touring the Egyptian galleries when studying ancient Egypt. Tours might have another focus, such as personal interpretation and employ VTS, or poetry and use artworks as writing prompts.

Variations on the single-visit school tour include tours that are led by the classroom teacher; allowing students to explore exhibitions on their own or in small

groups using audio guides; the opportunity for handling objects; and adding a session for making or writing activities based on the gallery tour.

Another common type of program is the classroom visit by a teaching artist, professional museum educator, or docent. The focus for these programs could be cultural or historical context to support classroom curriculum; art appreciation or art history; art making; or a community art project. Programs could be single or multiple visits.

Museums also work with schools to offer programs for specific groups, such as after-school art making for students needing daycare; or a teen leadership program.

Many art museums provide professional development workshops for teachers, which can be as short as ninety minutes or as long as one week. Topics for the workshops can be very wide ranging, such as exploring special exhibitions for curricular links; employing object-based learning in the classroom; arts integration methods; or specific craft and artmaking techniques.

Summary

At the beginning of the twentieth century, John Cotton Dana observed that the wealthy and powerful in the United States collected art for their own personal enjoyment and for the aggrandizement of their family's status (1917). They also helped establish art museums, which collected for primarily similar reasons, and displayed the art for primarily the same class of people. Dana epitomized the nascent view that museums

should be places of broad education for the residents, who provided the funds for these public institutions (1917).

Over the last fifty years, educational theories and pedagogies have been developed that are widely used in the informal learning setting of art museums. Although programs for students might focus on content knowledge, the most popular learning and teaching strategies concentrate on developing observation, communication, collaboration, empathy, critical thinking, and creative problem-solving skills. These general skills are useful in all types of learning settings and for all curricular areas, and are therefore being adopted and integrated into formal learning settings.

Art museums offer a variety of programs for students and teachers to learn through and with art and artworks, including single-visit school tours at the museum and classroom visits by teaching artists. One of the most effective types of programs involves multi-visit school tours. In the following chapters, case studies of multi-visit school tour programs will be presented, focusing on how art museums and school districts partner to provide exemplary learning experiences for underserved youth.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

In this thesis, art museum partnerships with public schools in underserved communities are examined. Key areas to be investigated include how partnerships and collaborations are formed and structured; how program focus and goals are determined; what types of learning theories and pedagogy are utilized; how programs are managed, including staffing and funding; and how program objectives and benefits for students are evaluated, including methodology and results. One important goal of this thesis is to offer recommendations to art museums that are considering developing partnerships with public schools in order to support educational goals in underserved communities. To examine art museum-school partnerships, a literature review and case studies were conducted.

Chapter 1 presents the case for including the arts as a core curriculum through data that clearly indicates the academic benefits of arts education and illustrates the gap in quality arts opportunities for underserved students. Main resources include the President's Council on the Arts and Humanities (PCAH) 2011 report, *Reinvesting in Arts Education: Winning America's Future Through Creative Schools*, that summarizes many research studies, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Achievement Gap and Arts Assessment reports.

The literature review, presented in Chapter 2 and 3, was conducted to provide context for the creation of art museum-school partnerships, as outlined below. In Chapter

2, both public education and museum education are reviewed. First, a brief history of public education in the United States was conducted in order to understand the past landscape of public schools, how public education is structured today, and the place of arts education in public education. A key source included *School: The Story of American Public Education* (2001), edited by Sarah Mondale and Sarah B. Patton, which provided an overview of major events in the formation of the public school system in the United States. Other sources included journal articles and reports to Congress regarding the effect of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) on arts education. Next, the role of educational standards, including the National Core Art Standards (NCAS), Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), were discussed in terms of their impact on teaching and learning expectations in the classroom.

Then, a history of museum education was conducted to provide context for current trends and expectations. Key sources included *Museums in Motion*, 3rd edition (2017), by Edward P. Alexander, Mary Alexander, and Juilee Decker, and *Learning in the Museum* (1998) by George Hein, which provided an overview of the evolution of museums as educational institutions. The American Alliance of Museums (AAM) provided reports and statements regarding the changing role of education in museums over the last fifty years to the present.

In Chapter 3, cognitive development theories and visual arts pedagogy are presented to provide an understanding of educational approaches for art education. First, learning theories were examined as they pertain to museum settings. Chief sources

included *Children and Their Development*, 2nd edition (2001) by Robert V. Kail and *Learning from Museums*, 2nd edition (2018) by John H. Falk and Lynn D. Dierking, which provided overviews of the most significant theories of cognitive development and learning theories from the twentieth century that continue to be influential in education practice today. Next, visual arts pedagogy was reviewed in the context of school and museum settings, including approaches developed at museums and cultural centers. A major source was *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience* (2011) by Rika Burnham and Elliott Kai-Kee, which provided historical background and delineated the main educational approaches pursued by museums. Other sources included *Artful Thinking: Stronger thinking and learning through the power of art* (2006) by Shari Tishman and Patricia Palmer; *Visual Thinking Strategies: Using Art to Deepen Learning Across School Disciplines*, 2013 by Peter Yenawine; and “What is Arts Integration? Explore the Kennedy Center’s comprehensive definition” (2020), an online article by Lynne B. Silverstein and Sean Layne, which all describe teaching strategies and how engagement with art can support critical and creative thinking across disciplines. Then, a brief overview of the types of school programs offered by art museums is provided.

Case studies are presented in Chapter 5, 6, and 7. Case studies were chosen as a methodological approach in order to gather more detailed and nuanced information about the design (including establishment of relationships with schools, pedagogy, and program goals), management (including staffing and funding), and evaluation (including methodology and results) of successful museum-school partnerships. Art museums for

the case studies were selected according to the following museum-school partnership criteria:

1. The program involved multiple visits to the museum and/or to the classroom.
2. The program served Title 1 schools or schools in low-income districts.
3. The program was well-established, well-funded, and well-documented.

Multiple visits were chosen as one criterion because deeper learning takes time (Hein 1998; Tishman and Palmer 2006) and a more impactful relationship among the museum, students, and teachers can be built (Lesk 2019). Another chief criterion was that the schools serve low-income communities. Title I schools have fewer resources and opportunities for class trips (Malburg 2008), or museum educator visits to classrooms thus requiring more support than schools in wealthier districts. The last criterion of being an established program was important in order to elicit a more complete picture of how such partnerships evolve and respond to changes in the fields of public, museum, and visual arts education. In addition, well-funded programs have the capacity to conduct more comprehensive evaluations, thus providing evidence of positive program impact.

An internet review of school programs at twenty art museums of different sizes from across the United States revealed that only half had multi-visit programs. After a closer study of the remaining ten programs, three were chosen for their especially robust programs. The National Gallery of Art's Art Around the Corner has supported economically disadvantaged students for twenty-five years and hires a professional evaluation company to perform assessment. The Philadelphia Museum of Art has several

partnership programs, some of which have been in existence for twenty to thirty years. Although the Barnes Foundation's program is newer, it is generously funded, has a similar reach, and is also evaluated by a professional evaluation firm.

Websites were an important resource for the case study museums, in regards to information about the museums' histories, missions, and program descriptions. Annual reports were also available online and provided information about staffing, funding, and student demographics.

In order to derive more comprehensive explanations about the development, management, educational approaches, and evaluation of the partnerships, the museum staff who direct the programs were interviewed as content experts. Emails were sent to the appropriate administrators in November, 2019. In-person interviews at each museum, lasting approximately forty-five minutes, were arranged for December, 2019. Sara Mark Lesk, Senior Educator and Manager, Art Around the Corner, Division of Education at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. was interviewed on December 4, 2019. Stephanie Stern, PreK-12 Programs Manager at the Barnes Foundation located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania was interviewed on December 16, 2019. Barbara Bassett, The Constance Williams Curator of Education, School and Teacher Programs at the Philadelphia Museum of Art was interviewed on December 17, 2019.

The questions asked focused on how the partnerships were formed, how the programs were developed, how the programs are managed, and how they are evaluated.

Question one asked, “In what type of school partnerships does the museum participate?” This question was designed to describe a more complete picture of the range of partnership programs at each museum and the rationale behind each program.

Question two asked, “Why does the museum provide this type of programming?” This question was designed to determine the purpose and goals of the collaborative multi-visit programming.

Question three asked, “What is the history of program?” This question was designed to elicit background information about the formation of the program and how the program has responded to changes in the fields of education and museum education, as well as to possible economic and political changes.

Question four asked, “Which museum administrators supervise and manage the partnerships?” This question was designed to understand staffing requirements and responsibilities.

Question five asked, “How is contact initiated?” This question was designed to understand how programs are launched and how relationships with teachers and school districts are cultivated in advance of forming the partnership.

Question six asked, “How are agreements reached?” This question was designed to explain what types of restrictions, expectations, and requirements are placed on museum staff in planning and creating the programs; who is involved in deciding the logistical framework of the program; and the depth and style of collaboration with the teachers and district.

Question seven asked, “How are goals and objectives determined?” This question was designed to understand who is involved in setting the goals for the program and what criteria are used to determine the objectives.

Question eight asked, “How is the program developed and implemented?” This question was designed to understand which museum staff is involved in the development and management of the program, and what management considerations need to be addressed.

Question nine asked, “How is the impact of these programs evaluated?” This question was designed to understand the program assessment methods and whether goals and objectives were met, and what the benefit to students are and how the benefits are determined.

Question ten asked, “How is the program funded?” This question was designed to understand funding sources and how the budget is determined.

Question eleven asked, “Is there a plan for sustainability?” This question was designed to understand how the programs expect to continue and what plans are in process for the future.

There are many moving parts in producing a multi-visit program. From registering schools to teacher professional development, from lesson content to budgetary concerns, from arranging transportation to the museum to student learning goals, there are many factors in planning and managing multiple visit programs, whether most sessions take place at the museum or school. The literature review and case studies were

structured to focus on the development, management, and evaluation of art museum-school partnerships in underserved communities.

Because the focus of this thesis is on the administration and impact of these partnerships, the content of the lessons was not reviewed; gallery educators and teaching artists were not interviewed; and programs were not directly observed. The case studies in the following chapters illuminate considerations in launching and maintaining meaningful, collaborative partnerships between schools and art museums.

CHAPTER 5: NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Museum Mission and Background

The National Gallery of Art (NGA) was established by Congress in March 1937 as a national resource for the people of the United States (NGA 2020a). Andrew W. Mellon (1855–1937), a financier, art collector, and Secretary of the Treasury, believed that the United States should have a public national art museum with the highest quality artworks modeled after those of great European countries. Mellon donated his world-class art collection, personally funded the construction of the building, and included a sizable endowment to ensure the museum’s longevity (NGA 2020a).

Located near Capitol Hill on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., the original edifice, now referred to as the West Building, was dedicated on March 17, 1941, with President Franklin D. Roosevelt accepting the gift on behalf of the nation. By 1967, additional exhibition and storage space was needed, and architect I. M. Pei (1917-2019) was selected to design the East Building, which was dedicated on June 1, 1978. The six-acre Sculpture Garden featuring American flora and a fountain with a reflecting pool, opened on May 23, 1999, as an outdoor gallery for monumental sculptures (NGA 2020a).

The collection expanded quickly through major donations from leading U.S. collectors. Thanks to their generosity, the NGA’s world-renowned artworks include pivotal works by European masters such as Leonardo da Vinci, Paul Cézanne, Rembrandt van Rijn, and Johannes Vermeer; major works by leading impressionist, post-

impressionist, and modern artists such as Edouard Manet, Edgar Degas, Pablo Picasso and Paul Gauguin; significant works by U.S. artists such as George Bellows, Gilbert Stuart, Jacob Lawrence, Romare Bearden, Louise Bourgeois, Roy Lichtenstein, and Kara Walker; thousands of photographs, books, prints, and other works on paper; and a vast array of decorative arts including Chinese porcelains, early American furniture, tapestries, and ceramics. Today, the collection of over 150,000 artworks continues to grow through donations and acquisitions (NGA 2020a).

NGA's mission is "to serve the United States of America in a national role by preserving, collecting, exhibiting, and fostering the understanding of works of art, at the highest possible museum and scholarly standards" (NGA 2020b). From conducting advanced research to "the dissemination of knowledge to its visitors and to the widest possible student and general public, the Gallery is an educative institution" (NGA 2020b).

Since NGA opened, it has offered daily public tours and weekly lectures. In 1942, the Gallery established a film program and a free Sunday evening concert series that continues today (NGA 2020a). Programming has expanded over the years, and now includes a wide array of programs for youth, families, students, and teachers, including films for children and teens, artmaking activities, storytime, teen volunteer opportunities, school tours, high school seminars, and teacher workshops (NGA 2020c). Over 4.4 million people visited in 2018 (Lock 2019) and over 780,000 people participated in educational and public programming (NGA 2019).

Museum-School Partnership Programming

Background and Mission

NGA's museum-school partnership program, Art Around the Corner (AAC), partners NGA with Title I elementary schools in the Washington, D.C area. Launched in 1994, AAC celebrated its twenty-fifth year. According to Sara Mark Lesk, Senior Educator and Manager, Art Around the Corner, Division of Education, the program has changed over time, adapting to changes in school district objectives (Lesk 2019). Today, AAC is comprised of three programs: the Multiple-Visit Program, the Mini-Multiple-Visit Program, and the Fairfax County Public Schools Title I Program (NGA 2018).

As the program's mission, NGA's 2017-2018 End of Year Report states that, "Art Around the Corner is committed to providing quality multiple-visit programs at the National Gallery of Art for under-resourced students, families, and teachers that deepen understanding of art, strengthen critical thinking, and broaden life experiences" (NGA 2018, 3). The website adds that "... students visit the National Gallery to engage in critical- and creative-thinking activities to make meaning from art, acquire art vocabulary in context, and create art in response to what they see" (NGA 2020d).

The End of Year Report describes the desired impact of experiencing art through the AAC program:

- *Students* work towards their full potential in life and learning.
- *Family* members connect with each other through conversations about art.
- *Teachers* see how art affects their students in positive ways and integrate art into their teaching practice (NGA 2018, 3).

Pedagogy and Curriculum

Art Around the Corner emphasizes the development of critical thinking as a means to deepen understanding of art, as explained in the 2017-2018 End of Year Report:

AAC curriculum is inspired by “Teaching for Understanding,” and Artful Thinking, two pedagogies developed by the Project Zero research group at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education. Gallery teachers employ a number of consistent gallery strategies, including Artful Thinking Routines, sketching, dramatization, and creative writing. During each museum visit, gallery teachers use inquiry to encourage students to slow down as they observe, describe, reason, compare and contrast what they see, connect ideas to experiences, ask questions, use imagination, and reflect on their learning (NGA 2018, 5).

AAC themes are linked to classroom curricula, Common Core State Standards, and District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) content standards. In the 2017-2018 school year, the theme “Think Like an Artist” guided the student experience in the six-visit program. During each lesson, students engaged in open-ended discussion using Artful Thinking routines to help them observe, wonder about, and describe works of art. A key benefit of the thinking routines is learning to reason and support one’s interpretation with evidence found in the works of art. During the gallery lessons, students wrote poetry, sketched, acted out scenes, and compared works of art. During artmaking sessions in the Education Studio, third and fourth graders created portraits of people they admire and abstract paintings by playing with color, line, and shape. Fifth graders created modern abstract sculptures, clay figures on armatures, and Civil War collages (NGA 2018).

Programming Description

The primary audience for the Multiple-Visit Program provides third, fourth, and fifth graders in selected DCPS Title I elementary schools with five museum visits and one classroom visit per year for two or three years (NGA 2018). Usually, the entire grade level at each school participates. Students are divided into groups of twelve to fifteen. Groups stay together with the same museum educator throughout the program in order to build trust and encourage open, honest conversations which contributes to promoting critical and creative thinking and expression (Lesk 2019). During the single visit to the classroom, the museum educator sets expectations and lays the groundwork for the gallery visits. During museum visits, which last between one and one-half to two hours, students look closely at works of art and engage in open-ended discussions (NGA 2018). They also participate in activities such as role-playing, sketching, and writing to help them make personal and interdisciplinary connections to the art. Students are given sketchbook-journals to record their observations. At the end of two gallery visits, students also create their own original art in the Education Studio. Each lesson is tied to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and DCPS Learning Standards (NGA 2018; NGA 2020d).

In their classrooms, students receive activity books to prepare before their Gallery visit lessons and to reflect upon their visit afterwards (NGA 2018). Each lesson is guided by an essential question and has a featured artist or theme. Classroom teachers receive children's books and art reproductions to engage students in arts-integrated activities

between Gallery visits. They also participate in professional development workshops to learn how to integrate art into the curriculum (NGA 2018; NGA 2020d).

For the secondary audience of families, AAC hosts special Family Days at NGA. With the program's expansion, for the first time AAC hosted three Family Days during the 2017-2018 academic year (NGA 2018). Over 475 students and family members enjoyed a hot breakfast and an exhibit of student artwork created during the program. Families could explore the galleries with a museum exploration kit that included a sketchbook and pencil. A bilingual, self-guided family brochure was available. Children and their caregivers sketched, posed, wrote poetry, asked questions, and took photographs with art in the galleries. All children received an art kit to take home to promote further learning beyond the program (NGA 2018).

For the third audience of classroom teachers, professional development is an integral piece of the program (NGA 2018; Lesk 2019). AAC staff provided a course, "Using Thinking Routines to Integrate Art and Support Literacy" for thirty-five participating classroom, special needs, and art teachers. The four-part professional development course is now in its seventh year. Teachers participated in gallery demonstrations of Artful Thinking routines and then practiced integrating art in their classrooms with art reproductions provided by NGA. At each session, they shared and analyzed documentation of student thinking (NGA 2018).

The second AAC program, the Mini-Multiple-Visit (MMV) program consists of three-visits during one week, one classroom visit by a museum educator and two Gallery

visits (NGA 2018). This more condensed program allows additional Title 1 students to experience object-based learning with artworks. An interdisciplinary theme, such as storytelling in art or math in art, connects the visits and lessons (NGA 2020d).

The third AAC program is a partnership with the Fairfax County Title I Office. In this more limited program, AAC staff provide elementary students and their families with guided programming on a single visit (NGA 2018).

School Demographics and Criteria for Participation

As outlined above, the level of commitment from the schools involved is very deep. Active participation from the classroom teachers is expected throughout the academic year for two to five years. To ensure that teachers and school administrators understand the depth of the partnership, prospective schools first participate in the Mini-Multiple-Visit program (Lesk 2019). Although some schools are still accepted through a multi-stage interview process, teachers who have already experienced the Mini-Multiple-Visit program have a clearer understanding of AAC's methods and goals and therefore are more committed partners (Lesk 2019). Because the program has a track record and is well-known in the region, most schools today initiate contact with NGA's education department to inquire about the AAC program (NGA 2018).

In order to be accepted into AAC's six-visit program, schools must meet the following criteria as outlined in the End of the Year report:

- The school's commitment of the participating team of classroom teachers, art teachers, and the principal, for a three-to-five year period;

- Need, in terms of students being “at-risk” with regard to academic performance or Title 1 status;
- Need, in terms of the school not having similar arts programming;
- Geographic location (Art Around the Corner strives to serve a cross-section of the city’s quadrants);
- Previous participation in the Mini-Multiple-Visit program and/or on-site interview (NGA 2018, 5).

Demographic information in the End of Year Report states that all students are economically disadvantaged and that all the participating schools in all three programs are Title 1 elementary schools. AAC partnered with four DCPS schools for the six-visit program with 396 participating students, six DCPS schools for the Mini-Multiple-Visit program with 268 participating students, and two Fairfax County schools with 78 participating students. In total, nearly 750 students participated in AAC programs during the 2017-18 school year (NGA 2018).

Program Staffing

High-quality professional staff designs, manages, and teaches the AAC programs. Five Education Division staff members work on the AAC programs (NGA 2018). The Senior Educator and Manager of Art Around the Corner manages all aspects of NGA’s multiple-visit programs, supervising program staff and gallery educators, as well as developing community relationships to expand NGA’s audiences. The Coordinator of Professional Development designs and facilitates professional development for classroom and gallery educators, and also assists with curriculum, gallery, and studio teaching. The Coordinator of Community Engagement coordinates AAC Family Days and the Mini-

Multiple-Visit program, creates curriculum, teaches in the studio and galleries, and supports community outreach efforts. Another Museum Educator coordinates communications and logistics for all AAC programs, assists with curriculum writing and teaching, and supervises the Fairfax County Title I program. An Education Assistant prepares studio art materials and supports student artmaking in the Education Studio. All these professionals also work on other NGA programs and initiatives (NGA 2018).

AAC programs were taught by these five members of the education staff and ten part-time contract museum educators, called Gallery Educators (NGA 2018; Lesk 2019). Each year, new Gallery Educators need to be recruited and trained because several move on to full-time positions (Lesk 2019). In 2017, one Spanish-speaking gallery teacher joined and conducted her lessons in Spanish (NGA 2018).

Each fall, the contract Gallery Educators and AAC staff participate in a professional development workshop for two full days to prepare for the academic year (NGA 2018; Lesk 2019). The theme in 2017 was “Think Like an Artist”. A Smithsonian learning specialist presented strategies for teaching students with special needs. All participants met in six study groups to share teaching techniques and focus on student thinking (NGA 2018). Training is participatory and includes practicing storytelling, sketching, recognizing trauma, yoga, and mindfulness. New Gallery Educators are paired with those with experience (Lesk 2019).

AAC staff development is on-going and mainly consists of attending and presenting at professional conferences, such as the American Alliance of Museums

(AAM) annual conference and the International Conference on Thinking (ICOT) (NGA 2018). AAC staff leads professional development training; for example, ACC staff taught an in-gallery lesson for the Washington International School's Summer Teacher Institute (WISSIT), which is an extension of Project Zero (NGA 2018; Lesk 2019). They also teach in other NGA programs; for example, AAC staff taught English Language Learners (ELL) in a separate summer partnership with DCPS (NGA 2018).

Program Funding

The majority of the funding for AAC is provided by individuals and private family foundations (NGA 2018; Lesk 2019). For the 2019-2020 academic year, funding was provided by The Max and Victoria Dreyfus Foundation, Inc., the Mark and Carol Hyman Fund, the Harman Cain Family Foundation, the Janice H. Levin Fund, and Dr. Margaret A. Goodman. Some funding is received from community foundations such as the JTK Fund of the Arlington Community Foundation (NGA 2020d). In addition, an endowment was established by founder Andrew Mellon when the museum was initially launched which also provides substantial funding (Lesk 2019; NGA2020a).

These funds pay for all program costs—schools receive the entire program completely free of charge. AAC provides all transportation to and from the museum, including transportation for families for the Family Days. The museum pays all professional gallery teaching staff, plus their training. All materials are provided free of

charge, including curriculum materials, student booklets, art reproductions, and art making materials, for both classroom and gallery lessons (NGA 2018).

Program Evaluation

Assessment is considered integral to yearly program revision (Lesk 2019). AAC employs the services of RK&A, a professional evaluation firm with offices in New York City and Washington, D.C. that works with cultural institutions (Lesk 2019). The evaluation aims to be comprehensive, asking both classroom teachers and students to submit feedback through written reflections and evaluation forms. Aspects reviewed include asking teachers how much time they spend on the process, what their most important take-aways are, if they have any curricular ideas to share, and what they learned about themselves and their teaching practice. NGA staff also make assessments by observing student engagement during the program lessons (NGA 2018; Lesk 2019).

Findings confirm that almost all students make personal collections to the artwork (NGA 2018). Many students have not visited art museums before and did not consider themselves artists. After participating in AAC, students feel they understand how to look at art. One student shared, “By explaining what art pictures mean, I made a connection with art by acting out art pictures” (NGA 2018, 20).

Teachers report that students were highly engaged and were able to apply their thinking routines to other subject areas. Teacher comments as reported in the 2017-2018 End of Year Report included:

- “High energy students were able to focus and show attention to detail when making observations and creating sketches of sculptures.”
- “Students have been able to develop a lot of skills throughout the program (observing, describing, reasoning, etc.).”
- “Some of the students who are quieter in class seem to be more apt to verbal or artistic expression in Art Around the Corner. After students have been given the opportunity to create, they are more relaxed and open to delve into other topics” (NGA 2018, 21).

Summary

The National Gallery of Art’s museum-school partnership program, Art Around the Corner, has evolved over its twenty-five year history. Today, the program takes a holistic approach, with program elements that serve not only students, but families and teachers as well in order to reinforce the skills practiced. With its focus on developing critical thinking skills, the program successfully engages students to delve more deeply into the meaning of artworks. Students learn skills that are transferable to other subject areas, such as close observation and supporting interpretations with evidence. A key component is the teacher professional development, which empowers teachers to continue the pedagogy experienced during the program. The multi-visit, multi-year approach attempts to ensure that the skills are not lost, and become part of the students’, families’, and teachers’ thinking routines.

CHAPTER 6: THE BARNES FOUNDATION

Museum Mission and Background

The Barnes Foundation was chartered in 1922 by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Barnes 2020a). Philadelphia art collector Albert C. Barnes (1872–1951) established his namesake foundation as an educational institution. Barnes came from a working-class family and “believed that art had the power to improve minds and transform lives” (Barnes 2020a) of people from all segments of society.

An excellent student, Barnes earned admission to medical school based on merit and earned his degree by the age of twenty. He entered the field of pharmacology and made his fortune co-inventing an antiseptic (Barnes 2020a). With the guidance of his childhood friend and artist William Glackens, Barnes began purchasing modern artworks in 1912 with the goal of assembling “the greatest modern art collection” (Barnes 2020b).

Barnes became good friends with John Dewey and followed Dewey’s philosophy that education is fundamental to democracy (Barnes 2020a). Putting his beliefs into action, Barnes stopped production at his factories for two hours each day for art appreciation and philosophy lessons and discussions. Many workers were women and/or African Americans whom he hired in defiance of the pervasive prejudices of the time (Barnes 2020a).

The success of this program led Barnes to establish an educational institution that would offer free art appreciation courses. He purchased a twelve-acre arboretum in

Merion, Pennsylvania, approximately seven miles northwest of the Barnes Foundation's current location, where he built a residence and gallery that opened on March 19, 1925 (Barnes 2020a; Barnes 2020b). In 2012, amid great controversy, the Barnes moved to the Benjamin Franklin Parkway in Philadelphia, between the Philadelphia Museum of Art and City Hall (Simon 2012). The specially designed, award-winning building includes an auditorium, meeting spaces, eateries, and special exhibition galleries (Barnes 2020c).

Assembled by Barnes between 1912 and 1951, the collection of 4,323 objects (Barnes 2020d) is considered one of the most important holdings of impressionist, post-impressionist, and early modernist paintings in the world (Barnes 2020b). It is home to the world's largest groupings of paintings by Pierre-Auguste Renoir, with 181, and Paul Cézanne, with 69, plus significant works by Henri Matisse, Pablo Picasso, Amedeo Modigliani, Vincent van Gogh, and Chaim Soutine (Barnes 2020b). It also includes important examples of African masks and sculptures; Native American pottery, textiles, and jewelry; ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman art; Pennsylvania German furniture; United States avant-garde painting; and American and European decorative and industrial arts, including 887 wrought-iron metalworks (Barnes 2020b).

The mission of the Barnes Foundation is “to promote the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts and horticulture” (Barnes 2020a). The website proclaims that, “Education is at the heart of everything we do at the Barnes Foundation” (Barnes 2020a). Barnes was inspired by Dewey's ideas about education and democracy. He worked closely with Violette de Mazia (1899–1988), a French educator

who taught at the Barnes for sixty years, to shape the education program, referred to as the Barnes Method (Barnes 2020a), which is explained more fully in the “Pedagogy and Curriculum” section.

In addition to courses based on the Barnes Method, the Barnes Foundation presents a wide variety of public programs, including gallery tours, lectures, Family Days, concerts and musical performances, Toddler Time, and Family Art Labs (Barnes 2020e). Honoring Barnes’ commitment to diversity and inclusivity, many programs are free, offered on weekends and evenings, celebrate a variety of cultures, and are offered on-site and in neighborhoods throughout the city (2020e). An average of 250,000 people visit the Barnes Foundation annually, and over 12,000 school children were served during the 2018-2019 academic year (Barnes 2020f).

Museum-School Partnership Programming

Background and Mission

Founded as an educational institution, courses in art appreciation have been offered since the Barnes Foundation first opened in Merion in 1925. However, school partnerships were not formed before its move to Philadelphia in 2012 (Stern 2019). Since then, the education department has launched four programs—Look! Reflect! Connect! for pre-kindergarten, Pictures and Words for third grade, Art of Looking for fifth and sixth grades, and Artist Voices for seventh grade (Barnes 2020f).

The guiding philosophy of the educational programming is rooted in Barnes’

belief that visual literacy and critical-thinking skills are “essential to every person’s ability to be a participating, productive member of society” and “is grounded in the democratic principle that art should be accessible to all, regardless of background or education” (Barnes 2019, 2). The outreach programs are designed to break down perceived and actual barriers that inhibit certain groups from visiting art museums and participating in the arts. Another aim of the program is to help narrow the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their non-disadvantaged peers (Barnes 2020f).

The following are the overarching goals for all education programs:

- To help students and teachers of all backgrounds feel comfortable and confident in a museum setting.
- To give students and teachers the basic tools for “reading” works of art and for thinking critically about the image-saturated world around them.
- To help students and teachers of all backgrounds find relevance in our collection.
- To support students’ academic growth by aligning lessons with curricular standards and modeling arts integration for teachers and providing resources for teachers (Barnes 2020f, 6).

In particular, the emphasis of preK-12 programing is on providing opportunities for underserved communities to engage in the arts and for all communities to feel welcome at the museum (Stern 2019). The education department has embraced seven values and tenets to promote anti-racist teaching—joy, equity, respect, inclusivity, anti-racism, accountability, and opportunity. These values are a prominent part of museum educator training and are discussed regularly. They provide guidance for interactions with students and are included on every tour outline (Stern 2019).

Pedagogy and Curriculum

As referred to above, Barnes developed his teaching philosophy, called the Barnes Method, based on his own experiences, the ideas of John Dewey, and his work with Violette de Mazia (Barnes 2020f). Working-class families like his would not have had easy access to art museums in the early 1900s, yet he found meaning and delight in arts and crafts and believed everyone should have the same opportunity. His art appreciation lessons for his employees proved to him that, with some training, even uneducated factory workers could enrich their lives through engagement with visual arts.

Barnes wrote that his approach to education “comprises the observation of facts, reflection upon them, and the testing of the conclusions by their success in application. It stipulates that an understanding and appreciation of paintings is an experience that can come only from contact with the paintings themselves” (Barnes in Barnes 2019, 3). Barnes developed a teaching method that encourages students to experience art the way an artist does, through art’s formal elements of light, line, color, and space. This approach to teaching students how to “read” art makes visual images of all types approachable in any context (Barnes 2019). The Barnes Method is generally formalist in nature, aligning with Arthur Wesley Dow’s theory of understanding art through looking closely at artworks to explore their formal compositional elements.

Barnes organized the display of the objects in a non-traditional manner, ignoring its maker, historical time period, function, and culture. Barnes carefully and purposefully designed each grouping on the walls, which he called “ensembles,” as a teaching tool

meant to encourage viewers to notice similar visual elements among diverse objects (Barnes 2020b). Impressionist paintings were hung next to decorative metalwork and American Indian jewelry, with no signage or object information. Barnes' ensembles became central to his educational program which "emphasized close looking, critical thinking, and prolonged engagement with original works of art" (Barnes 2020a). An example can be seen in Figure 3. The current organization of the ensembles remains the same as it was when Barnes died in 1951 (Barnes 2020b).

Figure 3. Wall Ensemble: The ensembles created by Dr. Barnes combine art and craft, cosmopolitan and provincial styles, and objects from across periods and cultures. © Michael Moran/OTTO (Barnes 2020b).

Today, anti-racist teaching is incorporated into the pedagogy to further manifest Barnes' belief that art education should be equally accessible to all (Barnes 2020f).

Programming Description

School partnerships provide "multi-access outreach programs" (Barnes 2019, 3)

to pre-kindergarten, third, fifth, sixth, and seventh grade students in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) and pre-kindergarten and third grade students in the Camden City School District (CCSD), which is located across the Delaware River from Philadelphia in New Jersey (Barnes 2019, Barnes 2020f). All the multi-visit programs include a one-hour pre-visit, a museum visit, and a one-hour post-visit that include the following features:

- An interactive in-school lesson led by Barnes educators or professional teaching artists, featuring visual and written curricular materials providing the educational foundation for an art-making activity;
- A structured visit to the collection galleries led by Barnes docents and staff with additional age-appropriate activities (transportation included);
- A subsequent in-school lesson led by Barnes educators or professional teaching artists, during which reproductions of works from the collection are used as inspiration for writing or the creation of original artwork;
- Enriching extension activities and reading selections that emphasize interdisciplinary connections and encourage learning in the classroom before, during, and after the Barnes experience (Barnes 2020f, 6-7).

Although students visit the museum once, they receive a pre- and post-visit by a museum educator, making this a multi-visit program. The program was developed in collaboration with the school districts, is implemented jointly with teachers, and is responsive to district needs, making it a true partnership.

The programs' lessons are designed to support the core curricular areas of math, science, history-social sciences, and English language arts. Standards for each program are available online (Barnes 2020f).

The Look! Reflect! Connect! program for pre-kindergarten expands the typical role of visual arts in the lives of young students from focusing on making arts and crafts

to include close looking at and talking about art and artists. Teachers are provided with professional development, curricular binders, art posters, and children's books. Extending learning to the home environment is another goal. Parents and caregivers were invited to take a virtual-reality tour of the museum to get to know the Barnes, and participated in art making activities that they could use to support learning at home (Barnes 2020f).

Third to eighth grade programs each have their own program specific goals, and aim to meet the following overarching goals:

1. To help students and teachers of all backgrounds feel comfortable and confident in a museum setting.
2. To give students and teachers the basic tools for “reading” works of art and for thinking critically about the image-saturated world around them.
3. To encourage students and teachers of all backgrounds to find relevance in the Barnes collection.
4. To support students' academic growth by aligning lessons with curricular standards, modeling arts integration for teachers, and providing resources for teachers (Barnes 2020f, 6).

The Pictures and Words program for third grade builds literacy skills through identifying stories in artworks. Students are introduced to the process of reading paintings to in order to interpret the setting, characters, and main idea represented in the artwork. Students learn to make inferences by seeing how artists use color, line, and shape to convey a story. Students then participate in a dance workshop with a professional dancer and explore communicating stories nonverbally through movement and music. For their final project, students express their ideas by creating a sculpture (Barnes 2019).

The Art of Looking program for fifth and sixth grades employs project-based learning and hands-on activities to support STEAM (science, technology, engineering,

art, and math) integrated curriculum. Students also connect their findings to the artwork's subject, context, and meaning. Fifth graders use scientific investigation methodology, citing evidence and explaining their reasoning, while investigating an artwork to examine and learn about the properties of various artist materials. For their final project, students experiment with different watercolor techniques to create an original work. Sixth graders use mathematical concepts to examine coordinate planes, perspective, balance, and symmetry in artworks. For their final project, students explore two- and three-dimensional drawings (Barnes 2019).

The Artist Voices program for seventh grade explores how individual artists broke conventions to communicate new ideas. After engaging in close-looking, students analyze, discuss, and interpret artworks considered radical within their cultural and historical contexts. Students consider how art establishes a dialog between the maker and viewer, and how students can express their own ideas through visual media. For their final project, students create a personalized signature or graffiti tag (Barnes 2019).

Partnership programs continue to be developed. New initiatives are piloted for one year before they are fully launched (Stern 2019). The Look! Reflect! Connect! program for pre-kindergarten was launched in 2014, and the Artist Voices program for seventh grade launched in the 2018-2019 academic year (Barnes 2019). High school partnerships are also growing. These multi-visit programs often involve a community service aspect, where students provide tours or develop materials for younger students (Barnes 2020f).

School Demographics and Criteria for Participation

The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) serves the entire city and had an enrollment of over 202,000 students in kindergarten through twelfth grade in March, 2020 (SDP 2020a). The Camden City School District (CCSD) also serves its entire city and had an enrollment of approximately 15,000 students in 2020 (CCSD 2020a). The percentage of enrolled students who come from economically disadvantaged students is high enough in each district that both SDP and CCSD qualify to provide free lunch to every student (Pennsylvania Dept. of Education 2020; SDP 2019; CCSD 2020b).

The education department collaborates with SDP's Early Childhood Office and Office of the Arts and Academic Enrichment, and the CCSD's Early Childhood Office to identify schools most in need of arts education programming. Preference is given to schools that have the least resources and are demographically representative of their respective districts (Barnes 2020f). No more than two grades within one school are permitted to participate during a single school year. Separate funding allows the Barnes to provide these programs to Catholic schools in Philadelphia and Camden (Stern 2019).

During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Look! Reflect! Connect! program for pre-kindergarten served 710 children in select Philadelphia Head Start and Bright Futures locations (Barnes 2019), which are open to three- and four-year old children whose families meet federal or state low income guidelines (SDP 2020c), and three CCSD pre-kindergarten locations (Barnes 2019). The Pictures and Words program for third grade served 2,629 students in Philadelphia public and Catholic schools and Camden Catholic

schools. The Art of Looking program for fifth and sixth grade served approximately 2,450 students, and the Artist Voices program for seventh grade served 2,170 students from Philadelphia public and Catholic schools (Barnes 2019). In total, approximately 7,660 students in district-run schools and 300 students in Catholic schools experienced in multi-visit programming (Barnes 2019; Stern 2019). The total number of students served by all education programs is typically over 12,000 each year. The 2019-2020 school year would have seen an increase to 15,000 students served, however, the COVID-19 pandemic required that spring 2020 school programs and classroom visits for approximately 5,500 students at 65 schools be canceled, resulting in reducing the number served to 9,771 students (Barnes 2020f).

Program Staffing

The Director of PreK-12 and Educator Programs manages all partnerships (Stern 2019). The PreK-12 Programs Manager oversees all school group visits, and manages and trains all teaching specialists, though teaching specialists report to the Director. She is assisted by the Senior Coordinator for Pre-K–12 Programs and the Early Childhood Programs Coordinator, both of whom support logistics and scheduling (Stern 2019).

Staff who work on the lesson development, teacher support, and program implementation for the partnership programs include a Senior Program Specialist-Arts Integration, two Pre-K–12 Outreach Program Specialists, two Gallery Educators, and

four Teaching Artists (Barnes 2019). All staff members also work on other education programs (Stern 2019).

Program Funding

The Barnes Foundation receives generous funding to support its educational partnership programs for underserved youth. In addition to individual donors, family foundations, and regional foundations that support arts and culture, corporations provide major funding. GSK (GlaxoSmithKline) established The Barnes smART Fund for Education, an endowment that provides generous annual support for Kindergarten through eighth grade education outreach programs in the SDP. Subaru of America, Inc. provides a vehicle for museum educators to travel to schools in Philadelphia and Camden, in addition to generous funds to support programming (Barnes 2020f). Several companies support programs for SDP students with gifts made through Pennsylvania's Educational Improvement Tax Credit (EITC) program (Barnes 2020f), which allows businesses to claim a tax credit based on their donations to a qualified organization (Penna. Dept. of Community and Economic Development 2019).

The Barnes covers all expenses for the partnership programs, including program materials, admission fees, and roundtrip transportation for public schools in Philadelphia and Camden (Stern 2019; Barnes 2020f). For single-visit programs for SDP students, admission is still covered, although transportation costs are not. Schools outside of SDP pay a \$5.00 per person subsidized admission fee (Stern 2019).

The education staff works with the development team, reporting data and assessment results (Stern 2019). The staff considers donors' funding parameters, such as certain grade levels or zip codes, as it works to expand programming to new schools each year (Stern 2019).

Programming Evaluation

Staff meets regularly to review school programming delivery. There is a weekly review of logistics to ensure that the program runs smoothly. Gallery teachers meet monthly to share tips and techniques, brainstorm ideas, and reflect on their teaching practice (Stern 2019).

The Barnes Foundation contracted with Patti Saraniero, Ed.D., principal of Moxie Research, a program evaluation firm serving arts, culture, science and education organizations, three times in order to assess the grant-funded partnerships (Barnes 2019; Stern 2019; Barnes 2020f). Two primary data-gathering tools were developed to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the school outreach programs. The first type of tool was a teacher survey that was completed after the program and included up to thirty items related to student engagement, arts-integrated learning, and teachers' utilization of arts integration instructional strategies (Barnes 2019).

The second type of tool was an art rubric that rated student work based on specific criteria regarding the completeness of the artwork, the use of the elements of art, personal creative expression, and content vocabulary. The art rubric was used to assess if the four

partnerships' program goals were met and to gather student outcome data (Barnes 2019). These program-specific tools provided more robust and thoughtful teacher feedback than generalized surveys (Stern 2019).

Secondary evaluation tools included student surveys completed by fifth and seventh graders, and classroom and gallery tour observations by a professional researcher (Stern 2019).

Key findings of the evaluations, generalized for three academic years, 2017-2020, across all programs include:

- 90-100% of surveyed teachers saw all or most students looking carefully and being engaged in the activities during the gallery tour.
- 90-100% of teachers said the outreach lessons were somewhat aligned or closely aligned with the state's curriculum standards.
- 80-95% of teachers saw students demonstrating concepts introduced in outreach lessons and making interdisciplinary connections in keeping with grade level goals (e.g. literacy in third grade, science in fifth grade).
- 90-100% of teachers used the resource materials provided.
- 90-100% of teachers said the program's in-class lessons aligned with school district goals for improved learning.
- 80-90% of teachers said they were more knowledgeable about or more interested in integrating visual art into other content areas after completing the program (Barnes 2018; Barnes 2019; Barnes 2020f).

Summary

The Barnes Foundation was established by Alfred C. Barnes, M.D., as an educational institution in order for the general public to learn about art elements, principles, and theories. Barnes thoughtfully assembled objects into what he referred to as

ensembles, which combine artworks and functional pieces, cosmopolitan and rustic styles, and various periods and cultures. Barnes developed an instructional method that is unique and encourages learners to explore the formal elements of art—light, line, color, and space—and to share their personal observations, analyses, and interpretations.

After moving to downtown Philadelphia, The Barnes greatly expanded its educational outreach programs and began to establish partnerships with the School District of Philadelphia and the Camden City School District. The programs are based on the Barnes Method, which helps students develop valuable analytical and critical-thinking skills, visual literacy, and a deeper appreciation of visual arts. The lessons support Pennsylvania's education standards in visual art plus district literacy and STEAM goals. Museum staff meets monthly to reflect on their teaching practice and review lessons. The program design is iterative, allowing for changes in response to feedback and SDP needs and initiatives.

Albert C. Barnes believed that underserved groups should have access to world-class art. The partnership programs embody this vision by providing services free of charge. Of the total number of students who participate in education programming, over 70% experience the grant-funded partnership multi-visit opportunities. By embracing anti-racist values in training and programming, The Barnes Foundation continues to implement the ideals of its founder.

CHAPTER 7: PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART

Museum Mission and Background

The Philadelphia Museum of Art (PMA) was a legacy of the great Centennial Exhibition of 1876 that celebrated the 100th anniversary of the United States, which was held in Philadelphia's Fairmount Park (PMA 2020a). Working together, city and state authorities, and leaders of local educational institutions, took the opportunity to establish a museum of art, design, and craft. The Exhibition's art gallery in Memorial Hall was chartered in February 1876 (PMA 2020b) as the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art "for the improvement and enjoyment of the people of the Commonwealth" (PMA 2020a).

With growing collections and attendance, the Philadelphia City Council appropriated funds for a new building in 1894 (PMA 2020c). After years of delay, PMA's Main Building and accompanying one-acre sculpture garden began construction atop Fairmount hill, the city's highest natural elevation (PMA 2020d). Although the interior of the new structure would remain unfinished for many years, the Main Building opened to the public on March 26, 1928 (PMA 2020e). The name was officially changed to the Philadelphia Museum of Art by the end of the 1930s (PMA 2020f).

Additional buildings and collections were placed under PMA's administration by the city of Philadelphia, including two 18th century homes in Fairmount Park, Mount Pleasant and Cedar Grove (PMA 2020a). The Rodin Museum, with its Beaux-Arts

architecture and formal French garden, opened in 1929, and houses one of the most comprehensive collections of Auguste Rodin's work outside of Paris (Rodin Museum 2020).

To accommodate the ever-expanding collection, the Reliance Standard Life Insurance Building, across the street from the back entrance of the Main Building, was purchased and dedicated as the Ruth and Raymond G. Perelman Building. Opened in 2007, it was renovated to include galleries, storage, conservation space, the Wachovia Education Resource Center, and the Museum Library, which is a major U.S. art reference library and houses over 200,000 items (PMA 2020g). A major renovation of the Main Building began in 2017 in order to add exhibition and education space, and was expected to be completed by September, 2020 (PMA 2020h), but has been delayed to 2021 because of the COVID-19 pandemic (PMA 2020i).

PMA's collection of over 240,000 artworks (PMA 2020j) spans 2,000 years and includes European medieval and Renaissance artworks, and arms and armor; South Asian, Chinese, and Japanese works; important Impressionist and Post-impressionist artworks, including Paul Cézanne's *The Large Bathers* and Vincent van Gogh's *Sunflowers* (PMA 2020a); works by United States artists Mary Cassatt (PMA 2020e), James Abbott McNeil Whistler, and Henry Ossawa Tanner (PMA 2020c); masterpieces of early modern art by Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse, Georgia O'Keeffe, and Constantin Brancusi; contemporary works by Kara Walker and Cy Twombly; and the foremost collections of works by Marcel Duchamp (PMA 2020a) and Philadelphian Thomas

Eakins in the world (Guidestar 2020). PMA is also known for its elaborate architectural settings, including the South Asian Hindu Pillared Temple Hall from South Asia; a French Medieval Cloister; a Chinese Palace Reception Hall; a Japanese ceremonial Teahouse and bamboo garden; and a New York City Gilded Age Drawing Room (Guidestar 2020).

PMA's mission statement is, "The Philadelphia Museum of Art, in partnership with the city, the region, and art museums around the globe, seeks to preserve, enhance, interpret, and extend the reach of its great collections in particular, and the visual arts in general, to an increasing and increasingly diverse audience as a source of delight, illumination and lifelong learning" (Guidestar 2020). A mission statement does not currently appear on the museum's website.

Education has been an important part of PMA since its inception. The original concept included a school that would help students in design and manufacturing (PMA 2020a). In 1905, PMA launched an educational program for the general public which included its first public school tours (PMA 2020d). The Division of Education was established in 1929 (PMA 2020e) and saw continuous growth. In 1968, construction of the Bernice McIlhenny Wintersteen Student Center began, funded by generous gifts from individual donors and appropriations from the School District of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (PMA 2020k).

PMA continued to pioneer educational programs, including providing teacher professional development focused on adapting visual arts pedagogy to other curricular

areas; providing Kids Audio Tours; creating materials and programs for kindergarten through 12th grade about the arts and cultures of East Asia; developing online resources for teachers (PMA 2020g); designing special materials for teachers in conjunction with exhibitions; providing public school teachers with training to connect the collections to curriculum (PMA 2020l); partnering with a local newspaper to publish a special exhibition supplement specifically for schoolchildren; creating a six-week art appreciation course by telephone, Art Talk, for those unable to leave their homes; and collaborating with the Conservation department to create a video about arms and armor, which was available via teleconferencing to 5,000 subscriber schools (PMA 2020m).

In total, almost 773,000 people visited PMA in 2019 (PMA 2020n) and attendance is expected to exceed 800,000 annually once renovations are complete.

Museum-School Partnership Programming

Background and Mission

PMA has been involved in partnerships with schools and school districts for over thirty years and several programs have been developed and are currently implemented. The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) has long looked to PMA to provide meaningful educational services to students in the City of Philadelphia, as evinced by the city council appropriating funds to build the education center in 1968 (PMA 2020k).

According to Barbara Bassett, The Constance Williams Curator of Education, School and Teacher Programs, the overarching goal of all the partnership programs is to

provide students from underserved communities, or demographic groups that do not typically visit museums, exposure to museums, visual arts, and careers in museums and the arts, in addition to fostering creative and critical thinking skills. Programs and lessons also link to curricular areas and education standards. Family passes are given to all students to encourage family participation and support for on-going involvement with the arts (Bassett 2019).

Pedagogy and Curriculum

All PMA museum tours for school groups are “designed as interactive lessons that encourage students to examine objects and ideas through a variety of activities including discussions, worksheets, and small-group work. Observation, critical thinking, problem solving, and literacy skills are incorporated in all lessons” (PMA 2020o). School programs utilize elements of Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) and Project Zero’s Artful Thinking in a constructivist-based format to encourage students to develop a relationship with the artwork and to create meaning for themselves as they connect their observations and ideas to their curriculum (Bassett 2019).

Every lesson meets the following Common Core Academic State Standards for College and Career Readiness and National Visual Arts Standards:

Common Core Academic State Standards

1. CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.R.1

Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

2. CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.SL.1

Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

National Visual Arts Standards

1. Responding, Anchor Standard #7: Perceive and analyze artistic work.
2. Responding, Anchor Standard #8: Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work (PMA 2020p, 3, 6).

For their partnerships, education staff work collaboratively with teachers and administrators to tailor the lessons, or develop new lessons, to support each site's specific needs (Bassett 2019). Many of the Recommended Best Practices and Instructional Model descriptions outlined in SDP's Visual Arts Core Standards for fourth, fifth, and sixth grades are met:

- Observe and discuss a variety of works of art and artifacts that exemplify art makers from diverse cultures and historical periods
- Know and use the critical process of the examination of works in the arts: Compare and contrast; Analyze; Interpret; Form and test hypotheses; Evaluate/form judgments
- Understand and reflect on different responses to the same work of art
- Respect, appreciate and value the responses and opinions of others (SDP 2006, 106, 128, 150).

Programming Description

PMA's partnership with the School District of Philadelphia (SDP), Art Speaks, is "Designed to help fourth-grade students practice literacy skills while exploring art at the Museum and in the classroom" (PMA 2020o). Students engage in a variety of English-Language Arts skills as they share their observations about the artworks that they see

during the gallery tour, such as comparing, describing, interpreting, expressing personal opinions, and listening to other viewpoints. Additional Common Core State Standards for English-Language Arts are met through this program, such as “Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar” and “Produce clear and coherent writing” (PMA 2020p, 8). Additional SDP Core Curriculum Standards for Visual Arts are met for fourth grade, especially 9.4 Aesthetic Response:

- B. Know how to communicate an informed individual opinion about the meaning of works in the arts.
- D. Recognize that choices made by artists regarding subject matter and themes communicate ideas through works in the arts and humanities (SDP 2006, 108)

A museum educator travels to each classroom in advance of the single visit gallery tour to introduce students to Art Speaks and PMA. Each teacher receives a teaching booklet with literacy-focused pre- and post-visit activities, image cards, and a flash drive containing printable worksheets and images with looking questions for classroom use. These resources are also accessible online through both the PMA and SDP websites (PMA 2020o). There are twenty images of artworks from around the world, and the looking questions can be used as prompts for discussion or writing (Bassett 2019).

Although students visit the museum only once, a museum educator leads a pre-visit lesson, making this a multi-visit program. In addition, Art Speaks was developed in close collaboration with SDP, which originally approached PMA to form a partnership (Bassett 2019).

A newer program includes multiple visits. Sherlock was launched in the 2017-2018 school year for fifth and sixth graders with the goal of fostering observation skills, and critical and creative thinking (Bassett 2019). A museum educator visits the school to introduce the program, followed by seven gallery tours. In the 2019-2020 academic year, twelve classes at seven schools participated. The teachers become Teacher Fellows and receive a stipend to meet monthly in order to practice Artful Thinking routines to use in their classrooms (Bassett 2019).

The oldest current partnership began almost thirty-five years ago with the Upper Darby School District (UDSD) (Bassett 2019). Every fifth grader, approximately 1,000 students, visits the museum twice during the year. Curricular connections are reviewed every year to accommodate classroom and district updates and adjustments to learning goals (Bassett 2019).

PMA has had a partnership with a funder, the Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company (former owners of the Perelman Building) for over twenty years. The company's Delphi Project Foundation "supports innovative arts education programs to enhance the education for Philadelphia public school students and increase accessibility to the arts" (PMA 2020q). The Delphi programs focus on artmaking and include Art Partners and Art Futures, artists-in-residencies at six middle and ten high schools, respectively, plus an After School Art Club, a Summer Teen Media Program, and a Teen Sketch Club (PMA 2020q).

PMA also partners with private schools. For over twenty-five years, students attending two unrelated private Quaker schools have been engaging in deep, multi-visit programs that support learning in history-social studies (Bassett 2019; Friends Select School 2020). Specific funders direct their support for Catholic school participation in multi-visit programs (Bassett 2019).

More schools are requesting multiple visit programs in order to enrich student learning using primary source objects in PMA's collection (Bassett 2019). Classroom teachers work together with a museum educator to create a two-, three-, or four-visit program that supports curricular goals. Teachers and students work with a single museum educator to provide continuity and build a positive relationship (Bassett 2019). PMA has more than thirty-five themed tours for kindergarten through twelfth grades for single-visit school tours that can be adapted for multi-visit collaborations, such as "Artists and Nature," "HERstory," "Islamic Art," "STEAM at the Museum," and "The Artist and Society" (PMA 2020o). Additional standards that are supported in each specific lesson are listed in the "Standards Alignment for School Tours" (PMA 2020p), which teachers can easily access online. All programs utilize permanent collection objects, and gallery tours are typically ninety minutes long (PMA 2020o).

School Demographics and Criteria for Participation

As mentioned in the case study of the Barnes Foundation, the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) serves the entire city; had an enrollment of over 202,000 kindergarten

through twelfth grade students in March, 2020 (SDP 2020a); and the high number of economically disadvantaged families qualifies the entire district for the National School Lunch Program, thus providing free lunch to every student (SDP 2020b).

Art Speaks is open to all fourth-grade classrooms in SDP, including charter schools (PMA 2020o), which serve 37% of the total number of students (SDP 2020a). The focus on literacy is especially important for SDP because over 14,000 students, representing more than 130 countries and more than 100 languages, receive English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services (SDP 2020d). Excluding charter school students, approximately 16% of fourth graders are English Language Learners (ELL) and almost 17% have Individual Education Plans (IEP) (SDP 2020b).

Sherlock is open to fifth and sixth grade classrooms in SDP, including charter schools (Bassett 2019). The program is expected to add a few more classes each year over the next several years (Bassett 2019).

Upper Darby School District (UDSD) is located in Delaware county, approximately ten miles from PMA (UDSD 2020). Over 60% of students meet the low-income status set by the Federal Free/Reduced Lunch Program. Over fifty different languages are spoken by student families and over 10% of students are immigrants (UDSD 2020). Most residents are not regular PMA attendees and the fifth-grade school tour may be the first time the majority of students visit PMA (Bassett 2019).

Delphi programs are open to the appropriate grade-level students enrolled in SDP schools (PMA 2020q). Additional funders support participation by five Catholic high schools in the Art Futures program (Bassett 2019).

During the 2018-2019 academic year, participation in classroom-based programs provided by museum education staff and artists was 18,800 student visits, and the total number of student visits across all programs, which includes students visiting multiple times, was 60,400 (PMA 2020r). These numbers have been typical for several years. There was an exception in 2017-2018 when the number of visits was significantly reduced due to the massive construction project to expand the main building, which required the closure of many galleries and the education rooms (Bassett 2019).

Program Staffing

The Education Department's School and Teacher Programs are led by the Curator of School and Teacher Programs, who oversees all school partnerships and teacher professional development. The staff members who support the school partnerships described include the Manager of School Visits who schedules and organizes all school visits; the Manager of Teacher Services; the School Partnership Liaison; the Administrator of School Programs; two Museum Educators; and three part-time staff members who coordinate logistics and provide general program support (Bassett 2019). In addition, eight to ten part-time museum teachers conduct the gallery tours and

classrooms visits. All staff members work on other programs in addition to the partnerships described (Bassett 2019).

New educators observe school visits, and are paired with veteran teachers, who provide coaching as they team teach, which allows for immediate feedback. Gallery teachers participate in continuous, monthly education and training, such as meeting with curators of new exhibitions, or reviewing a specific teaching practice. A small group of approximately ten volunteers also teach some school tours. Volunteers must participate in two full years of training before teaching on their own, which involves the same rigorous training as the professional educators, including observing classroom visits and team teaching (Bassett 2019).

All Delphi programs are managed by the Delphi Program Coordinator, who matches teaching artists to programs and classes. The sixteen part-time teaching artists for the artist-in-residency programs, Art Partners and Art Futures, sometimes also teach other programs, such as the After School Art Club (Bassett 2019).

Program Funding

PMA receives generous funding that supports their education programs. PMA's Development Office works together with the Education Department to secure funding. Education senior staff provide feedback and data, as well as ideas for programs that need funders. On occasion, the Development Office is aware of a funder who is interested in certain types of projects and in those cases, the Development Office will reach out to the

Education Department to see if there is a program that matches the funder's interest (Bassett 2019).

One of the goals of Art Speaks is to remove barriers to access, therefore, all expenses are paid by PMA, including museum admission fees, bus transportation, teacher resources, and student materials. In addition, admission is waived year-round for all SDP students (Bassett 2019). Major donors as of August 28, 2017 include the Victory Foundation, The Anne M. and Philip H. Glatfelter, III Family Foundation, Lincoln Financial Group, and TD Charitable Foundation. Target is a major supporter and the program is described as "Art Speaks, a Target® Field Trip" on the website (PMA 2020o).

The Sherlock program was proposed by the Curator of School and Teacher Programs, who then spent time with the Development Office to explore funding options and apply for grants, such as IMLS and the Hearst Foundation, which both became funders of the program. Sherlock is fully funded by PMA and includes museum admission fees, bus transportation, teacher resources, and student materials. Teacher Fellows receive stipends (Bassett 2019).

The partnership with the Upper Darby School District (UDSD) was originally funded by the district. Since 2011, PMA has provided all of the funding for the program, including bus transportation to the museum for two visits, admission fees, and the cost of support materials for teachers. When the district was smaller and had more resources, fifth graders would visit three times and costs were covered by UDSD (Bassett 2019).

The Delphi Programs are an example of a funder approaching PMA to create a program. Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company's Delphi Project Foundation approached PMA with the idea of partnering to provide arts enrichment programs for students in Philadelphia (Bassett 2019). The Delphi Project Foundation receives its funds from the Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company through Pennsylvania's Educational Improvement Tax Credit (EITC) program (Pennsylvania Dept. of Community and Economic Development 2020). All program costs for SDP students are covered by the Delphi Project Foundation (Bassett 2019; PMA 2020q). Additional funders provide directed funds to allow five Catholic high schools to participate in the artist-in-residency program (Bassett 2019).

PMA is responding to increased requests for multiple-visit programs from schools within and outside of SDP (Bassett 2019). However, these programs require schools to fund their own transportation. Schools outside of SDP must also pay regular school admission fees per student for each visit (Bassett 2019). Schools within SDP receive free admission for students (PMA 2020r).

Program Evaluation

PMA generally uses informal program evaluation that includes teacher and student comments, and observations by the museum educator of the quality of student responses over time (Bassett 2019).

For Sherlock, PMA contracted with RK&A (Randi Korn & Associates), an

evaluation and research firm that supports museums and cultural organizations, to assess the first two years of the program. Formative evaluation of the first year led to program refinements in the second year (Bassett 2019). The executive summary of the study by RK&A reported that summative evaluation at the end of the first year indicated that students improved their observation and describing skills, particularly in looking holistically at artworks. At the end of the second year, students improved their critical thinking and evidentiary reasoning. Students' creative thinking skills also advanced, especially questioning and wondering (Bassett 2019; PMA 2020r).

Summary

The Philadelphia Museum of Art was founded in partnership with the City of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to benefit the public and, in part, to provide the latest educational opportunities related to crafts and design. As the collection moved toward world arts and cultures, PMA developed pioneering educational programming that focused on the role of art within cultural and historical contexts, and how understanding art can foster critical and creative thinking skills. Another goal of the programming is to expose young people to museums as relevant civic institutions with rich resources for their communities.

The deep partnerships that PMA has developed over the past thirty years with the School District of Philadelphia, Upper Darby School District, and Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company, have provided thousands of students with exposure to museums,

visual arts from around the world, and careers in museums and the arts. The partnerships encompass a wide variety of programs that meet a broad range of needs for underserved students in low-income families, from curriculum integration to English language acquisition, from after-school activities to summer camps, from close-looking to filmmaking. The multi-visit programs provide time for greater depth of learning that helps build young people's confidence in their ability to discover the meaning and relevance of art for themselves.

CHAPTER 8. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Art museums have been involved in public education for almost one hundred years (Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011). Today, there are a wide array of programs for students and teachers. The case studies presented here of the multi-visit school programs for Title I schools describe and analyze several programs at the National Gallery of Art (NGA), Barnes Foundation (Barnes), and the Philadelphia Museum of Art (PMA). Each program has unique facets, tailored to meet the needs of their intended audience. At the same time, analysis of the case studies reveals several similar program attributes regarding program management, goals, funding, educational theory, pedagogy, program evaluation, and outcomes.

The programs reviewed here, even ones at the same museum, were conceived and launched in a variety of ways. The National Gallery of Art (NGA) was already working with school districts in the Washington, D.C. area, and developed Art Around the Corner (AAC) in response to district needs (Lesk 2019). The Philadelphia Museum of Art (PMA) was also providing programming for the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) when the district requested that PMA develop a program specifically focused on literacy, and Art Speaks was the outcome. PMA's Sherlock program was proposed by the Curator of School and Teacher Programs, who then worked with the development department to source funding. A personal connection between a museum educator and a staff member at the Upper Darby School District led to the establishment of that program. A funder, the

Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company's Delphi Project Foundation, approached PMA with the idea of partnering to provide arts enrichment programs for students in Philadelphia (Bassett 2019). The Barnes Foundation had not been engaged in any school or district partnerships before its move to Philadelphia in 2012. After its move, the Barnes developed multi-visit programs in partnership with and in response to SDP needs (Stern 2019). The various ways that programs are initiated underscores that museum educators look for opportunities and are open to hearing from various sectors, such as public school districts, private funders, and personal contacts, in order to forge effective partnerships to benefit underserved children.

Implementing and maintaining multi-visit programs at multiple schools requires a robust staff. Each of the case study museums are large, well-established institutions with substantial financial backing. Each program is large enough to require one or two staff members to manage program logistics and scheduling. There are also two to five administrators and managers who develop the program and interface with the partners. They have multiple responsibilities in addition to the partnership programs, such as also managing internships and assisting with grant writing. Each program employs eight to sixteen gallery teachers or teaching artists. In total, thirteen to twenty full and part-time staff members at each museum work on the partnership programs. Almost all staff members also work on other education programs. The primary exception is the Delphi Program at PMA, which is supported by a single funder with a separate budget. While details vary, NGA, PMA, and the Barnes all employ several people with extensive

experience and expertise in their education departments.

Educator training at the case study museums is extensive, participatory, ongoing and regularly scheduled. Training features include reflecting on one's own teaching practice, review of program logistics, sharing of experiences and techniques, new educators learning from veterans, peer review, and opportunities for practice.

Funding for the programs is generally organized by the museum, since school district funding has become more limited since the 1990s. The case study museums source funding through grants from the government and foundations, sponsorships from corporations, and individual donations. This requires a close connection with the Development department in order to assist with matching grantors to programs, and to collaborate on the application process.

For the multi-visit partnership programs serving Title I schools, the museums cover all costs, including transportation to and from the museum; museum educator wages, plus their training; and all materials including curricular materials, student booklets, art reproductions, and art making materials. NGA also includes transportation for families for Family Days. PMA covers transportation costs for museum educators to travel to school sites for certain programs. Generous funding enables museums to provide high-quality programs to Title I schools that otherwise could not afford such substantive support for teachers and students.

Program focus and goals are developed jointly by the partner school or district, and the museum. The museum educators noted that it takes a long time to develop trust,

and that the collaborations deepen over time.

There are several overarching goals common to the programs at the case study museums. One primary goal is to support student academic growth by meeting district, state, and/or national education standards. Programs hope to help narrow the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their non-disadvantaged peers.

In order to achieve this objective, arts integration is used to address literacy, history-social science, math, or science learning goals, as well as visual arts standards. Learning in all curricular areas is done in and through the arts. A few programs focus more on art appreciation and art making, but because the programs foster critical thinking, the skills practiced are transferable and help students with observing details and evidentiary reasoning in other curricular areas.

This leads to a second common goal, to provide teachers with tools for using arts integration on their own. Classroom teachers are active participants and collaborators in program delivery, and therefore, the vast majority use the resources and classroom activities provided, such as worksheets, art reproductions, inquiry prompts, and teaching booklets. Most of the programs also include several sessions of teacher professional development during the school year. Museum educators model arts integration in the galleries and in the classroom. In addition, teachers and students work with a single museum educator to provide continuity and build a positive, trusting relationship. This encourages mentorship of the teacher by the museum educator.

A third major goal is to improve students' visual literacy. Each program refers to

“reading” artworks and helping students understand what they are seeing in terms of cultural-historical context and formal compositional elements, such as color and line.

A fourth common goal is to help students and teachers of all backgrounds feel welcome and find relevance to their lives at art museums. By learning looking and discussion techniques, and after multiple visits, students and teachers feel confident in navigating art museums.

The learning theory followed by all the programs is constructivism, and the primary method employed is object-based learning—students are expected to construct meaning for themselves based on close observation of the artwork. The Barnes Method is essentially a formalist approach, which means it is object-based and constructivist. NGA and PMA base their program activities on Project Zero Artful Thinking Routines and VTS, which are also constructivist, object-based techniques.

While not explicitly referenced, educators incorporate multiple-intelligence theory into their programs by using arts integration and pluralization to teach both art and another subject area. For example, when students create a tableau of a sculpture, as shown in Figure 3, students are accessing bodily-kinesthetic intelligence to better understand the compositional elements, and

Figure 4: Students create a tableau.

After discussing the *Shaw Memorial*, 1900, a Civil War sculpture by Augustus Saint-Gaudens, fifth graders create a tableau of the figures, including the horse (NGA 2018, 22).

considering the complexities of producing such a large-scale piece in plaster, as well as the social history it represents.

The predominant method for students to demonstrate their thinking and learning is through group discussion facilitated through inquiry and open-ended prompts. Students are required to explain their reasoning during discussions, whether educators are using the Barnes Method, Project Zero Artful Thinking Routines, or VTS. Other activities and products that demonstrate student thinking and learning include writing poetry, sketching, journaling, role playing, dancing, analyzing two- and three-dimensional aspects of artworks, investigating chemical properties of watercolor, and creating original art in various mediums. The variety of activities and products highlights the application of arts integration, and references multiple-intelligence theory through pluralization.

Some programs include a family or community event at the museum for students to share their projects and learning. These events are not held every year, and seem to be dependent on funding, staff capacity, and museum logistics.

Program evaluation ranges from informal to comprehensive. PMA generally does not conduct formal evaluations, relying instead on casual teacher feedback, student comments, and educator observations that are not collected or analyzed in a systematic way (Bassett 2019). Some PMA programs have been running for over twenty-five years, and yearly program updates are based on teacher, school, and district input (Bassett 2019). To conduct comprehensive evaluations, the case study museums contract with experienced assessment specialists, RK&A or Moxie Research. Quantitative and

qualitative evaluation methods, data analysis, and reports are expensive. Consequently, PMA and the Barnes used contract services only for the first years of new programs—RK&A conducted two years of evaluation of Sherlock for PMA, and Moxie Research conducted evaluation of their programs for three years for the Barnes. NGA uses RK&A to assess Art Around the Corner annually, and considers assessment to be integral to yearly program revision.

Results of the comprehensive evaluations reveal that the multi-visit partnership programs at the case study museums attain the common overarching goals stated earlier. While the Barnes publicly reported the most results, NGA and PMA reference general results in program or annual reports. For all the programs, results broadly indicate that most teachers felt that students learning advanced because of participation in the program, in terms of critical thinking skills and specific curricular areas associated with specific programs; teachers were more interested in and comfortable using arts integration; students visual literacy skills improved, including observing and describing; and teachers and students felt more comfortable and confident in art museum settings. Students demonstrated their active engagement in the museum activities by listening attentively, participating in discussions, asking questions, and supporting their ideas with evidence found in the artwork.

Given the positive impact of the programs, more schools would like to participate and museums would like to increase their outreach. However, there are two primary considerations to address. The first is funding. These programs support Title I schools,

which do not contribute any funding. The museums bear all the costs and must source all the funds. Multi-visit programs are expensive, and serving additional schools would require significant financial backing.

The second consideration is museum capacity, primarily gallery limitations and logistics. Galleries can only physically accommodate a certain number of people at one time. Student groups often spend over an hour in front of one artwork. This is especially challenging for the Barnes, which has smaller galleries. Museums must be mindful of general visitors, other museum programs and tours, fire codes, and potential hazards to the artworks. In addition, there are scheduling constraints tied to schools—museum visits generally cannot occur in the evenings, on weekends, or during breaks. These issues pose impediments to growing the programs at each of the case study museums.

In sum, review of the case studies shows that there are many overarching commonalities among the multi-visit programs. Museum educators are open-minded and flexible when looking for opportunities to support underserved children. Museums provide all the funding, which is substantial and sourced from major donors. Programs are grounded in constructivist learning theory and object-based learning techniques. Museum educators partake in rigorous training that is collaborative and reflective. Program effectiveness is evaluated by experienced assessment specialists. Teachers learn arts integration methods. Students develop observation and critical thinking skills. Student and teacher engagement are high, and after participating in the program, they feel connected to the museum. Although desired, program expansion is limited by funding

and museum capacity. The variety of multi-visit programs for Title I schools demonstrate that the overarching goals can be achieved through many different means with generous funding and museum educator expertise.

CHAPTER 9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Museums continue to work diligently to fulfill their twenty-first century role as educational institutions that are accessible for diverse audiences. In the early 1900s, John Cotton Dana, Albert Barnes, and John Dewey were among the minority who genuinely believed in the democratic ideal that everyone, regardless of background, should have access to high-quality art and cultural objects, and education. Barnes and Dewey in particular believed that these two realms, rigorous learning opportunities and aesthetic and cultural appreciation, were foundational to American society.

Today, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) defines the purposes of museums as “education, study and enjoyment” (ICOM 2020). The American Alliance of Museums views “museums as institutions of public service and education” (AAM 1992, 7). One avenue of action for fulfilling this role is partnering with Title I schools to help meet the educational needs of underserved children. The Barnes Foundation, Philadelphia Museum of Art, and National Gallery of Art provide a variety of multi-visit programs that successfully incorporate art and arts integration into classroom learning in low-income neighborhoods.

After reviewing the literature regarding public education, museum education, learning theories, and visual arts pedagogy; studying data regarding the impact of art education on student outcomes; and conducting case studies at three museums, four

primary conclusions can be drawn: first, significant benefits accrue to Title 1 students who participate in well-designed and implemented museum education programs; second, multi-visit museum programs fill an educational need for underserved students; third, program success relies on high-level professional standards; and finally, collaboration is a key component.

Once these conclusions are presented, four recommendations are outlined. Finally, this thesis will close with some final thoughts.

Conclusion 1: Significant Benefits Accrue to Title 1 Students Who Participate in Well-Designed and Implemented Museum Education Programs

First, the benefits for students from Title 1 school who participate in museum education programs are significant and can be confirmed through evaluation. Research over the past thirty years clearly demonstrates that learning in and through the arts improves achievement across disciplines. Multiple research results were reviewed by the President's Council on the Arts and Humanities (PCAH) in 2011 and show that learning in the arts supports students' cognitive, academic, and social growth. Evaluations from the case study museums reveal increases in analysis skills, confidence in higher-level thinking, and enthusiasm for participation in learning.

Despite these benefits, the arts continue to be sidelined in schools as standardized tests become more pervasive. No Child Left Behind (NCLB), enacted in 2002, tied funding to test scores, which has had a lasting effect on educational priorities. In effect

for over ten years, time and resources were shifted to the tested subjects, reading and mathematics. Even though federal guidelines have included the arts as a core curricular area since NCLB, school districts continue to cut arts classes first whenever there are funding challenges, or when test scores dip.

Conclusion 2: Multi-Visit Museum Programs Fill an Educational Need for Underserved Students

Significantly, multi-visit museum programs fill an educational need for underserved students, addressing the “equity” aspect put forth in *Excellence and Equity*. The achievement gap in the arts and all academic areas attests to the overall lack of quality education, as well as insufficient art materials. Schools and districts in low income areas do not have equivalent access to quality arts programs, primarily because Title I schools do not have the funding. The cost of multiple museum visits includes transportation, admission, program support, classroom materials, and museum educator or teaching artist fees. Alternatively, teachers would need specialized training and on-going support to become proficient in object-based learning and arts integration in order to provide similar learning experiences for their students in their classrooms.

However, if schools partner with museums, then the museum can work to secure the needed funding. Highly trained museum educators can tailor the program to student needs, create classroom materials and teacher resources, lead engaging activities, model teaching strategies, and provide robust teacher professional development. The

professional development component is critical for enabling teachers to continue providing similar arts-based learning experiences after participation in the program is concluded.

Conclusion 3: Program Success Relies on High-Level Professional Standards

Third, program success relies on high-level professional standards, which relates to the “excellence” aspect referred to in *Excellence and Equity*. Museum educators who design and run the programs are veterans who have years of experience in visual arts pedagogy. The staff for the multi-visit programs undergo rigorous, ongoing training. The support staff provide exceptional organizational and logistical support. Development staff are skilled in cultivating generous donors and finding appropriate grants.

Training for museum educators is thorough, involving readings, writing, discussion, and reflection about arts education theory and practice, as well as taking an honest look at their own teaching practice. They are also paired with veteran museum educators, giving new educators the opportunity to observe presentation techniques and team teach before leading their own sessions. Training lasts several months, providing time for new educators to build on their experiences and address individual, specific concerns. The entire cohort works closely, and rookies and veterans alike benefit from peer coaching and learning.

Conclusion 4: Collaboration is Key

Fourth, collaboration is key because it amplifies a program’s effectiveness. The

educators at the case study museums all remarked that it takes time to develop trust, and therefore, a single museum educator works with the same class and teacher for the entire program. This continuity leads to familiarity and comfort, allowing for deeper collaboration, more sharing of ideas, and a willingness to try new suggestions.

Because teachers feel that they are supported as they learn new skills, they gain confidence as they practice object- and inquiry-based learning, and arts integration techniques. Collaboration ensures that the museum staff is attentive to district and teacher input so that program goals are based on student needs, and that both teachers and museum educators experience professional growth.

Recommendations

Four main recommendations are outlined below.

First, staffing should be highly-trained and sufficient in number. Museum educators for multi-visit programs should be well versed in constructivist learning strategies, including object-based learning, inquiry-based learning, Project Zero Artful Thinking Routines, and Visual Thinking Strategies. They also need experience in collaboration in order to understand how to contribute and receive feedback, promote trust, and provide meaningful support to their peers and classroom teachers. Their professional learning should be on-going with regularly scheduled sessions for sharing practical tips, concerns, and successes. They should also be aware of the latest practices

and evolving issues in visual arts and museum education, through reading professional journals, attending conferences, and networking with colleagues.

Furthermore, there needs to be a sufficient number of staff members supporting the multi-visit programs. These programs have many different components that to be managed well, including scheduling, budgeting, classroom materials, teacher professional development, museum educator training, transportation, and other logistical details. Without adequate staffing, people will become overwhelmed, and without adequate training, student learning will be comprised. Eventually, the shortcomings will become apparent in program outcomes.

The second recommendation is to include a rich, ongoing teacher professional development component in the programs. Just as Dewey noted that although learning is based on experience, not every experience is educative, it is also true that not every arts integration activity will be more effective than other teaching approaches (Scheinfeld 2004a). In fact, not all activities labeled as arts integration will effectively address standards in more than one discipline, which is the defining characteristic of arts integration (Scheinfeld 2004b). Based on the Kennedy Center's definitions, activities designed to meet standards in only the non-arts subject would align with arts-enhanced lessons, not arts integration. (Silverstein and Layne 2020a). For example, having students draw a map of Asia to reinforce geography skills does little to advance visual arts learning.

This all points to the critical importance of training and practice in developing effective arts integration curriculum. Even an instructor at a local university who teaches a course on arts integration confessed that she sometimes finds it difficult to sort out the challenges and to present the techniques in meaningful ways. Without sufficient training, teachers will not change their classroom practices once the program is concluded, and long-lasting positive impact for student learning will be lost.

In addition, teachers who implement arts integration methods reported feeling that their level of professionalism increased, they were able to meet the needs of a wider range of students, and they enjoyed their work more (Silverstein and Layne 2020b). Job satisfaction is important in every field, and without it, teachers sometimes leave the profession, or become less effective and disengaged (Silverstein and Layne 2020b).

Third, museums involved in Title I school education programs should utilize outside evaluation specialists, especially when launching a program. Although expensive, utilizing assessment specialists will ensure that the evaluation tools will capture meaningful information accurately. In addition, interfacing with children and government employees (that is, teachers) might require specific types of liability waiver forms that an expert would be qualified to handle. Well-designed assessments can confirm that goals are met, that demographic information is collected, and that meaningful feedback about the impact of program activities is being provided.

Importantly, the information gathered is valuable for making program improvements. Quantitative assessment demonstrates to stakeholders, parents,

community, teachers, school and museum administrators, politicians, and funders, that real student advancement has been achieved through the arts. Qualitative assessment highlights the enthusiasm and joy of learning and teaching through the arts, and the increased sense of community and empathy.

The results of these evaluations should not only be shared with stakeholders, but also more broadly throughout the field. Because the assessments are conducted by private firms, the assessment tools are usually considered proprietary. It would be helpful for smaller museums with less funding to have access to more results and methods to support their own endeavors to launch partnerships with schools.

Fourth, education program managers and administrators should develop a close relationship with the museum's Development department. Generous funding is required to mount such large programs. Reaching out to foundations and donors, and applying for grants requires specific skills and knowledge, and a lengthy timeline, often many months, sometimes years. This is especially crucial during these times of budgetary uncertainty.

In 2017, all members of the Presidential Committee on Arts and Humanities (PCAH) quit en masse, partly in response to lack of funding—the White House fiscal 2018 budget allotted zero dollars under the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities (Penn 2017). It is important that emphasizing funding for these types of multi-visit programs with a teacher professional development component is in keeping with funding priorities and strategic planning. Without adequate funding, the program will not be able to include all components and effectiveness will be

limited. Alternatively, the full program will only be available to a few classes, limiting the program's potential reach.

Final Thoughts

In July, 2020, I spoke with a friend who is an administrator for several public charter schools in low-income areas. The COVID-19 pandemic had shut down schools in the spring, and by July, it was clear that classes would resume remotely in the fall. At the time, I was working on a grant for a museum to bring arts integration to Title I schools. As I started to share ideas about how arts integration could be a way to help meet history social-science standards, my friend interrupted me and said that the focus for the upcoming year would be catching-up on literacy and math skills. The students are behind and must catch-up. There would be no time for anything else.

Those children deserve more.

In spite of thirty years of conclusive research that engagement in the arts boosts academic learning; in spite of government pronouncements of the importance of arts education to the future of the American economy; and in spite of innumerable stories about the joy and increased sense of community that participation in the arts evokes in students and teachers, even progressive minded educators will not accept that the arts could play a central role in children's educational journeys. When confronted with the challenges caused by the pandemic, educators retreated to teaching to the test.

In order to convince administrators, parents, and policy makers that arts-infused classrooms are effective learning environments, it is imperative that teachers receive high-quality comprehensive training in object- and inquiry-based learning. Museum educators are exceptionally well-situated to provide such training. Because museums are informal learning settings, museum educators must design activities for a broad range of ages, interests, prior knowledge, and previous experiences. They consider multiple intelligences, developmental stages, and constructivism. They understand that visitors are typically in groups, making learning in museums essentially social in nature. They appreciate that the social-emotional aspect of learning builds connections of all kinds; connections to personal experiences, to prior knowledge, to family and friends, to unknown places and cultures, to the museum, and to the community. And they witness the joy and excitement that learning through the arts can spark. This professional environment enables museum educators to productively partner with schools and to collaborate thoughtfully and openly with teachers in order to benefit children.

Because that is the ultimate goal—to benefit underserved children. Youth who live in poverty and low-income neighborhoods must cope with many challenges in their lives. Lack of training and funding for high-quality education programs is one challenge with significant repercussions that contribute to a cycle of poverty. The multi-visit programs can help boost academic learning because they focus on developing students' observation, reasoning, communication, collaboration, and problem-solving skills, which are useful across all academic areas, and in life. Enhancing these skills empowers

students to meet new learning situations with confidence. Participation in the arts seems to be a factor in reducing high school drop-out rates. If students consider themselves to be capable learners, they might further their academic growth and pursue higher-paying careers. Education can break the cycle of poverty.

Title I was launched by President Lyndon Johnson in 1964 as part of the “war on poverty.” Although it provides meals and funding, over the last half century, Title I has still not been able to reach its goals regarding improved educational programming and outcomes. An achievement gap persists between low-income and other students. Multi-visit museum programs that focus on visual arts and include a teacher professional development component successfully help close the gap. These programs need to be replicated.

At stake is the future of underserved children. The crucial role of art in children’s development and life was expounded upon by John Holt (1927-1985), influential teacher, educational theorist, social critic, and author:

I will insist once again, and more strongly than before, that art is a very powerful and essential way for many children both to explore the world around (and inside) them and to express much of what they have learned and felt about it. It is not a ‘frill’ but a central human activity and need, one we neglect at our peril (Holt 2017, 195).

REFERENCES

- A+ Schools of North Carolina. 2020. "A+ Schools as a Change Agent." Accessed October 9, 2020. <https://www.ncarts.org/aplus-schools/impact/schools-change-agent>
- Alexander, Edward P., Mary Alexander, and Juilee Decker. 2017. *Museums in Motion*, 3rd ed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- American Alliance of Museums, Education Committee. 1990. "Statement on Professional Standards for Museum Education." *The Journal of Museum Education*, 21, No. 1, Winter, 1996, 20-22. Accessed October 6, 2020. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40479051>
- American Alliance of Museums, Education Committee. 2005. *Excellence in Practice: Museums Education Principles and Standards*, revised. Washington, D.C.: American Alliance of Museums. Accessed January 31, 2020. https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bz_5mDyp81VsT1l4c1BtWFFLT1k/edit
- American Alliance of Museums. 1992. *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums*. 3rd ed. 2008. Washington, D.C.: American Alliance of Museums. Accessed October 7, 2020. <http://ww2.aam-us.org/docs/default-source/resource-library/excellence-and-equity.pdf>
- American Alliance of Museums. 2020a. "Professional Networks: Education (EdCom)." Accessed September 8, 2020. <https://www.aam-us.org/professional-networks/education-committee/>.
- American Alliance of Museums. 2020b. "EdCom Task Force to Explore an Education-Related Core Document." Education Committee. Accessed September 8, 2020. <https://www.aam-us.org/professional-networks/education-committee/edcom-task-force-to-explore-an-education-related-core-document/>
- Barnes Foundation. 2018. *Education Outreach Programs Annual Report 2017-2018*. Accessed March 6, 2020. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/barnes-images-p-e1c3c83bd163b8df/assets/Barnes-School-Programs-Grant-Report-20182.pdf>
- Barnes Foundation. 2019. *Education Outreach Programs Annual Report 2018-2019*. Accessed March 6, 2020. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/barnes-images-p-e1c3c83bd163b8df/assets/EducationOutreach2018-19.pdf>
- Barnes Foundation. 2020a. "About." Accessed September 2, 2020. <https://www.barnesfoundation.org/about>
- Barnes Foundation. 2020b. "The Barnes Collection." Accessed September 2, 2020. <https://www.barnesfoundation.org/whats-on/collection>
- Barnes Foundation. 2020c. "Host an Event: Corporate Events." Accessed September 2, 2020. <https://www.barnesfoundation.org/host-an-event/corporate-events>

- Barnes Foundation. 2020d. "Provenance Statement." Accessed March 19, 2020. <https://www.barnesfoundation.org/collection/provenance-statement>
- Barnes Foundation. 2020e. *2019 Annual Report*. Accessed October 3, 2020. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/barnes-images-p-e1c3c83bd163b8df/assets/bf-2019-annualreport.pdf>
- Barnes Foundation. 2020f. *Creative Learning: Pre-K to 12, Education Programs Annual Report 2019-2020*. Accessed October 6, 2020. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/barnes-images-p-e1c3c83bd163b8df/assets/2020-Edu-Grant-Report.pdf>
- Bassett, Barbara. 2019. Interview by Ruby Ming. December 17, 2019.
- Burnham, Rika and Elliott Kai-Kee. 2011. *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.
- Camden City School District. 2020a. "CCSD: Facts & Figures." Accessed March 24, 2020. http://camdencity.ss12.sharpschool.com/divisions/superintendent_s_office/c_c_s_d_facts_figures
- Camden City School District. 2020b. "School Nutrition." Accessed March 24, 2020. http://camdencity.ss12.sharpschool.com/for_families/school_nutrition
- Center for the Future of Museums. 2014. *Building the Future of Education: Museums and the Learning Ecosystem*. Arlington, Virginia: American Alliance of Museums. Accessed September 8, 2020. <https://www.aam-us.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Building-the-Future-of-Education.pdf>
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. 2020. "Development Process." Accessed August 31, 2020. <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/>
- Cuban, Larry. 2001. "Part Four, 1980-2000: The Bottom Line: Introduction." In *School: The Story of American Public Education*, edited by Sarah Mondale and Sarah B. Patton, 173-182. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dana, Joseph Cotton. 1917. *The Gloom of the Museum, New Museum Series, no. 2*. Woodstock, Vermont: Elm Tree Press.
- Davis, Katie, Joanna Christodoulou, Scott Seider, and Howard Gardner. 2011. "The Theory of Multiple Intelligences." Chapter 24. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence*, edited by Robert J. Sternberg and Scott Barry Kaufman, 485-503. Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dewey, John. 1934. *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigee Books, Penguin Putnam, Inc.
- Dewey, John. 1938. *Experience and Education*. New York: Free Press, Simon and Schuster, Inc.

- Duncan, Arne. 2011. "Lessons from High-Performing Countries." Remarks at National Center on Education and the Economy National Symposium, May 24, 2011. Accessed August 30, 2020. <https://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/lessons-high-performing-countries>.
- Falk, John H. and Lynn D. Dierking. 2018. *Learning from Museums*, 2nd ed. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Friends Select School. 2020. "Distinctive Programs: Upper School." Accessed March 13, 2020. <https://www.friends-select.org/educational-program/distinctive-programs>
- Gardner, Howard. 2005. "Multiple Lenses on the Mind." Paper delivered at Expo-Gestion, Bogota, Colombia, May 25, 2005. Accessed January 31, 2020. <https://howardgardner01.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/multiple-lenses-on-the-mind2.pdf>
- Gardner, Howard. 2011. "The Theory of Multiple Intelligences: As Psychology, As Education, As Social Science." Address given at José Cela University in Madrid, Spain, October 22, 2011. Accessed September 22, 2020. <https://howardgardner01.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/473-madrid-oct-22-2011.pdf>.
- Greer, W. Dwaine. 1984. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study." *Studies in Art Education* 25, No. 4 (Summer): 212-218. Accessed September 27, 2020. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1320414>
- Guidestar. 2020. "Philadelphia Museum of Art." Accessed March 6, 2020. <https://www.guidestar.org/profile/23-1365388>
- Hein, George. 1998. *Learning in the Museum*. New York: Routledge.
- Holt, John. 2017. *How Children Learn*, 50th anniversary ed. New York: Da Capo Press, Hachette Book Group.
- Hudson, Kenneth. 1975. *A Social History of Museums: What the Visitors Thought*. London: The MacMillan Press, Ltd.
- International Council of Museums. 2020. "Museum Definition." Accessed September 15, 2020. <https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/>.
- Johnson, A., Kimberly A. Humber, Nancy Cutler, Melissa Bingmann, and Tim Grove. 2017. *The Museum Educator's Manual: Educators Share Successful Techniques*, 2nd ed. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Kaestle, Carl F. 2001. "Part One, 1770-1900: The Common School: Introduction." In *School: The Story of American Public Education*, edited by Sarah Mondale and Sarah B. Patton, 11-17. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kail, Robert V. 2001. *Children and Their Development*, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Kennedy Center. 2020. *CETA Evaluation Findings*. Accessed October 9, 2020. https://www.kennedy-center.org/globalassets/education/networks-conferences--research/networks--strategic-leadership/changing-education-through-the-arts-schools/ceta-learn-more-ceta_evaluation_findings.pdf
- Klein, Alyson. 2015. "No Child Left Behind: An Overview." *Education Week*, April 10, 2015. Accessed August 31, 2020. <https://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/no-child-left-behind-overview-definition-summary.html>
- Lesk, Sara Mark. 2019. Interview by Ruby Ming. December 4, 2019.
- Lock, S. 2019. "Number of visitors to the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C. from 2007 to 2018." Statista. May 28, 2019. Accessed March 8, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/247430/yearly-visitors-to-the-national-gallery-of-art-in-washington/>
- Lui, Angela. 2012. "Teaching in the Zone: An Introduction to Working Within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to Drive Effective Early Childhood Instruction." *Children's Progress*. Accessed October 5, 2020. http://sowamslibrary.weebly.com/uploads/2/3/0/7/23079404/teaching_in_the_zone.pdf
- Malburg, Sarah. 2008. "What Are Title 1 Schools? Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Students." Bright Hub Education. Accessed February 29, 2020. <https://www.brighthubeducation.com/teaching-methods-tips/11105-basics-of-title-1-funds/>
- McCluskey, Neal. 2015. "Has No Child Left Behind Worked?" Testimony to Committee on Education and the Workforce: Democrats, U.S. House of Representatives, February 9, 2015. Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.cato.org/publications/testimony/has-no-child-left-behind-worked>
- McMurrer, Jennifer. 2007. *Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era*. Washington, D.C.: Center on Education Policy.
- Mondale, Sarah, and Sarah B. Patton, eds. 2001. *School: The Story of American Public Education*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2016a. "2016 Arts Music and Visual Arts Grade 8 Assessment Report Card: Summary Data Tables: Performance Results_Visual Arts." National Center for Education Statistics. Accessed October 5, 2020. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/arts_2016/files/2016_arts_appendix_tables.pdf
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2016b. "NAEP Data Explorer, Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab: National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories." The Nation's Report Card, Data Tables. Accessed October 5, 2020. <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/ndecore/xplore/NDE>.

- National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2016c. "Achievement Gaps Dashboard." The Nation's Report Card. Accessed October 5, 2020. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/dashboards/achievement_gaps.aspx#
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2020. "Arts Assessment, 2016, Grade 8." Accessed October 5, 2020. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/arts_2016/#/
- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. 2014a. "Philosophical Foundations and Lifelong Goals." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://sites.google.com/nccas.org/nccas-wikispace/standards-components/philosophical-foundations-lifelong-goals>
- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. 2014b. "National Core Arts Standards: A Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nationalartsstandards.org/sites/default/files/Conceptual%20Framework%2007-21-16.pdf>.
- National Core Arts Standards. 2019. "State Adoption of New Arts Education Standards since 2014." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nationalartsstandards.org/map>
- National Gallery of Art. 2018. *Art Around the Corner EOY Report 2017-2018*. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art Education Division.
- National Gallery of Art. 2019. *Annual Report 2018*. Accessed February 8, 2020. <https://www.nga.gov/about/annual-reports.html>
- National Gallery of Art. 2020a. "About the Gallery." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nga.gov/about/creating-the-museum.html>
- National Gallery of Art. 2020b. "Mission Statement." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nga.gov/about/mission-statement.html>.
- National Gallery of Art. 2020c. "Education." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nga.gov/education.html>
- National Gallery of Art. 2020d. "Art Around the Corner." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nga.gov/education/teachers/art-around-the-corner.html>
- National Science Teaching Association. 2020. "About the Next Generation Science Standards." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://ngss.nsta.org/about.aspx#>
- Next Generation Science Standards. 2020a. "Developing the Standards." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www.nextgenscience.org/developing-standards/developing-standards>
- Next Generation Science Standards. 2020b. "Appendix M. Connections to CCSS-Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects." *Next Generation Science Standards*. Accessed September 1, 2020. https://www.nextgenscience.org/sites/default/files/Appendix%20M%20Connections%20to%20the%20CCSS%20for%20Literacy_061213.pdf.

Parsad, B., and Spiegelman, M. 2012. *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1999–2000 and 2009–10*. National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, (NCES 2012–014). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Accessed August 20, 2020. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012014rev.pdf>

Penn, Kal. 2017. “Why the White House’s Arts and Humanities Committee Decided to Resign All at Once Under Trump.” Interview by Yohana Desta. *Vanity Fair*, August 18, 2017. Accessed October 9, 2020. <https://www.vanityfair.com/hollywood/2017/08/white-house-arts-humanities-committee-resignation-trump>.

Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development. 2020. “Educational Improvement Tax Credit Program (EITC).” Accessed November 10, 2020. <https://dced.pa.gov/programs/educational-improvement-tax-credit-program-eitc/>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020a. “An Overview of the Museum's History.” Accessed March 4, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-19.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020b. “Centennial Origins: 1874–1876.” Accessed March 8, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-154-18.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020c. “The Early Decades: 1877–1900.” Accessed March 5, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-224-20.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020d. “1900-1910.” Accessed March 5, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-225-21.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020e. “1920-1930.” Accessed March 5, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-227-23.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020f. “1930-1940.” Accessed March 8, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-228-24.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020g. “2000-2010.” Accessed March 9, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-605-505.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020h. “Bringing Us Together Through the Power of Art.” Accessed November 9, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/ourfuture/vision>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020i. “Philadelphia Museum of Art Plans to Reopen on September 6, 2020.” Press Release, August 10, updated August 31, 2020. Accessed October 2, 2020. <https://press.philamuseum.org/pma-plans-to-reopen-on-september-6-2020/>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020j. “Online Collection Search.” Accessed November 9, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/collections/search.html>

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020k. “1960-1970.” Accessed March 9, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-601-501.html>

- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020l. "1980-1990." Accessed March 9, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-603-503.html>
- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020m. "1990-2000." Accessed March 9, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/information/45-604-504.html>
- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020n. *2019 Year in Review*. Accessed March 5, 2020. https://pma-api-prod-public.s3.amazonaws.com/public/2019-12/PMA_Year_in_Review_FY19_2019_11_25_web.pdf
- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020o. "Learn: 4-12 Collection Tours." Accessed March 10, 2020. <https://www.philamuseum.org/schooltours?page=3>
- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020p. "Standards Alignment for School Tours." Accessed March 12, 2020. https://www.philamuseum.org/doc_downloads/education/StandardsAlignmentSchoolTours.pdf
- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020q. "Community Engagement: Delphi Programs." Accessed March 15, 2020. <https://philamuseum.org/educationpartners?page=1>
- Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020r. *Impact Report, 2020 Edition*. Accessed October 2, 2020. https://assets.philamuseum.org/public/2020-04/2020impactreport_04-24-20.pdf
- President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. 2011. *Reinvesting in Arts Education: Winning America's Future Through Creative Schools*. Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. Accessed October 6, 2020. <https://www.giarts.org/sites/default/files/Reinvesting-in-Arts-Education-Winning-Americas-Future-Through-Creative-Schools.pdf>
- Raber, Jesse. 2017. "The Arts in Public Schools: An Intellectual History." *Process: A Blog for American History*, March 28, 2017. Organization of American Historians. Accessed September 1, 2020. <http://www.processhistory.org/raber-arts-public-schools/>
- Ravitch, Diane. 2001. "Part Two, 1900-1950: As American as Public School: Introduction." In *School: The Story of American Public Education*, edited by Sarah Mondale and Sarah B. Patton, 63-70. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rodin Museum. 2020. "The History of the Rodin Museum." Accessed March 9, 2020. <http://www.rodinmuseum.org/492-518.html>
- Scheinfeld, Daniel R. 2004a. "Arts Integration in the Classroom: Reflections on Theory and Application." *Applied Research in Child Development*, no. 5, Spring 2004: 1-10. Herr Research Center, Erickson Institute. Accessed October 6, 2020. <https://www.erikson.edu/wp-content/uploads/arcd52004.pdf>
- Scheinfeld, Daniel R. 2004b. "Q&A: A conversation with Dan Scheinfeld." *Applied Research in Child Development*, no. 5, Spring 2004: 14-16. Herr Research Center,

Erickson Institute. Accessed October 6, 2020. <https://www.erikson.edu/wp-content/uploads/arcd52004.pdf>.

School District of Philadelphia. 2006. *Core Curriculum: Visual Arts K-12*. Philadelphia: Songhai Press. Accessed March 13, 2020. <https://www.philasd.org/arts/wp-content/uploads/sites/144/2018/12/ART-Curriculum-17.pdf>

School District of Philadelphia. 2020a. "Fast Facts." Updated March 10, 2020. Accessed March 15, 2020. https://www.philasd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/SDP_FastFacts_1920.pdf

School District of Philadelphia. 2020b. "District Performance Office, School Information—District Enrollment & Demographics: SY 2019-2020." Updated November, 2020. https://www.philasd.org/performance/programsservices/open-data/school-information/#district_enrollment

School District of Philadelphia. 2020c. "Prekindergarten Services." Accessed March 15, 2020. <https://www.philasd.org/earlychildhood/programs-and-services/prekindergartenservices/>

School District of Philadelphia. 2020d. "Office of Multilingual Curriculum & Programs." Accessed March 12, 2020. <https://www.philasd.org/multilingual/frequently-asked-questions/>

Scialabba, George. 2020. "Creativity Is Intelligence Having Fun." Quote Investigator. Accessed October 9, 2020. <https://quoteinvestigator.com/2017/03/02/fun/>. Original source: 1984. "The Browser: Mindplay." *Harvard Magazine*, March-April, Volume 86, Number 4, 16-19. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Magazine Inc.

Silverstein, Lynne B. and Sean Layne. 2020a. "What is Arts Integration? Explore the Kennedy Center's comprehensive definition." The Kennedy Center. Accessed September 28, 2020. <https://www.kennedy-center.org/education/resources-for-educators/classroom-resources/articles-and-how-tos/articles/collections/arts-integration-resources/what-is-arts-integration/>."

Silverstein, Lynne B. and Sean Layne. 2020b. "Why Arts Integration? Two Big Reasons." The Kennedy Center. Accessed October 7, 2020. <https://www.kennedy-center.org/education/resources-for-educators/classroom-resources/articles-and-how-tos/articles/collections/arts-integration-resources/why-arts-integration-two-big-reasons/>

Simon, Nina. 2012. "The Art of the Steal: Access & Controversy at the Barnes Foundation." Museum 2.0, January 4, 2012. Accessed March 4, 2020. <https://museumtwo.blogspot.com/2012/01/art-of-steal-access-controversy-at.html>

Smithsonian. 2020. "About the Smithsonian." Accessed September 7, 2020. <https://www.si.edu/about>

Stern, Stephanie. 2019. Interview by Ruby Ming. December 16, 2019.

The Art of Education University. 2020. "Historical Perspectives in Art Education." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://artofed-uploads.nyc3.digitaloceanspaces.com/2015/06/Historical-Perspectives-in-Art-Education.pdf>

Tishman, Shari and Patricia Palmer. 2006. *Artful Thinking: Stronger thinking and learning through the power of art*. Final report. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Accessed September 2, 2020. <https://pz.harvard.edu/resources/final-report-artful-thinking>

Toledo Museum of Art. 2020. "Visual Literacy: Why Visual Literacy?" Accessed September 28, 2020. <https://www.toledomuseum.org/education/visual-literacy/why-visual-literacy>.

Tuchfeld, Lorraine Sabrina. 2010. "Art Museum-School Partnerships: 'Filling the Gaps' in Art Education." M.A. thesis, San Francisco State University.

Tyack, David. 2001. "Introduction." In *School: The Story of American Public Education*, edited by Sarah Mondale and Sarah B. Patton, 1-8. Boston: Beacon Press.

U.S. Department of Education. 1994. "National Standards for Arts Education: Summary Statement: Education Reform, Standards, and the Arts." Accessed September 1, 2020. <https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/ArtsStandards.html>

Upper Darby School District. 2020. "Comprehensive Plan 2018-2021." Accessed March 12, 2020. <https://www.upperdarbysd.org/Page/2866>

Whitford, W. G. 1923. "Brief History of Art Education in the United States." *The Elementary School Journal*, 24 no. 2 (October): 109- 115. The University of Chicago Press. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/994696>

Williams, Patterson. 1982. "Object-Oriented Learning in Art Museums." *Roundtable Reports*, 7, No. 2: 12-15. Accessed September 26, 2020. <https://sjmusart.org/sites/default/files/files/object-oriented-learning-in-art-museums.pdf>.

Yenawine, Peter. 2013. *Visual Thinking Strategies: Using Art to Deepen Learning Across School Disciplines*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Education Press.

APPENDIX A: NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART WEBSITE SOURCES

National Gallery of Art. 2018. Art Around the Corner EOY Report 2017-2018.

National Gallery of Art Art Around the Corner 2017-2018 End of Year Report

Copyright ©2019 Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington. All rights reserved.

Produced by the National Gallery of Art, Washington

Mission

Art Around the Corner is committed to providing quality multiple-visit programs at the National Gallery of Art for under-resourced students, families, and teachers that deepen understanding of art, strengthen critical thinking, and broaden life experiences. We strive to be a local and national resource of best practices in arts education by facilitating student experiences and teacher training based on curriculum-connected lessons, thinking-centered discussion, kinesthetic strategies, and art making.

Impact

Through experiencing the power of art in AAC:

- **Students** work towards their full potential in life and learning.
- **Family members** connect with each other through conversations about art.
- **Teachers** see how art affects their students in positive ways and integrate art into their teaching practice.

Outcomes

Intended results among students, families, and teachers:

Students

- Students practice and develop creative and critical thinking dispositions.
- Students appreciate art as a form of personal, cultural, and historical expression that can enhance their lives.
- Students appreciate an art museum as a place for enjoyment and learning.

Families

- Parents experience the NGA as a relevant place for their family's enjoyment and education.
- Parents and children engage in meaningful conversations about art.
- Families strengthen their relationship with teachers and the school community.

Teachers

- Teachers develop a relationship with AAC staff based on shared values and mutual respect.
- Teachers feel comfortable using art as a vehicle to teach.

General Program Overview

Launched in 1994, Art Around the Corner (AAC) is the National Gallery's multiple-visit outreach program to Title 1 elementary schools in the DC region. AAC centers on partnerships between the National Gallery of Art and public elementary schools from both the District of Columbia and Fairfax County.

Art Around the Corner includes the six-visit program which welcomes students twelve times over two years and the three-visit Mini-Multiple-Visit (MMV) program, completed in a single week. In both multiple-visit programs students develop critical thinking skills to make meaning from art, learn about the world around them, acquire vocabulary in context, explore various forms of self-expression, and gain a sense of ownership of the National Gallery of Art. AAC is supported by a standards-based curriculum, skillful and interactive museum teaching, integrated classroom activities, and extensive evaluation.

Target Audience

Participating schools for the six-visit program are selected on the following criteria:

- The school's commitment of the participating team of classroom teachers, art teachers, and the principal, for a three-to-five year period;
- Need, in terms of students being "at-risk" with regard to academic performance or Title1 status;
- Need, in terms of the school not having similar arts programming;
- Geographic location (Art Around the Corner strives to serve a cross-section of the city's quadrants);
- Previous participation in the Mini-Multiple-Visit program and/or on-site interview.

Pedagogy

The Art Around the Corner curriculum emphasizes the development of critical thinking to deepen understanding of art. Linked to classroom curricula, Common Core and DC content standards, the AAC curriculum is inspired by "Teaching for Understanding," and Artful Thinking, two pedagogies developed by the Project Zero research group at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education.

Gallery teachers employ a number of consistent gallery strategies, including Artful Thinking Routines, sketching, dramatization, and creative writing. During each museum visit, gallery teachers use inquiry to encourage students to slow down as they observe, describe, reason, compare and contrast what they see, connect ideas to experiences, ask questions, use imagination, and reflect on their learning.

Program Format

The program is designed for third, fourth and fifth graders, their teachers and families. Generally, the entire grade level at each school participates. Classes are divided into two groups of 12-15 students, each led by the same museum educator throughout the program.

In the six-visit program, students visit the National Gallery five times, and museum educators visit the classroom once during the year. Museum visits last 1 1/2 - 2 hours; students engage with art in the galleries every time they come and create art in the Education Studio on two visits. Classroom teachers partner by engaging students in pre-and-post-visit activities, introducing vocabulary and reading children's books about a featured artist or theme. Additional activities are optional.

Professional Development and Evaluation

Professional development is an integral part of Art Around the Corner. Program staff provide a course, “Using Thinking Routines to Integrate Art and Support Literacy” for participating classroom, special needs, and art teachers. Workshops and study groups for gallery teachers support gallery teaching technique.

Both classroom teachers and students submit feedback via written reflections and evaluation forms. National Gallery staff also make assessments by observing the program. Assessment is integral to yearly program revision.

Curriculum and Materials

Program participants receive extensive materials, including curriculum binders, sketchbook-journals, children’s books, art reproductions and posters, art materials, and digital media that include art images.

Special Events for Families

To celebrate students’ participation and to involve families, AAC organizes Family Days at the National Gallery. Family Days bring students and families to the museum for breakfast or lunch, an interactive gallery tour, an exhibition of student art, and art-making materials to take home.

Additional Multiple-Visit Outreach Programs

The Mini-Multiple-Visit (MMV) program brings students from DC public schools to the National Gallery for a 3-visit program during one week. In a partnership with the Fairfax County Title I Office, AAC staff provide elementary students and their families with guided programming.

6 • *Art Around the Corner*

Program Summary

2017 – 2018

Art Around the Corner partnered with ten DCPS Title I elementary schools and two Fairfax County Title I elementary schools, serving nearly 750 students during the 2017-18 school year.

- The Six-Visit Program partnered with Seaton, Cleveland, Bruce-Monroe, and Anne Beers Elementary Schools, with 396 students in the program.
- The Mini-Multiple Visit (MMV) program worked with 268 students from John Burroughs, Bancroft, Cooke, Savoy, Tyler and Wheatley Elementary Schools.
- The four-part professional development course served 35 classroom, art, and special needs teachers from participating schools.
- Students in both the Six-Visit Program and MMV program engaged in the galleries with David Ibata and Bruce Campbell, painters and copyists at the National Gallery.
- Three Family Days welcomed approximately 475 students and family members.
- The Fairfax County Title I program served 78 students and family members from Coates and Clearview Elementary Schools.
- Museum educators teaching in the programs included five members of the education staff and ten contract museum educators. Several new contract gallery teachers were recruited and trained, including one Spanish-speaking gallery teacher who conducted her lessons in Spanish.

See charts on pages 15, 16, and 17 for additional information on participating schools.

Curriculum

Six-Visit Program

The theme *Think Like an Artist* guided the student experience in the six-visit program. During each lesson, students engaged in open-ended discussion using Artful Thinking routines, developed by Project Zero at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, to help them observe, wonder about, and describe works of art, while learning to reason with evidence found in the works of art. During the lessons, they wrote poetry, sketched, acted, and made connections by comparing works of art during gallery walks. In the Education Studio, third and fourth graders played with color, line, and shape to make abstract paintings and also created portraits of people they admire. Fifth graders created modern sculpture maquettes, clay figures on armatures, and Civil War collages.

See charts on pages 18 -19 for curriculum summaries, including each grades' lesson themes, featured artists, and works of art.

8 • Art Around the Corner

Mini-Multiple Visit Program

The three-part Mini-Multiple Visit program took place in tandem with the six-visit Art Around the Corner program in the fall of 2017. Classroom teachers from four DC elementary schools selected from two curriculum-connected themes, *Artists are Innovators* or *Artists are Historians*. All students had the chance to meet and sketch in the galleries with artist and NGA copyist Bruce I. Campbell. At the end of each program week, classroom teachers received an art activity kit so that students could create original works of art inspired by what they saw and experienced at the museum back at school.

In spring 2018, students from Savoy and Wheatley, schools that were formerly part of the six-visit program, participated in two MMV weeks, one exploring the Civil War and the other focusing on Civil Rights, in works of art. Overall, 268 students participated in the MMV program.

Culminating Events

For the first time, Art Around the Corner hosted three Family Days, one in fall 2017 and two in winter 2018, to accommodate its growing numbers. In total, over 475 students and family members came to the East Building for a hot breakfast and an exhibit of the art made during the program. During their visit, families were encouraged to explore the museum using a bilingual self-guided family brochure and a museum exploration kit, that included a sketchbook and sketch pencil. Families sketched, posed, wrote poetry, asked questions, and took photographs during their time in the galleries. All children received an art kit to take home.

Fairfax County Title I Program

In partnership with the Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) Title 1 office, Art Around the Corner invited students and family members from Lake Anne and Forest Edge Elementary Schools to participate in the Gallery's Fall Community Weekend. During their visit, families watched an original children's play inspired by the works of Henri Matisse entitled *Color's Garden*.

Classroom Teacher Professional Development

“Thinking Routines to Integrate Art and Support Literacy,” AAC’s professional development course, welcomed its sixth annual cohort of 35 Title 1 teachers from AAC partner schools. Teachers participated in gallery demonstrations of Artful Thinking routines and then practiced integrating art in their classrooms with art reproductions provided by the museum. At each session, they shared and analyzed documentation of student thinking. Two sessions were filmed for the Massive Open Online Course, *Teaching Critical Thinking with Art*, which is based on the onsite course.

Gallery Teacher Professional Development

Ten contract gallery teachers and all AAC staff participated in a professional development workshop in September 2017 to prepare for the Art Around the Corner year, focusing on the theme: *Think Like an Artist*. Smithsonian learning specialist Ashley Grady presented strategies for teaching students with special needs. The entire group participated in six study groups to share teaching techniques and focus on student thinking.

Staff Development

In May 2018 several AAC staff attended the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) conference in Phoenix, and Sara Lesk and Julie Carmean presented the first module of the in-process online course to educators at the International Conference on Thinking (ICOT). AAC staff taught English Language Learners (ELL) in a special summer program partnering DC public schools with the National Gallery. In August, Meghan Lally Keaton presented on strategies for teaching all learners in the art museum at the VSA Intersections conference in Atlanta; Emily Mendonca taught an in-gallery lesson for WISSIT, the Washington International School’s Summer Teacher Institute; and Julie Carmean attended a conference entitled Reimagining Migration in Los Angeles.

Art Around the Corner • 11

Online Learning Project

Julie Carmean and Sara Lesk produced the prototype module of Course 1 of the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), tentatively titled *Teaching Critical Thinking with Art*. Working with Smithsonian Enterprises and Howes Studio, the course development team created ten new videos in classroom and museum settings that model Artful Thinking routines with a variety of age levels. Targeting K-12 teachers, pre-service teachers, and museum educators, the course will teach educators to integrate works of art in their teaching environments, and to use the National Gallery’s website for accessing art and art information. Course development continues, with an anticipated launch date of January 2019.

Website

To read about Art Around the Corner on the National Gallery’s website, go to: <http://www.nga.gov/content/ngaweb/education/teachers/art-around-the-corner.html>

Student Comments

- I looked at pictures, talked about the artwork, asked myself questions, and thought really hard about what the painting really was.
- I focused on the little details of the big blue chicken and explored different types of art and textures. I also explored my environment.
- I thought like an artist because I was observing and sketching. Also, I did the See, Think, Wonder.
- I am an artist! How I think like an artist was I observed the sculptures and the paintings and drew like them.
- It was helpful when we learned about the Civil War because in my reading class we are talking about the Civil War and Reconstruction.
- By explaining what art pictures mean, I made a connection with art by acting out art pictures.
- I remember the chocolate and soap sculptures because it was creative to use those materials to make the sculptures.
- See, Think, Wonder helped me in describing and expressing myself through art.
- Painting never has to be perfect, you can do anything however you want.
- Thank you for making sure we all understood and putting everything in a fun way.
- Thank you for teaching me about my history.

20 • *Art Around the Corner*

Classroom Teacher Comments

- They enjoy sketching, trying new activities that don't necessarily involve reading/ writing. Discussing art allows for more ideas to be shared from students who may usually remain silent.
- Thank you for including materials in Spanish. I still would like more practice with growing their thinking through art. I feel like I'm just starting to touch the surface.
- High energy students were able to focus and show attention to detail when making observations and creating sketches of sculptures.
- Students are noticing minute details about art and wondering about the artists' motivations.
- Thank you for including a diverse collection of artists.
- Students have been able to develop a lot of skills throughout the program (observing, describing, reasoning, etc.). For example, the meeting with the professional painter has been excellent in order for students to understand all the possibilities that art offers to viewers.
- Some of the students who are quieter in class seem to be more apt to verbal or artistic expression in Art Around the Corner. After students have been given the opportunity to create they, are more relaxed and open to delve into other topics.
- Just as math is everywhere, so is Art. It is all in your perspective. You can find beauty or things to wonder about in everything. The more you see, the more you think, the more you wonder/question. This helps to spark synopses in the brain and create connections which builds understanding on higher levels.

Art Around the Corner • 21

After discussing the Shaw Memorial together, Cleveland fifth graders create a tableau of the figures -- including the horse -- in the Civil War sculpture.

22 • *Art Around the Corner*

Program Staff

Sara Mark Lesk, Senior Educator and Manager of *Art Around the Corner*

Sara manages all aspects of the Gallery's multiple-visit outreach programs, supervising program staff and gallery educators, while developing relationships in the local community to expand the Gallery's audiences. She is a co-developer of the Massive Open Online Course.

Julie Carmean, Museum Educator and Coordinator of Professional Development

Julie designs and facilitates professional development for classroom and gallery educators and assists with curriculum, gallery and studio teaching. She also heads up the creation of the Gallery's first Massive Open Online Course.

Meghan Lally Keaton, Museum Educator and Coordinator of Community Engagement

Meghan coordinates AAC Family Days and the Mini-Multiple-Visit program, creates curriculum, teaches in the studio and in the galleries, and contributes broadly to the program's community outreach efforts.

Emily Mendonca, Museum Educator

Emily coordinates communications and logistics for the various Art Around the Corner programs, assists with curriculum writing and teaching, and supervises the Fairfax County Title I program.

Sarah Caruso, Education Assistant

Sarah supports student art making by preparing studio art materials and engaging with students as they create art in the Education Studio.

National Gallery of Art. 2019. Annual Report 2018.

National Gallery of Art
2018 Annual Report

Copyright ©2019 Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art,
Washington. All rights reserved.

Produced by the National Gallery of Art, Washington

www.nga.gov

978-0-89468-414-2

COLLECTING
EXHIBITING
EDUCATING
PRESERVING

The education division served more than 780,000 visitors at the Gallery this year through its programming and publications. Several new initiatives helped broaden the division's reach by making programmatic offerings more inclusive to new and more diverse visitors.

The second annual John Wilmerding Symposium on American Art, funded by The Walton Family Foundation, brought together a group of distinguished scholars, curators, and artists who spoke about stories embedded in works of American art in the Gallery's collection.

The following day, the large-scale Community Celebration further explored the expanding and changing stories of American art and the Gallery's role in sharing those stories. In the weeks leading up to the celebration, a performance artist collected stories at several locations

in the community and then used them to provide material for a "story chorus" on the day of the event. Visitors also drew and wrote on a large paper path inspired by Jacob Lawrence's *Sidewalk Drawings*, which was on view in the *Outliers and American Vanguard Art* exhibition. A second community weekend, *Art + Play*, delighted visitors at a two-day event that emphasized the connection between art and enjoyment. The weekend included an "exquisite corpse" workshop, based on the drawing game created by early twentieth-century surrealist artists. A specially commissioned play for all ages that drew its inspiration from Henri Matisse's cut-outs, *Color's Garden: An Adventure with the Elements of Art*, invited visitors to connect with the visual arts through the performing arts.

National Gallery of Art. 2020a. "About the Gallery."

<https://www.nga.gov/about/creating-the-museum.html>

National Gallery of Art

[Home](#) » [About the National Gallery of Art](#) » [Gallery History](#)

Gallery History

Establishing the Museum

The National Gallery of Art was conceived and given to the people of the United States by Andrew W. Mellon, a financier and art collector who served as secretary of the treasury under four presidents from 1921 to 1932. During his years as a public servant, Mellon came to believe that the United States should have a world-class national art museum comparable to those of other nations. In 1936 Mellon wrote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt to offer his gift of paintings and sculpture for a new museum in Washington, DC, that he would build and finance with his own funds. Roosevelt endorsed Mellon's offer, and Congress accepted his gift in 1937.

[Explore this detailed, interactive timeline of the Gallery's history.](#)

Construction of the West Building

Mellon selected American architect John Russell Pope (1874–1937) to design the building for the new museum. Now called the West Building, it was designed in a neoclassical style that mirrors elements of Pope's designs for the nearby National Archives building and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. The exterior was constructed with Tennessee pink marble, and Pope specified that skylights should cover virtually the entire three-acre roof to illuminate and unite the galleries.

Mellon and Pope died within 24 hours of each other in August 1937, not long after excavation for the West Building's foundations had begun, but the museum was built according to their concepts. The National Gallery of Art was dedicated on March 17, 1941, with Paul Mellon presenting the museum on behalf of his father to President Roosevelt, who accepted the gift for the nation.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt speaking at the dedication of the National Gallery of Art, March 17, 1941. National Gallery of Art, Gallery Archives. "The dedication of this Gallery to a living past, and to a greater and more richly living future, is the measure of the earnestness of our intention: that the freedom of the human spirit shall go on." [Listen to the full speech.](#)

Creating the Collection

When the National Gallery of Art opened to the public, the nucleus of its world-class collection was 126 paintings and 26 sculptures given by Andrew Mellon—from Raphael's *Alba Madonna* to Francisco de Goya's *Marquesa de Pontejos* and Giovanni Bologna's *Mercury*, which currently adorns the central fountain in the Rotunda. Mellon insisted that the museum not bear his name, believing that it should be a truly national institution and knowing that it would depend on generous gifts of art from many individuals to fill its spacious galleries. The National Gallery of Art became a "collection of collections" thanks to the generosity of [founding benefactors](#) Samuel H. Kress, Rush Kress, ... Ailsa Mellon Bruce, and Paul Mellon.

... the Gallery's collection has grown to more than 150,000 works ...

Fulfilling the Mission: Public Programming

In the Gallery's dedication, President Roosevelt referred to the Gallery as "a living institution . . . dedicated forever . . . to the use and enjoyment of the people of the United States." To fulfill this obligation, the Gallery established programs in its first year that have delighted visitors ever since.

The first temporary loan exhibition was held just two months after the museum opened [Hundreds of succeeding exhibitions](#) have enabled the museum to display art from a wider range of cultures and time periods than are represented in the permanent collection.

A horticultural department, responsible for maintaining the Gallery's indoor and outdoor gardens, curates stunning displays of plants and flowers throughout the year ...

Daily [public tours](#) and [weekly lectures](#) have been offered since the Gallery's opening, and in 1942 the Gallery established a [film program](#) and a [free Sunday evening concert series](#)—the oldest, continuous series

in the city. Public programs have since expanded to include a wide array of [free educational programs and resources](#) for visitors, teachers, and students.

Expanding the Mission: Construction of the East Building

Andrew Mellon anticipated that the National Gallery of Art would grow beyond the capacity of its original building, and, at his request, Congress set aside an adjacent plot of land for future use when it first established the Gallery. Plans for expansion were forming by the museum's 25th anniversary in 1966, because most of its original galleries were filled and there was a desire to create a library and an advanced research center.

In 1967 Andrew Mellon's children, Paul Mellon and Ailsa Mellon Bruce, offered funds for a second building, and architect I. M. Pei (1917–2019) was selected to design it. The modernist structure he conceived was inspired and informed by its trapezoidal site, located between Pennsylvania Avenue and the National Mall and between Third and Fourth Streets NW. ... Pei designed the East Building as two triangles—one to hold a library, offices, and community of scholars, and the other as public gallery space for the permanent collection and exhibitions. Pei linked his design to the neoclassical design of John Russell Pope by calling for the exterior to be clad in the same Tennessee pink marble used for the West Building.

Construction of the East Building began in 1971, and...a newly founded Collectors Committee commissioned artists such as Henry Moore and Alexander Calder to create works... This committee has made annual [gifts of modern art](#)^{[LS1] [BC2]} to the Gallery ever since, including works by Joan Miró, Louise Bourgeois, Yayoi Kusama, Tony Smith, and others.

On June 1, 1978, Paul Mellon and President Jimmy Carter dedicated the new museum to the people of the United States. With the East Building opening, the Gallery's vision for a research center was realized in both the expansion of the Library as well as the creation of the [Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts \(CASVA\)](#). CASVA continues to build a network of scholars enhancing the understanding of art and architecture through professorships, fellowships, symposia, and publications, while the Library supports the academic community at large.

Architect I. M. Pei in the East Building of the National Gallery of Art on opening day, June 1, 1978. © Dennis Brack/Black Star. National Gallery of Art, Washington, Gallery Archives. Listen to audio of an [oral history interview with I. M. Pei](#), conducted in 1993.

Construction of the National Gallery of Art Sculpture Garden

The concept of the National Gallery of Art Sculpture Garden dates to the 1790s, when Pierre L'Enfant called for a public, landscaped garden in his master plan for the nation's new capital. The Sculpture Garden's six-acre plot between 7th and 9th Streets NW was controlled by the National Park Service until 1966, when they signed an agreement with the Gallery to collaborate on its use.

By the time full jurisdiction was officially transferred to the Gallery in 1991, the Park Service had added a central, circular pool that was used as an ice rink in winter as well as an art nouveau-inspired pavilion and ring of linden trees. With generous support from the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, the Gallery employed ... landscape architect Laurie D. Olin to refresh the garden's design... Once again, Tennessee pink marble was employed to create a visual thread through the entire Gallery campus.

The National Gallery of Art Sculpture Garden opened to the public on May 23, 1999. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton accepted the gift of the completed garden on behalf of the nation.

Completing the Campus: The Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain

Another agreement with the National Park Service transferred custody of the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain and surrounding triangular park to the Gallery in 2015. The fountain, completed in 1952 ... honors Andrew W. Mellon's legacy ... as founder of the Gallery, also as the secretary of the treasury who ... When the bronze fountain was constructed, it was thought to be the largest in the world.

The Gallery's collection, its public programs, and its contributions to the study of visual arts continue to grow thanks to the efforts of countless supporters, staff, and other advocates who believe, as President Roosevelt declared, that "great works of art...are so clearly the property not of their single owners but...of all who love them."

For additional information and resources on Gallery history, visit the [Gallery Archives page](#).

National Gallery of Art. 2020b. "Mission Statement."

<https://www.nga.gov/about/mission-statement.html>

National Gallery of Art

[Home » About the National Gallery of Art » Mission Statement](#)

Mission Statement

The mission of the National Gallery of Art is to serve the United States of America in a national role by preserving, collecting, exhibiting, and fostering the understanding of works of art, at the highest possible museum and scholarly standards.

Policies and procedures towards these goals are cumulatively set forth in the Gallery's legislation, bylaws, trustee action and staff guidelines. The following general definitions are intended to explicate the goals of the Gallery.

1. Preserving. The Gallery's principal duty is to keep its collections intact for future generations and to pass these on in optimum condition. To carry out this responsibility the Gallery strives to maintain effective programs of security, environmental control, buildings maintenance, and conservation.

2. Collection. The Gallery limits its active art collecting to paintings, sculpture, and works of art on paper, from the late middle ages to the present, from Europe and the United States. Trustee policy allows the Gallery to accept, in addition, other significant works of art in conjunction with major donations in the primary areas of the Gallery's collections.

3. Exhibiting. The Gallery is dedicated to putting its collections on view in Washington and by loan elsewhere, as well as borrowing works of art for exhibition in Washington. As its collecting field is narrow in comparison to the world's art, the Gallery strives to supplement its own works with exhibitions of material from other times and other cultures. At the same time balance is sought with exhibitions that illuminate and reinforce its own collections. The highest standards of scholarship, maintenance, installation, and interaction with the public all contribute to this critical exhibiting role.

4. Fostering Understanding. The Gallery's role as an institution dedicated to fostering an understanding of works of art operates on a broad spectrum. From advanced research conducted both at its Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts and by its curators, to the dissemination of knowledge to its visitors and to the widest possible student and general public, the Gallery is an educative institution. The Gallery also collects materials for research related to its collections, as well as the history and appreciation of art in general. The Gallery recognizes that not only the dissemination of information but the enhancement of the aesthetic experience are essential to fostering understanding of works of art. Ancillary programs furthering its aesthetic role, such as concerts and changing horticultural displays, have been part of the Gallery's mission virtually since its inception.

National Gallery of Art. 2020c. "Education."

<https://www.nga.gov/education.html>

National Gallery of Art

[Home](#) » [Education](#)

Education

TEACHERS

A place for educators to connect with resources, programs, and tours—online and on-site.

[Learn More](#)

NGA KIDS

Draw it, paint it, do it yourself online in this interactive art zone just for kids. Create your own original masterpieces and learn from the experts. Have fun!

[Learn More](#)

FAMILIES

Discover multi-generational programs and resources that engage children and adults in active exploration of art.

[Learn More](#)

LEARNING RESOURCES

Borrow free-loan teaching packets and DVDs or access online lessons, activities, and interactives to bring art to your classroom, home, non-profit tv station, or other learning setting. All materials are free.

[Learn more](#)

TEENS

Check out programs for teens interested in creating art, learning the history of art, exploring museum careers, and collaborating with other teens.

[Learn More](#)

ADULTS

Take advantage of free lectures and gallery talks, audio tours, films, and special events. Blend studio art and history in our Drawing Salon and Words and Images programs.

[Learn More](#)

INTERNS & FELLOWS

From curatorial to horticulture, education to exhibition design, the Gallery offers training opportunities to explore museum professions. Join us.

[Learn More](#)

National Gallery of Art. 2020d. “Art Around the Corner.”

<https://www.nga.gov/education.html>

National Gallery of Art

[Home](#) » [Education](#) » [Teachers](#) » [Art Around the Corner](#)

Art Around the Corner

Art Around the Corner is a set of programs that partners the National Gallery of Art with D.C.-area Title I elementary schools. In *Art Around the Corner*, students visit the National Gallery to engage in critical- and creative-thinking activities to make meaning from art, acquire art vocabulary in context, and create art in response to what they see.

The program's mission is to provide quality multiple-visit programs for students and teachers that deepen understanding of art, strengthen critical thinking, and broaden life experiences.

Art Around the Corner offers several programs: the Multiple-Visit Program, the Mini-Multiple-Visit Program, and the Fairfax County Public Schools Title I Program.

Multiple-Visit Program

The *Art Around the Corner Multiple-Visit Program* brings fourth and fifth graders in selected District of Columbia Public School (DCPS) Title I elementary schools to the National Gallery up to ten times over two years to experience original works of art and make personal and interdisciplinary connections with them. In small groups, students look closely at works of art, engage in open-ended discussion, role-play, sketch, write and make art. All lessons are tied to Common Core State Standards and DCPS Learning Standards.

Students receive pre- and post-visit activity books to prepare for and reflect on their Gallery lessons as well as sketchbook-journals to use in the museum. Each lesson is guided by an essential question and has a featured artist or theme.

Classroom teachers receive children's books and art reproductions to engage students in arts-integrated activities between Gallery visits. They also participate in professional development workshops to learn how to integrate art into the curriculum.

The program also serves families during special AAC Family Days at the museum.

Art Around the Corner provides all transportation, curriculum materials, student booklets, art reproductions, art making materials and professional gallery teaching staff.

Mini-Multiple-Visit Program

The *Mini-Multiple-Visit Program* extends the learning opportunities of *Art Around the Corner* to a broader audience of Title I students. This program includes one visit to the classroom by Gallery teachers and two visits to the museum by participating students, all within one week. Visits are connected by an interdisciplinary theme; for example, storytelling in art and math in art.

Art Around the Corner 2019-2020 was made possible by The Max and Victoria Dreyfus Foundation, Inc., Dr. Margaret A. Goodman, the Mark and Carol Hyman Fund, the Harman Cain Family Foundation, the JTK Fund of the Arlington Community Foundation, and the Janice H. Levin Fund.

APPENDIX B: BARNES FOUNDATION WEBSITE SOURCES

Barnes Foundation. 2018. *Education Outreach Programs Annual Report 2017-2018*.

PRE-K-8 REPORT FINDINGS

Patti Saraniero, EdD, principal of Moxie Research (moxieresearch.com), worked with Barnes educators to create the data-gathering tools used to evaluate the Barnes's pre-K-8 outreach programs. The following tools were used in her assessments:

- Teacher survey: A post-program survey completed by teachers that consists of up to 30 items regarding student engagement, arts-integrated learning, and teachers' use of arts integration as an instructional strategy.
- Art rubric: A tool used to rate student work based on criteria such as completeness of artwork, effective use of elements of art (color, lines, shapes), creativity through personal expression, and use of content vocabulary.

4

KEY FINDINGS

PRESCHOOL PROGRAMMING: LOOK! REFLECT! CONNECT! (Pre-K)

Data collected from teachers participating in *Look! Reflect! Connect!* showed a positive response to the program. Teachers had a very favorable view of teaching materials provided by the Barnes and reported that the program helped students build perceptual abilities. They noted that one strength of the program was that it offered new vocabulary to describe artwork. Teachers also said that they were excited to expose their pre-K students to an age-appropriate art experience.

- 67% of teachers surveyed strongly agreed that the program asked students to look carefully and ask and answer questions.
- 100% of teachers agreed that the in-classroom lesson closely aligned with their district's goals for improved learning.
- 75% of teachers reported that students continued the discussion about lesson content after the program ended.
- 100% of teachers said the professional development was effective.

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO THOUGHT PRE-K PROGRAM INCREASED STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF ART

Agree Strongly Agree

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO THOUGHT PRE-K PROGRAM INCREASED STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF KEY CONTENT AREAS

Agree Strongly Agree Did not answer

"It has been so nice to see my students connect with the lessons. At first I didn't think they would get it, but since you did the line lesson, that's all they talk about! They point out lines in and outside the classroom, and I notice lines in their journals."

—Pre-K teacher, Thurgood Marshall School, Philadelphia

"I really enjoyed the trip to the museum and was amazed at how you engaged our youngest learners and enhanced their appreciation for art. We really appreciate the experience and exposure the Barnes has provided for our students."

—Pre-K teacher, Bonsall Annex School, Camden, NJ

PICTURES AND WORDS (Grade 3)

KEY FINDINGS

Data collected for this program, which came from teacher surveys and a student artwork rubric, showed that teachers and students enjoyed all three components of the program: in-class lessons, a gallery tour, and a dance workshop. Teachers commented on how much they appreciated exposing their students to the Barnes collection and observing art from different cultures. Teachers also said that they learned how to integrate art into their reading and writing activities.

- 99% of teachers surveyed agreed that Barnes educators clearly made connections between visual art and literacy during the gallery tour.
- 100% of teachers saw students making inferences using literacy vocabulary (*character, setting, main idea*).
- 100% of teachers agreed that the in-class lessons and gallery tour aligned with the SDP's goals for improved learning.
- 100% of teachers said the program's activities contributed to improving students' literacy skills.

10

The assessment of student artwork also demonstrated that:

- 100% of student artwork showed strong evidence of color and line.
- 75% of student artwork included some sort of pose that referenced the Barnes sculpture discussed in the lesson.
- 60% of student artwork was given the highest rating on individual expression, demonstrating that students were exhibiting a high level of creativity.

“One major strength of the program is that all students were engaged and participating regardless of their English proficiency.”

—Third-grade teacher, St. Anthony of Padua, Camden, NJ

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO THOUGHT PICTURES AND WORDS IMPROVED STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF ART

Agree Strongly Agree

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO THOUGHT PICTURES AND WORDS IMPROVED STUDENTS' LITERACY SKILLS

Agree Strongly Agree

“Pictures and Words allows students a chance to experience a variety of expressions—reading, visual arts, dance—within one program, and the students were able to make themselves fit where they were most comfortable.”

—Third-grade teacher, Gilbert Spruance School, Philadelphia

11

ART OF LOOKING (Grades 5–6)

KEY FINDINGS

Teachers reported that the program's components—the in-class lessons, gallery tour, and gallery workshop—helped students see real-world applications of science and math. Students were able to think critically about the artwork and how artists solved the problem of presenting their ideas visually. Teachers saw students building science, math, and art vocabulary skills to analyze artwork. Teachers themselves learned how to integrate science and math with art in the activities. The hands-on activities were seen as especially useful for students with special needs, enabling students of all abilities to experience the program.

12

- 100% of teachers surveyed agreed that students used content vocabulary in science during in-class lessons.
- 67% of teachers strongly agreed that students clearly made connections between visual art and science.
- 100% of teachers noticed students using science vocabulary during gallery tours.
- 89% of teachers said they were more knowledgeable about integrating visual art into other content areas after completing the program.
- 100% of teachers used the pre- and post-visit activities and poster sets.
- 100% of teachers strongly agreed that the program encouraged students to use mathematical practices.
- 93% of fifth-grade students completed the four watercolor experiments and made substantive observations about their artwork.

- 100% of teachers thought the in-class lessons, gallery tour, and gallery workshop closely aligned with district goals for improved learning.
- 100% of teachers thought the in-class lessons, gallery tour, and gallery workshop closely aligned with grade-level content standards.

13

CROSSING BOUNDARIES (Grades 7–8)

KEY FINDINGS

In the 2017–18 academic year, teachers gave the Barnes educators in this program high ratings. Teachers clearly saw the integration of social studies and art and how the program made connections across subject areas. They thought that the activities were hands-on and introduced students to the cultures behind the art that they saw.

- 88% of teachers surveyed agreed the program clearly made connections between visual art and social studies.
- 100% of teachers said the in-class lesson increased students' understanding of core curriculum areas (English and language arts, visual arts, and social studies).

- 100% of teachers strongly agreed that students used content vocabulary in visual art and social studies in the gallery tour.
- 86% of teachers said students analyzed artwork to better understand other cultures.
- 87% of teachers noticed students comparing and contrasting artworks from different cultures.
- 100% of teachers said *Crossing Boundaries* closely aligned with grade-level content standards.

The assessment of student artwork also demonstrated that:

- Student artwork showed a high level of creativity and used line, colors, and shapes very effectively 83% of the time.
- Students completed poetry writing and made a connection to the writing within the artwork 83% of the time.

14

“A simple painting can represent culture in a big way. The Barnes is an amazing museum. It’s like going all around the world, but in reality you are just in a museum!”

—Seventh-grade student

“The visit to the Barnes allowed my students to meet people who are like them pursuing art and dance and speaking knowledgeably about both.”

—Seventh-grade teacher, William Dick School, Philadelphia

15

Barnes Foundation. 2019. *Education Outreach Programs, Annual Report 2018-2019.*

About the Barnes

The Barnes Foundation was founded in 1922 by Dr. Albert C. Barnes "to promote the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts and horticulture." As a nonprofit cultural and educational institution, the Barnes shares its unparalleled art collection with the public, organizes special exhibitions, and presents education and public programming that fosters new ways of thinking about human creativity. The Barnes collection, which is known for its exceptional breadth, depth, and quality, is displayed in ensembles that integrate art and objects from across cultures and time periods, overturning traditional hierarchies and revealing universal elements of human expression.

Home to one of the world's finest collections of impressionist, post-impressionist, and early modernist paintings—including the largest groups of paintings by Pierre-Auguste Renoir and Paul Cézanne in existence—the Barnes presents masterworks by such artists as Henri Matisse, Pablo Picasso, Amedeo Modigliani, and Vincent van Gogh, alongside ancient, medieval, Renaissance, and non-Western art as well as metalwork, furniture, and decorative art.

The Barnes Foundation's mission is grounded in the democratic principle that art should be accessible to all, regardless of background or education. Dr. Barnes promoted visual literacy and critical-thinking skills as essential to every person's ability to be a participating, productive member of society. He hired a teaching staff and opened the Barnes Foundation for classes in 1925, employing

a teaching method that encouraged students to read art as an artist does and to study its formal elements of light, line, color, and space. Dr. Barnes wrote that his approach to education "comprises the observation of facts, reflection upon them, and the testing of the conclusions by their success in application. It stipulates that an understanding and appreciation of paintings is an experience that can come only from contact with the paintings themselves." This approach to teaching students the language of art is based on his philosophies, as well as those of Violette de Mazia and John Dewey, and makes art accessible wherever it is encountered.

Since the Barnes Foundation's move to Philadelphia in 2012, nearly 1.8 million people from all 50 states and 70 countries have visited the art collection, participated in educational and public programs, and attended special exhibitions. The Barnes education program has served close to 72,000 schoolchildren and remains committed to the institution's mission, providing multi-access outreach programs to pre-K–12 students in the school districts of Philadelphia and Camden, New Jersey. Over the past seven years, the Barnes has built upon the progressive vision of its founder, investing in original scholarship relating to its collection and enhancing accessibility throughout every facet of its programming. As the Barnes continues to expand its commitment to teaching visual literacy in groundbreaking ways, it aims to become a leading forum for the exploration of the arts, ideas, and histories represented in its core collections.

Recent Highlights

- Nearly **1.8 million** visitors since 2012
- **240,000+** visitors in 2018
- **18,000+** member households in 2018
- **4 million+** online visitors engaged since the launch of the new website in 2017
- **276,000+** newsletter subscribers
- Nearly **80%** of annual budget directly supports programs
- **50+** ongoing citywide cultural and educational community partnerships
- **\$65.8 million** endowment in FY 2018
- **12,000+** schoolchildren attend education programs annually
- **Free admission** for ACCESS cardholders and community partners, free admission on Sundays for Philadelphia teachers, and PECO First Free Sunday Family Day programs open to all

3

Look! Reflect! Connect! (Pre-K)

Percentage of teachers who thought the program contributed to students' learning in art

"The students were talking about lines that wiggle, zig-zag, and curve during the lesson and throughout the remainder of the day."

—Pre-K teacher,
Early Childhood Development Center, Camden

"The children enjoyed the hands-on activity. I think giving them an opportunity to create something made a lasting impression on them and their chaperones."

—Pre-K teacher,
Robert E. Lamberton School, Philadelphia

Key Findings

Data collected from teachers participating in Look! Reflect! Connect! showed students were highly engaged in the activities conducted during the outreach lessons and gallery tour. The program introduces students to art vocabulary such as primary and secondary colors, textures, and lines, and teachers reported that students demonstrated an understanding and use of the vocabulary and were identifying lines in artwork and in the classroom. Teachers appreciated the opportunity to introduce students to art and to the Barnes as a resource. They said the professional development workshops and curricular binders, art posters, and children's books were important components of the program. The following findings are of note:

- 91% of surveyed teachers saw all or most students looking carefully and being engaged in the activities during the gallery tour.
- 92% of teachers said the outreach lessons closely aligned with the state's early learning standards.
- 100% of teachers saw students demonstrating concepts introduced in outreach lessons.
- 100% of teachers said the outreach lessons aligned with curriculum standards.
- 91% of teachers said they used the children's books along with art posters and lines, and teachers in the classroom.

Pictures and Words (Grade 3)

During the 2018–19 academic year, 2,629 third graders from Philadelphia public and Catholic schools and Camden Catholic schools participated in *Pictures and Words*, a literacy-based program that teaches students to read paintings just as they learn to read text, thereby increasing their visual literacy skills. Students examine the characters, settings, main ideas, and conflicts portrayed in an artwork and develop a narrative about their observations. Making inferences by evaluating an artwork addresses Pennsylvania's English Language Arts Standards for reading and reinforces the skills that are being built in the classroom with written words. Barnes educators offer this program exclusively to students in third grade, a pivotal year for literacy development, to more closely align with the SDP's third-grade literacy curriculum and the City of Philadelphia's Read by 4th initiative.

In this powerful three-part program connecting stories and art, students participate in class lessons, a gallery tour, and a dance workshop. They begin with an in-class lesson where they analyze an object and learn how literary components of a story align with visual elements of art. The power of storytelling comes alive when students are exposed to original art during a field trip to the Barnes, where they build skills in observing details and identifying stories within the art. Students then meet with a professional dancer to explore how dance reinforces storytelling techniques. Students are encouraged to connect personally with their experiences in this program by expressing what is meaningful in the works they see in the collection and in the sculpture they create as a final project.

Program goals for *Pictures and Words* students included:

- Understanding how art tells a story and demonstrating critical-thinking skills by making inferences about artworks to support opinions;
- Describing the story of a painting by identifying its character, setting, and main event, thus using the artwork as a text;
- Identifying, through strong observational skills, how color, line, and shape work as key details and evidence to convey the story in a work of art; and
- Creating works of art that show individual expression using a variety of artistic processes and materials.

Third-grade students in *Pictures and Words* created clay sculptures and placed their characters in a story.

10

Percentage of teachers who thought the educator did the following to help students learn during the in-class lessons

Percentage of teachers who said integrating visual art with other curricular content is an effective strategy for student learning

12

Key Findings

Data collected for this program, which came from teacher surveys and a student artwork rubric, showed that students strengthened their skills in finding characters, settings, and main ideas in artworks during discussions in the Barnes galleries. Teachers reported that this program not only removed the financial obstacle of visiting an art institution but also enabled them to fit art into classroom instructional time. Teachers said a major strength of the program is its accessibility for English language learners, and that it shifted their thinking about how looking at and discussing art can further build literacy skills.

- 100% of surveyed teachers said the program contributed to their students' learning in art.
- 93% of teachers agreed that the program's activities contributed to improving their students' literacy skills.
- 96% of teachers reported that all or most students made inferences using literacy vocabulary—character, setting, main idea—when looking at works of art during the gallery tour.
- 90% of teachers said the program's in-class lessons aligned with school district goals for improved learning.
- 100% of teachers said their students would benefit from more art in the curriculum.

Art of Looking (Grades 5–6)

Fifth and sixth graders delve into STEAM-based learning (science, technology, engineering, art, and math) in the *Art of Looking* program, which cultivates problem-solving skills outlined in Philadelphia's Core Science Curriculum, the Pennsylvania Core Standards for Mathematics, and the Next Generation Science Standards (a multistate initiative for K–12 science content standards). During the 2018–19 academic year, approximately 2,450 students from Philadelphia public and Catholic schools participated in this three-part program that integrates art with science and math principles through in-class lessons, a gallery tour, and a gallery workshop.

The fifth-grade program encourages students to develop problem-solving skills in an art context using the Next Generation Science Standards for inquiry and investigation. Students use scientific inquiry and make claims about an artwork, citing evidence and explaining their reasoning. In a classroom lesson, students are prepped to analyze artwork using scientific reasoning: *What evidence can you see in an artwork that shows an artist's ideas? How do artists use materials to convey their ideas?* Students hone these

skills during a visit to the Barnes by learning about the qualities of art materials and examining artworks in the collection. They take on the role of conservator or curator when they examine archival materials used by Barnes staff to answer questions about artists. Students then test their understanding of art by experimenting with three watercolor techniques as a final project.

In the sixth-grade program, students examine dimensions in art to address mathematical practice standards. During the gallery tour, students perceive an artwork as a math problem when they plot coordinate planes on a painting to discover where the artist constructed focal points. While at the Barnes, students work in small groups to investigate compositional elements in paintings, such as perspective, balance, symmetry, and open and closed configurations. They then reinterpret those works by arranging themselves as objects in the paintings and taking photographs of their new interpretations. As a final project, students experiment with two- and three-dimensional drawings.

"Our students are given the opportunity to develop their minds and see works of art they most likely would not see without this program. It is a wonderful experience they truly enjoy."

—Sixth-grade teacher,
Eliza B. Kirkbride School, Philadelphia

"Students walk away from the *Art of Looking* program with an artistic eye, a questioning eye, and an interested eye. I am thrilled my students have been a part of this endeavor, and we look forward to working with the Barnes in the future."

—Fifth-grade teacher,
Sadie Alexander School, Philadelphia

13

Percentage of fifth-grade teachers who thought the guide did the following to help their students learn during the gallery tour

Key Findings

Teachers reported that the program's components—the in-class lessons, gallery tour, and gallery workshop—contributed to student learning in both art and math. One teacher noted the portion of the gallery visit where students used scientific inquiry to make claims about an artwork—citing evidence and explaining their reasoning—was a great real-world example of how to solve a problem.

Fifth-grade students successfully used visual art vocabulary and science procedure vocabulary (using the CER model) when analyzing works of art. Sixth-grade students used math content vocabulary (such as two- and three-dimensional shapes, scale, and coordinate grids) in all three components of the

Percentage of sixth-grade teachers who observed their students do the following during the gallery workshop

program. Teachers reported the program improved their confidence in integrating visual art into math and science areas of the curriculum.

- 100% of surveyed teachers said integrating visual art with other curricular content is an effective strategy for student learning.
- 100% of fifth-grade teachers thought all three components of the program aligned with district goals for improved learning.
- 100% of sixth-grade teachers thought all three components of the program aligned with grade-level mathematical practice standards.

Artist Voices (Grade 7)

Seventh graders from Philadelphia public and Catholic schools find their creative voice and become artistic rebels in Artist Voices, the newest Barnes school program. Piloted in the previous academic year, this program was fully implemented in 2018–19 with 2,170 students. In the area of language arts, the SDP curriculum teaches students to identify the authorial voice and individual viewpoints in diverse media formats and evaluate the motives behind what is being presented. In this program, students discover how works of art express an individual artist's voice and view of the world. They explore art as a communicative tool and learn how cultural and historical contexts inform artists' creative choices on the subject, choice of material, and application of that material. Students also study works of art as a dialogue between artist and viewer.

The program begins with an in-class lesson where students are asked to investigate radical artists from different time periods and places. They learn historical details about the artists and examine their work

to identify how they broke with the conventions of their time. During a field trip to the Barnes, students analyze how particular artists defied traditions to evolve their own styles. Complementing the language arts curriculum's emphasis on using reasoning and evidence-based analysis when reading text, the program asks students to read artworks and draw on personal experiences to interpret them. Through careful analyses, students build critical-thinking skills that prepare them for creating their own graffiti tags (or personalized signatures) as a final project.

Program goals for Artist Voices students included:

- Developing visual literacy and critical-thinking skills by looking closely and interpreting works of art;
- Drawing on experiences to interpret an artist's work and voice and support claims with visual evidence;

16

- Building art vocabulary and using aesthetic principles, including color, line, shape and form, to analyze works in the Barnes collection; and
- Expressing individual artistic voices and viewpoints in works of art.

Key Findings

In the 2018–19 academic year, teachers commented on the strong connection between art and the English language arts curriculum. Teachers saw these connections being made when students compared and contrasted artists' styles and when they used technical vocabulary to explain similarities and differences during the gallery tour. They also noticed this when students identified characters and settings in artworks or analyzed an artist's purpose. Teachers also appreciated that the content and activities were age-appropriate and engaging for students.

- 100% of surveyed teachers agreed that Artist Voices made connections between art and English language arts curriculum during the in-class lessons.
- 80% of teachers strongly agreed that students used English language arts content vocabulary during the program.
- 100% of teachers said the program's activities contributed to students' learning in art and literacy.
- 90% of teachers strongly agreed that, during the in-class lessons, students recognized artists' central idea or purpose while looking at art and demonstrated how artists' voices evolved.

17

Percentage of teachers who thought the in-class lessons and gallery tour aligned with grade-level content standards

Percentage of teachers who thought the in-class lessons and gallery tour aligned with district goals for improved learning

Barnes Foundation. 2020a. "About."

<https://www.barnesfoundation.org/about>

The Barnes Foundation: About: Our Mission and Our History

Education is at the heart of everything we do at the Barnes Foundation.

[OUR MISSION AND HISTORY](#) | [VALUES](#) | [LEADERSHIP](#) | [GOVERNANCE AND IMPACT](#) | [CAREERS AND VOLUNTEERING](#)

Our Mission

The mission of the Barnes is to promote the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts and horticulture.

Our founder, Dr. Albert C. Barnes, believed that art had the power to improve minds and transform lives. Our diverse educational programs are based on his teachings and one-of-a-kind collections.

Our History

Philadelphia art collector Albert C. Barnes (1872–1951) chartered the Barnes Foundation in 1922 to teach people from all walks of life how to look at art. Over three decades, he **collected** some of the world's most important impressionist, post-impressionist, and modern paintings, including works by Renoir, Cézanne, Matisse, and Picasso. He displayed them alongside African masks, native American jewelry, Greek antiquities, and decorative metalwork.

Dr. Barnes was a strong supporter of progressive education and social justice, and he worked closely with **black communities** in the belief that people—like art—should not be segregated.

Raised in a working-class household, Albert Barnes excelled in school and earned a medical degree by age 20. Instead of practicing medicine, he turned to pharmacology, where he made a fortune by co-inventing an antiseptic. In 1912, at the age of 40, he began purchasing modern paintings with the help of his childhood friend William Glackens. Following the philosophy of John Dewey—who believed that education was fundamental to democracy—Dr. Barnes held art appreciation lessons at his factories. Each day, for two hours, production stopped as his workers discussed painting and philosophy. Many were women or African Americans to whom, in defiance of the era's prejudices, Dr. Barnes had extended employment.

Galvanized by the success of the factory teachings, and with a rapidly growing art collection at his disposal, Dr. Barnes decided to undertake a full-blown experiment in education. In 1922, he purchased a 12-acre arboretum in Merion, Pennsylvania, and hired architect Paul Phillippe Cret to design a residence and gallery. This would become the first home of the Barnes Foundation, an educational institution that offered free art appreciation classes. The unique approach to teaching—now known as the Barnes Method—emphasized close looking, critical thinking, and prolonged engagement with original works of art. Dr. Barnes worked closely with his colleague [Violette de Mazia](#) to shape the program.

To better serve Dr. Barnes's educational mission, the Foundation moved to Center City Philadelphia in 2012, where its vastly expanded program reaches 12,000 Philadelphia schoolchildren every year. In its award-winning Parkway home, designed by Tod Williams Billie Tsien Architects | Partners, Dr. Barnes's final 1951 arrangement of the collection is still on view, enhanced by a wide variety of special exhibitions, public programs, and **classes** for adult learners. Community and family programs are offered on-site and in neighborhoods throughout the city, honoring Dr. Barnes's commitment to diversity and inclusivity.

The Barnes Foundation.
© Michael Moran/OTTO

The main gallery upon entering the Barnes collection.
© Michael Moran/OTTO

Dr. Alfred C. Barnes

Barnes Foundation. 2020b. “The Barnes Collection.”

<https://www.barnesfoundation.org/whats-on/collection>

The Barnes Foundation: Collection

[WHAT'S ON](#) | [PLAN YOUR VISIT](#) | [OUR COLLECTION](#) | [TAKE A CLASS](#)

PERMANENT COLLECTION The Barnes Collection—Ongoing: A story behind every object

About the Collection

The Barnes is home to one of the world's greatest collections of impressionist, post-impressionist, and early modern paintings, with especially deep holdings in Renoir, Cézanne, Matisse, and Picasso. Assembled by Dr. Albert C. Barnes between 1912 and 1951, the collection also includes important examples of African art, Native American pottery and jewelry, Pennsylvania German furniture, American avant-garde painting, and wrought-iron metalwork.

The minute you step into the galleries of the Barnes collection, you know you're in for an experience like no other. Masterpieces by Vincent van Gogh, Henri Matisse, and Pablo Picasso hang next to ordinary household objects—a door hinge, a spatula, a yarn spinner. On another wall, you might see a French medieval sculpture displayed with a Navajo textile. These dense groupings, in which objects from different cultures, time periods, and media are all mixed together, are what Dr. Barnes called his “ensembles.”

The ensembles, each one meticulously crafted by Dr. Barnes himself, are meant to draw out visual similarities between objects we don't normally think of together. Created as teaching tools, they were essential to the educational program Dr. Barnes developed in the 1920s.

Dr. Barnes began collecting in 1912. After making a fortune in the pharmaceutical business, he turned his attention to building “the greatest modern art collection” of his time. In February of that year, he sent his friend, the artist William Glackens, to Paris with instructions to bring back paintings by the French avant-garde. Glackens returned with 33 works, including Van Gogh's *The Postman* (1889) and Picasso's *Young Woman Holding a Cigarette* (1901).

Dr. Barnes quickly established himself as a bold and ambitious collector, traveling frequently to New York and Paris, buying from dealers and sometimes directly from artists. Over the course of four decades, he assembled what is now considered one of the world's greatest collections of impressionist, post-impressionist, and early modern European paintings, with works by Paul Cézanne, Henri Matisse, Pablo Picasso, Amedeo Modigliani, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, and Chaim Soutine.

Great Paintings at the Barnes: The collection has the world's largest holdings of paintings by Renoir (181) and Cézanne (69), as well as significant works by Matisse, Picasso, Modigliani, Van Gogh, and other renowned artists.

In 1922, Dr. Barnes chartered the Foundation as an educational institution for teaching people how to look at art. He was inspired by the writings of philosopher John Dewey, who emphasized the importance of education in a truly democratic society, and he decided to devote his whole collection to the project. He commissioned architect Paul Cret to design a gallery (the original building is still in Merion); he hired a teaching staff, including the legendary [Violette de Mazia](#); and the Barnes Foundation opened for classes in 1925.

Meanwhile, Dr. Barnes continued to build his collection. Though still focused on European modernism, his interests extended into other areas as well. In the early 1920s, he added a stunning group of African masks and sculptures to his collection—there are over 100—which he acquired from the French art dealer Paul Guillaume. He also began to purchase Native American ceramics, jewelry, and textiles; old master paintings; ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman art; and American and European decorative and industrial arts, including 887 wrought-iron objects.

Dr. Barnes continued collecting until his death in 1951. The wall ensembles are still arranged exactly as he left them.

The ensembles created by Dr. Barnes combine art and craft, cosmopolitan and provincial styles, and objects from across periods and cultures. © Michael Moran/OTTO

Barnes Foundation. 2020c. “Host an Event: Corporate Events.”

<https://www.barnesfoundation.org/host-an-event/corporate-events>

Foundation: Host an Event

[CORPORATE EVENTS](#) | [PRIVATE PARTIES](#) | [WEDDINGS](#)

Host an Event

Our award-winning spaces will make the perfect venue for your next unforgettable event.

Corporate Events

Conveniently located in Center City, the Barnes Foundation is an ideal place to hold your next corporate event. Our state-of-the-art building—designed by Tod Williams Billie Tsien Architects | Partners—is fully accessible and boasts grand open spaces, comfortable meeting rooms, and spectacular garden settings.

Event Spaces

Walter and Leonore Annenberg Court and Terrace – Adjacent to the Collection Gallery, the light-filled Annenberg Court is a versatile space that can be adapted for events of all kinds.

Frances M. Maguire Garden Pavilion – With floor-to-ceiling windows overlooking a leafy courtyard, the Maguire Garden Pavilion offers a tranquil setting for receptions of up to 100 guests.

Lower Lobby Suite – Natural light from the Gallery Garden ... illuminates this comfortable lower-lobby space ... Native American ceramics and jewelry, the only pieces displayed outside the galleries, ...

Garden Restaurant – Our restaurant and adjacent garden provide a lovely setting for private dinners and cocktail receptions.

Barnes Foundation. 2020d. “Provenance Statement.”

<https://www.barnesfoundation.org/collection/provenance-statement>

The Barnes Foundation: Provenance Statement

Provenance Statement

Introduction to Provenance Research

Provenance research, or the history of ownership of a work of art, is a regular part of museum practice. The goal of provenance research is to trace the history of an art object through its owners and locations from its creation until the present day. ...

Our Collection

The Barnes Foundation’s collection includes 4,323 objects, approximately 1,055 of which are paintings or works on paper. Approximately 150 collection items are “covered objects,” as defined by the AAM. Classification of a painting or other collection object as a “covered object” does not imply that the Barnes acquired the collection item illegally. It merely indicates that the piece was created before 1946 and acquired by the Barnes after 1932, and that it may have changed ownership in Europe between 1932 and 1946.

Barnes Foundation. 2020e. 2019 Annual Report.

Programs

PECO Free First Sunday Family Day

Once a month, PECO Free First Sunday Family Day offers free access to the Barnes collection and special exhibitions, along with a robust program of performances and activities designed to engage audiences who might not otherwise have the opportunity to visit. PECO Free First Sunday Family Day particularly supports the Barnes's efforts to provide all families with avenues to strengthen their relationships with art, and through art. The Barnes partners with community organizations throughout the Philadelphia

region on diverse programming—including performances by emerging talents, hands-on experiences, and stimulating talks—that is designed to help all visitors see their culture and history reflected within the Barnes.

In 2019, the Barnes welcomed 24,500 visitors to PECO Free First Sunday Family Day and worked with 35 community partners.

PECO Free First Sunday Family Day is generously presented by PECO.

Photo by Michael Perez

THE BARNES FOUNDATION—2019 ANNUAL REPORT 37

First Friday!

The Barnes is open into the evening on the first Friday of every month, with live music, performances, and access to the collection and exhibitions. First Friday! is one of the Barnes's most popular events, attracting more than 5,000 guests in 2019.

Artist Bash

Held three times a year, Artist Bash features diverse performance-based artists connected by a unifying theme. At Artist Bash, the audience engages with musicians, dancers, designers, performers, and poets in a program highlighting cultural traditions and creative practice. In 2019, the popular program attracted about 600 guests per event, with 50% of attendees identifying as non-Caucasian.

Artist Bash was created in partnership with iHeartRadio, OneHunted, the Philadelphia Asian American Film Festival, and Small But Mighty Arts.

38

Barnes Jawn(t)

In October, the Barnes presented an evening of Barnes Jawn(t)s, improvised after-hours tours of the collection led by Philadelphia personalities. Created by Obvious Agency, these anything-goes tours put the spotlight on artists, community leaders, and performers representing the city's many cultures and traditions.

"The Jawn(t) series serves as an example of how the Barnes has worked to create a greater network of community connections, one that can allow the museum to grow and thrive with a younger and more diverse audience."

—*The Philadelphia Citizen*

Barnes Takeover

The Barnes Takeover series, which invites local artists to share their unique interpretations of the Barnes collection, continued this year with programs in April, May, and June. The April program featured a performance by Madhusmita Bora and Prerona Bhuyan, co-founders of the Philadelphia-based Sattriya Dance Company, connecting works in the collection to a celebration of Krishna.

Young Professionals Night

Young Professionals Night is a social gathering for young art aficionados and appreciators. In 2019, Young Professionals was held three times and attracted about 600 guests to each event. The party features music, dancing, and access to the collection and special exhibitions, with cocktails and light fare available for purchase. Guests are encouraged to dress according to the art-inspired theme, which is drawn from the Barnes collection or the exhibition on view.

Young Professionals Nights in 2019 were sponsored by Mole Street Artists. The September edition was also sponsored by the Philadelphia Foundation. Young Professionals Nights are hosted by the Barnes Contemporaries, an active and committed group of young patrons and art enthusiasts, ages 21 to 39, who enjoy distinct programs and social events. The Contemporaries' generous annual membership contributions provide unrestricted support for the Barnes's educational mission and programs.

Artist Bash, 2019. Photo by Michael Perez

Photos by Michael Perez

40

Barnes on the Block

In July, the Barnes and Mural Arts Philadelphia hosted Barnes on the Block, a free party to connect and enliven the neighborhood. This lively event welcomed over 3,000 guests—more than half of whom lived within three miles of the Barnes. Close to 60% of attendees identified as non-Caucasian. The day included free admission to the collection, food trucks, a beer garden, live music, and interactive art and craft-making opportunities.

Barnes on the Block was sponsored by Target.

In May, performance artist Morgan FitzPatrick Andrews and members of Vermont's Bread and Puppet Theater told stories sparked by the Egyptian hieroglyphs and Greek pottery in the collection. In June, drag songstress Cookie Diorio gave a one-of-a-kind performance inspired by Dr. Barnes's unconventional ensembles.

Public program offerings were supported, in part, by Tod Williams Billie Tsien Architects and an anonymous donor.

Tuesdays on the Terrace

The Tuesdays on the Terrace program, held twice in June, featured unconventional conversations between two Philadelphians of different ethnic backgrounds, fields, genders, and generations. Each conversation was guided by audience questions submitted at the beginning of the program. The resulting exchanges were fascinating and filled with personal stories and experiences shared through different cultural perspectives. Dr. Molefi Kete Asante, head of African-American studies at Temple University, spoke with Colette Fu, a photographer, book artist, and paper engineer, and Philadelphia Parks & Recreation commissioner Kathryn Ott Lovell shared the stage with performance artist Sherman Fleming.

Audience Development and Community Engagement Initiatives

The Barnes is committed to strengthening access and engagement for all communities, including youth and families across Philadelphia. By building new relationships and deepening existing ones, we are working to reach Dr. Albert Barnes's goal of making art accessible to all. This year, we continued our work with key community partners and forged new collaborations to expand our reach within Philadelphia's richly diverse neighborhoods and communities. Our staff and programs facilitate meaningful connections to art by meeting people where they are.

Audience engagement initiatives were generously supported by the Barra Foundation, Betsy Z. and Edward E. Cohen, Lisa D. Kabnick and John H. McFadden, The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, the Stavros Niarchos Foundation, Wendy Rayfield, and the William Penn Foundation.

Puentes a las Artes/Bridges to the Arts

Now in its third year, Puentes a las Artes/Bridges to the Arts is an art-based biliteracy program for pre-K and kindergarten ELL/ESL learners (ages 3 to 5) from South Philadelphia's growing Latinx immigrant community. High-quality biliteracy learning and

Virtual Reality

With a grant from the Barra Foundation, the Barnes developed virtual reality (VR) headsets that re-create the Barnes's galleries, allowing individuals to virtually explore the collection within their own community setting. In partnership with the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Barnes launched educational programs to engage Philadelphians in areas where access to the Barnes may pose geographic hurdles. Headsets were brought to local libraries by Barnes community educators, and visitors were able to see and learn about the collection, ask questions, and make connections to art and one another.

In 2019, the program expanded to 63 neighborhood sites, including senior centers, parks and recreation centers, and select K-12 schools throughout Philadelphia, as well as Barnes community partners such as the New Kensington Community Development Corporation (NKCDC), People's Emergency Center, Project HOME, and SpArc Philadelphia. Through this program, the Barnes engaged 1,806 community members.

Following each virtual meetup, participants had the opportunity to visit the Barnes for a guided tour of the

enrichment opportunities are out of reach for many of Philadelphia's poorest communities, especially those marginalized by race and ethnic origin. A collaboration with Puentes de Salud, an organization that promotes the health and wellness of Philadelphia's Latinx population, this program addresses the achievement gap, as less than half of children from these families are enrolled in early learning programs. With after-school instruction by bilingual teaching artists at South Philadelphia's Southwark Elementary School, workshops in the community, and family programming at the Barnes, Puentes a las Artes fosters a rich arts- and literacy-based environment in which the young learners can thrive and grow.

Puentes a las Artes also features a family-engagement strategy with ongoing parent/caregiver literacy workshops and visits to the Barnes to develop skills, adopt creative learning strategies, and share resources. These regular visits to the Barnes include bilingual storytime, intergenerational art making, and access to the collection, with bus transportation.

Over its two-year pilot phase, the program reached a total of 79 early

collection with the same teaching team. These visits were fully escorted, beginning at the neighborhood libraries and using SEPTA for transportation. Of the field-trip participants, 84% were first-time visitors and 14% had not been to the Barnes in more than two years.

The virtual reality program and headsets were developed with support from the Barra Foundation. Ongoing work continues through the Knight Center for Digital Innovation in Audience Engagement at the Barnes.

"The Barnes is the first museum in the region to use VR technology to engage visitors in this way. Ana Gamboa, who oversees the program as the Barnes's special project coordinator, says they'd love to see other institutions adopt similar approaches. 'It's a way for [museum educators] to go into communities, meet them where they are, invite them into the museum, and then encourage them to come back.'"

—Generocity

Photo by Ana Gamboa

learners, as well as family members (168 siblings and 127 parents), with 168 hours of after-school arts-integrated instruction and enrichment activities, plus 14 Barnes family workshops and PECO Free First Sunday Family Day visits.

Puentes a las Artes/Bridges to the Arts is made possible with major support from the William Penn Foundation. Additional support is provided by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation.

"Their programs with our youngest—and future—students have assisted Southwark in achieving 'at target' reading growth over the last two years."

—Andrew Lukov, Principal of Southwark Elementary School

"It's really the relationship and connection to art that's so important and intrinsic to our mission. And for this particular program, art is like a launching point for conversation and dialogue, and it's almost our first language in some ways . . . Looking at art develops that conversation and natural transition into gaining vocabulary and literacy development."

—Barbara Wong, Director of Community Engagement at the Barnes

Photo by Darren Burton

THE BARNES FOUNDATION—2019 ANNUAL REPORT 43

Barnes @ LoLa 38

The Barnes has partnered with the People's Emergency Center Community Development Corporation (PECCDC) for Barnes @ LoLa 38, a multidisciplinary pop-up program designed to break down barriers to cultural inclusion by expanding arts access within communities while building connections to the Barnes. These programs serve the Barnes's educational mission as well as the PECCDC's mission to respond to community needs and build upon

neighborhood assets to help improve the quality of life for all West Philadelphia residents.

Barnes @ LoLa 38 is located at the former United Bank Building on Lower Lancaster Avenue in West Philadelphia, close to where Dr. Barnes seeded his ideology of "art is for everyone" with his factory workers at 40th and Filbert Streets. It offers monthly programs for the community, with art-making workshops and performances for families, teens, and adults. This initiative provides West Philadelphia participants

with free-admission community passes as well as free shuttle service to the Barnes's monthly PECO Free First Sunday Family Day.

In the program's first ten months, 724 participants—ranging in age from 6 months to 83 years—from neighborhoods around Lower Lancaster Avenue attended 37 events.

Barnes @ LoLa 38 is made possible with support from the William Penn Foundation.

"The PECCDC is thrilled to be able to connect [with] neighbors in West Philadelphia . . . through the offerings at the Barnes @ LoLa 38. We are grateful to the Barnes and to the William Penn Foundation for supporting this new way to bring art to everyone."

—James Wright, Director of Community, Economic and Real Estate Development at the PECCDC

THE BARNES FOUNDATION—2019 ANNUAL REPORT 47

Toddler Time

Every third Thursday of the month, the Barnes presents Toddler Time, an opportunity for curious and imaginative children (up to age 5) to delve into art-related stories, art making, and movement activities and to discover works in the Barnes collection. In 2019, more than 300 toddlers and their parents or caregivers came to Toddler Time. Many attend regularly to meet with others who share their enthusiasm for art in early childhood development.

Photo by Barbara Wong

Summer Imaginarium Workshops

Our second year of Summer Imaginariums served 210 children, nearly double the number of students reached during the program's inaugural year. These summer-camp programs, offered at five Philadelphia Parks & Recreation centers, connect young people (ages 6 to 13) with the Barnes's cultural and creative resources and support learning throughout the summer. Led by Barnes educators and the community engagement team, students took part in arts learning that links critical thinking, imagination, and literacy. In 2019, two sites funded transportation to the Barnes, supporting 70 youth and chaperones to tour the collection.

Photo by Barbara Wong

Art for All Community Pass

To foster sustained cultural access beyond first-time engagement experiences, the Barnes offers the Art for All Community Pass to low-income and underserved audiences. The program provides passholders and up to three guests with a year of free admission as well as discounts at the Barnes Shop and cafés. In 2019, the Barnes issued more than 2,000 Art for All Community Passes.

Restorative Justice

The Barnes is committed to providing opportunities for individuals who are incarcerated, on probation, or on work release to reconnect with society in productive ways through community engagement, skill-building, and collaborative mural projects.

In 2019, the Barnes partnered with two proven providers in this field, Mural Arts Philadelphia and Baker Industries, whose programs boast remarkable track records in reducing recidivism and securing employment post-program. Using Dr. Barnes's philosophy, educators guide participants in developing the skills of understanding and discussing art—thinking creatively to describe a work's visual content; reflecting critically on their perceptions; practicing awareness of the distinction between subject and painting; managing levels of uncertainty inherent in the process; and finding vocabulary to communicate their evolving perceptions. These skills

mirror those essential to success in life. Confronting the challenges of this work in the art gallery environment allows for safe self-reflection and engenders an atmosphere of communal support.

From July 11 through August 8, 2019, the Barnes hosted *Breaking Barriers: Art as Social Justice*, an exhibition of collaborative works created by 12 emerging artists from the Guild, Mural Arts Philadelphia's paid apprentice program for formerly incarcerated individuals and young adults on probation, and 11 artists from SCI: Phoenix, southeast Pennsylvania's maximum-security prison. Guild members studied works in the Barnes galleries and took printmaking classes at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, while inmates at SCI: Phoenix learned about the history and evolution of papermaking technology. Throughout the project, participants exchanged images and letters for inspiration, creating a bridge between the two groups. The resulting works in *Breaking Barriers* were truly collaborative efforts.

Reciprocal Partnership with the Musées d'Orsay et de l'Orangerie

The Barnes entered a partnership with the Musées d'Orsay et de l'Orangerie in Paris, offering reciprocal free admission for members of both institutions—the first ever such arrangement between French and American museums.

Barnes Foundation. 2020f. *Creative Learning: Pre-K to 12, Education Programs Annual Report 2019-2020.*

About the Barnes

Dr. Albert C. Barnes (1872–1951) chartered the Barnes Foundation in 1922 to teach people from all walks of life how to look at art. He purchased a 12-acre arboretum in Merion, PA, for his educational institution—founded with the mission “to promote the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts and horticulture”—where he offered free art appreciation classes. His unique approach to teaching, now known as the Barnes Method, emphasized close looking, critical thinking, and prolonged engagement with original works of art.

Dr. Barnes began collecting art in 1912, acquiring what are now some of the world’s most important impressionist, post-impressionist, and modern paintings, including works by Renoir, Cézanne, Matisse, and Picasso. Dr. Barnes’s collecting interests later expanded beyond European modernism—he purchased African masks and sculptures; American art; Asian art; Native American ceramics and textiles; old master paintings; ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman art; and decorative and industrial arts. He hung these items with his modern paintings in unconventional groupings called “ensembles” that mixed cultures, time periods, and media. These carefully crafted ensembles were a teaching tool, essential to Dr. Barnes’s educational program.

As his collection grew, Dr. Barnes became increasingly interested in education and social justice. At his factory in West Philadelphia, which produced the antiseptic Argylol, he structured the workday to include two-hour arts enrichment seminars for his factory workers to discuss painting and philosophy. Many were women or African Americans to whom,

in defiance of the era’s prejudices, Dr. Barnes had extended employment. Using teaching approaches he developed with philosopher John Dewey that stressed the importance of education in a truly democratic society, Dr. Barnes expanded his factory experiment into a full-scale teaching institution where any person, regardless of background or education, could learn to appreciate art through the direct study of his collection. He wrote, “All we hope to do at the Foundation is to help people learn to see not only pictures but every other object and situation in life.”

Now best known as a visionary collector and pioneering educator, Dr. Barnes was also a fierce advocate for the civil rights of African Americans, women, and the economically marginalized. Committed to racial equality and social justice, he established a scholarship program to support young Black artists, writers, and musicians who wanted to further their education. Dr. Barnes was deeply interested in African American culture and became actively involved in the Harlem Renaissance, collaborating with philosopher Alain Locke and scholar and activist Charles S. Johnson to promote awareness of the artistic value of African art.

Since the Barnes Foundation’s move to Philadelphia in 2012, over two million people from all 50 states and 130 countries on six continents have visited the art collection, participated in educational and public programs, and attended special exhibitions. Innovative community and family programs are offered on-site and in neighborhoods throughout the city, sharing the power of art with an increasingly diverse audience and honoring Dr. Barnes’s commitment to inclusion and access.

In keeping with the Foundation’s educational mission, the Barnes has served close to 82,000 schoolchildren in the Philadelphia region since 2012, many from underserved communities. This educational programming is provided to pre-K–12 students, promoting visual literacy and encouraging them to make personal connections to art.

This year’s programming was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Though the Barnes closed its doors from mid-March to late July to safeguard the public from coronavirus, the institution remained dedicated to enriching the lives of audiences near and far. The Barnes staff quickly implemented new online offerings to stay connected to the community, including interactive virtual learning for elementary and middle school students, a series of bilingual video lessons featuring stories and literacy-based art making, downloadable family art activities, adult education classes, and regular doses of culture and education. The Barnes Takeout series on YouTube, for example, features Barnes curators, scholars, and educators reflecting on their favorite works in the collection, offering accessible analysis in short episodes that employ deep-zoom technology to foster close looking. Through engaging online content, the Barnes has continued to serve as a vibrant hub of art, education, scholarship, and community programming for learners of all ages, incomes, and backgrounds throughout the closure and since reopening to the public on July 25.

Photo by Sean Murray

Institutional Highlights

- Over **2 million** visitors since 2012
- **259,000+** visitors in 2019
- **17,000+** member households in 2019
- **8 million+** online visitors engaged since the launch of the new website in 2017
- **133,000** newsletter subscribers
- **150,000+** views in the first three months of Barnes Takeout online programming
- **1,200+** students enrolled in online adult education classes offered April to June 2020
- Nearly **80%** of annual budget directly supports programs
- **50+** ongoing citywide cultural and educational community partnerships
- **\$92.8 million** endowment in FY 2019
- **13,000+** schoolchildren attend education programs annually (fewer students attended this year due to COVID-19-related closures)
- **800** Art for All Community Passes distributed to pre-K families, allowing for free year-long admission
- **Free admission** for ACCESS cardholders and community partners, free admission on Sundays for Philadelphia teachers, and PECO Free First Sunday Family Day programs open to all

Seventh-grade students tour the Barnes collection galleries, led by Emily Addis, the Barnes's Pre-K-12 Outreach Programs Specialist. Photo by David Morán

4

includes art from around the world, it is dominated by works by European male artists of the 19th and early 20th centuries; as a result, students of color may not see themselves represented in the artwork. To address this, the Barnes staff refers to anti-racist teaching guidelines when designing questions that encourage students to share their cultural backgrounds and real-world experiences based on what they see in or what is missing from the artwork. Students are also invited to ask questions such as "Should art look like me?" while examining works in the collection, empowering them to think more broadly about the value of art and the definition of culture.

The Barnes's multi-visit education programs engage students at key stages of their academic and social-emotional development—*Look! Reflect! Connect!* (pre-K), *Pictures and Words* (grade 3), *Art of Looking* (grade 5), and *Artist Voices* (grade 7). This approach brings art to students when it will have the most impact; when students and teachers are most receptive to arts-integrated content; and when in-depth programming seems to align best with the school districts' curricular goals. The programs use age-appropriate activities to integrate art with core curriculum areas (literacy, math, science, history, English language arts) while encouraging students to develop a deeper appreciation of art and improve critical-thinking skills through the observation of formal art elements such as light, line, color, and space. These programs, including related materials and transportation, are offered free to underserved schools in Philadelphia and Camden.

Each grade-level program has its own curriculum-aligned agenda, but there are four shared goals:

1. To help students and teachers of all backgrounds feel comfortable and confident in a museum setting.
2. To give students and teachers the basic tools for

"reading" works of art and for thinking critically about the image-saturated world around them.

3. To help students and teachers of all backgrounds find relevance in the collection.
4. To support students' academic growth by aligning lessons with curricular standards and modeling arts integration for teachers and providing resources for teachers.

To accomplish these goals, the Barnes relies on a unique three-touchpoint approach that prepares students to reflect on their experiences with the collection. These program components include:

- An interactive in-school lesson led by Barnes educators or professional teaching artists, featuring visual and written curricular materials providing the educational foundation for an art-making activity.

Pre-K to 12 Education Programs in the Philadelphia Region

Dr. Albert Barnes believed that art had the power to improve minds and transform lives. The Barnes's youth education programs are based on his teachings and one-of-a-kind collections. In 1925, he wrote that his educational approach "comprises the observation of facts, reflection upon them, and the testing of the conclusions by their success in application." The Barnes's diverse education programs encourage students to incorporate personal experiences in their observation and analysis of art, and provide valuable opportunities for underserved youth to learn from art by studying the collection.

The Barnes serves pre-K-12 students—mainly from the School District of Philadelphia (SDP)—through multi-visit education programs, special initiatives, and single-visit opportunities. Each year, in collaboration with the SDP's Office of the Arts and Academic Enrichment and the Camden City School District's Early Childhood Office, the Barnes identifies schools that are demographically representative of their districts and have the greatest need of arts enrichment. This engagement, coordinated with school principals and teachers, focuses on narrowing the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their peers and breaking down barriers that may keep certain communities from participating in visits to art museums.

In a typical academic year, the Barnes's school programs serve more than 12,000 students in public, private, and Catholic schools in Philadelphia and the surrounding suburban areas. This year, the Barnes was on track to exceed this number and reach 15,200 students from 226 schools, given

During the 2019–20 academic year, the Barnes served 9,771 students from 161 schools:

- 4,443 students (single visits)
- 5,224 students (multi-visit programming)
- 106 students (high school partnerships)

Due to COVID-19-related closures:

- 5,500 students had programs or visits canceled
- 65 schools had all programs or visits canceled

the popularity of the fall exhibition *30 Americans*. The show, which presented works by influential contemporary African American artists exploring issues of personal and cultural identity, resonated with the Philadelphia community, leading to an increase in single-visit programming.

The 2019–20 academic year was cut short due to the coronavirus pandemic and statewide closures. For the remainder of the school year, the Barnes education staff developed and delivered an enriching virtual arts education program for elementary and middle school students and their families. This report focuses on the Barnes's many different education and community programs offered to pre-K-12 students during the year, as well as the new initiatives that grew out of the pandemic.

The Barnes has developed a pedagogy of anti-racist teaching to ensure that pre-K-12 programming is inclusive and incorporates contemporary viewpoints that students can bring to conversations about art. Though the Barnes collection

5

- A structured visit to the collection galleries led by Barnes docents and staff with additional age-appropriate activities (transportation included).
- A subsequent in-school lesson led by Barnes educators or professional teaching artists, during which reproductions of works from the collection are used as inspiration for writing, experimentation with art materials, and the creation of original artwork.

Educators also provide enriching extension activities and reading selections that emphasize interdisciplinary connections and encourage learning in the classroom before, during, and after the Barnes experience.

To accommodate every grade level, the Barnes offers single-visit field trip opportunities and transportation for grades K–12.

Evaluation

The Barnes reached out to Patti Saraniero, EdD, principal of Moxie Research, to conduct a study to better understand the impact of its educational programs on students and teachers. The study evaluated the overarching goals of the Barnes's multi-visit programs as well as the school district's curricular aims for each grade-level program.

This was a mixed-method evaluation study, with data collected through student surveys (grades 5 and 7 only), teacher surveys, and structured observation of both teachers and students during in-school lessons and gallery field trips. To measure success in meeting the four overarching goals of Barnes education programs, this evaluation study revolved around the following areas of inquiry:

- Does each program impact students' perceptions about art?
- Does each program provide students with the opportunity for self-expression through art

making and discussion about works in the Barnes collection?

- Does each program support relevant standards in English language arts and visual art?
- What feedback do classroom teachers and art specialists have about the programs?

The results of these questions were measured against the specific goals of the education programs for pre-K and grades 3, 5, and 7.

The evaluation was designed to collect data through May 2020; however, data collection ceased in March due to COVID-19-related closures, and the study was concluded at that time.

Above: Photo by Darryl Morán

Opposite: This past example of a double-sided poster for *Pictures and Words* features visual and written components for discussing a 16th-century sculpture in the Barnes collection from the Kingdom of Benin, Edo.

High School Partnerships

The 30 Americans exhibition was a highlight for high school partnerships at the Barnes Foundation. Twenty-six art students from Philadelphia Performing Arts: A String Theory Charter School in the Center City West neighborhood visited the Barnes as part of a multi-visit experience. The students toured the permanent collection and 30 Americans on two different field trips. Central High School in Philadelphia's Olney neighborhood and Roxborough High School also participated in a multi-visit experience that asked students to study the artwork, provide guided tours, and make artwork of their own.

Roxborough students from an English class created artwork inspired by the paintings of Kehinde Wiley and themes of the exhibition. Students wrote essays that activated an art project of block-printed symbols that had personal meaning. These prints became important backdrops in their final video portrait projects.

Ninth graders from Central High School served as exhibition guides for fifth graders from Potter-Thomas School (in the North Central neighborhood of Philadelphia), a rewarding experience for both age groups. The high school students also made artwork inspired by Kehinde Wiley that incorporated block printing into self-portrait drawings.

"I didn't know fifth graders were so interested in art. They had more to say than I thought they would."

—Ninth-grade student, Central High School, after leading a tour of students from Potter-Thomas School

Above: This self-portrait was produced by a Central High School student for a project that incorporated block printing. Photo by Jay Bevenour

"I want to do that when I'm older. I want to inspire young people like me to be artists and to be confident like that."

—Fifth-grade student, Potter-Thomas School, in response to the tour led by high schoolers

Above: A Central High School student participates as a station guide for the 30 Americans exhibition. Photo by Jay Bevenour

A select group of Central and Roxborough students also served as gallery guides when the exhibition was open to the public. Visitors were very engaged, listening and talking with the students about the works. The students said they were amazed at how the

public treated them, as they had no idea that their input would be valued or that they would be taken so seriously—one student was offered the opportunity to discuss a college scholarship after her presentation.

12 HIGH SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS

THE BARNES FOUNDATION 2019-20 EDUCATION REPORT 13

Look! Reflect! Connect! (Pre-K)

Look! Reflect! Connect! is an early literacy program for pre-K students, teachers, and parents that encourages an understanding of and relationship with art by expanding on typical early childhood concepts of art making. The program responds to Pennsylvania and New Jersey early learning standards stating that literacy skill development for pre-K students should include building vocabulary, learning to look at visual images and match them to ideas and objects, and answering questions to connect illustrations to the written word.

In the 2019-20 school year, the Barnes expanded enrollment in the Look! Reflect! Connect! program to better serve students and strengthen partnerships with schools. Since 2014, this program has successfully served 2,680 pre-K students in Philadelphia and Camden, reaching all Bright Futures classrooms and the majority of school-district-affiliated Head Start classrooms in Philadelphia. Prior to the 2019-20 academic year, each school could participate just once over a two-year period, leaving room for new schools to enroll in the program. This year, that eligibility requirement was waived so that schools could participate with greater frequency, allowing the Barnes to strengthen relationships with the schools.

As part of Look! Reflect! Connect!, pre-K teachers receive in-depth professional training, curricular binders and poster sets, and in-class lessons and field trips for their students. The program is designed so that when teachers finish, they have the resources they need to continue integrating art with their students on their own. New professional development opportunities are offered each year that allow for a deeper partnership with educators,

who can elect to continue their relationship with the Barnes through repeat learning experiences.

The Barnes also expanded opportunities to pre-K families this year, aligning with curricular goals for family engagement and incorporating feedback from teachers. According to the US Department of Education, "Strong family engagement in early childhood systems and programs is central—not supplemental—to promoting children's healthy intellectual, physical, and social-emotional development; preparing children for school; and supporting academic achievement in elementary school and beyond." In a workshop created for pre-K registration fairs, back-to-school nights, and parent-teacher conferences, parents were introduced to the Barnes collection through a virtual reality (VR) tour and participated in art activities that they could incorporate into learning

Above: At a curriculum-based workshop offered at a pre-K registration fair, families were introduced to the Barnes through a virtual tour using Virtual Reality (VR) headsets. Photo by Lauren Resch

at home. By enhancing this aspect of Look! Reflect! Connect!, the Barnes supports educators in meeting family engagement goals within the Pennsylvania and New Jersey educational standards.

A total of 730 learners and 45 teachers from nine schools in Philadelphia and Camden took part in the program during this school year. Due to COVID-19-related closures, some field trips and in-class lessons were canceled, but most students participated in all the lessons and visited the Barnes Foundation.

Program goals for Look! Reflect! Connect! students included:

- Expressing critical-thinking skills by making predictions and using evidence while responding to artwork (e.g., using "I think... because...").
- Exploring and asking questions to seek meaningful information about a growing range of topics, ideas, and tasks.
- Knowing and using basic elements of visual arts by demonstrating an understanding of color, shape, and line.
- Using new art and content vocabulary and phrases acquired during the program.

Program goals for Look! Reflect! Connect! teachers included:

- Recognizing the Barnes as a resource for themselves and their students through continued visits, as well as engagement with the artwork and resource materials.
- Demonstrating the ability to facilitate inquiry-based discussions about art and artwork in their pre-K classroom.
- Incorporating meaningful arts integration by identifying connections to state learning standards across content areas such as science, math, and literacy.
- Sharing knowledge of a variety of art-making materials and skills with pre-K students.

Program goals for parents of Look! Reflect! Connect! students included:

- Recognizing the Barnes as a resource and place of engagement for their families.
- Facilitating inquiry-based discussions with their families in response to artwork.

Below: With the guidance of Lauren Resch, the Barnes's Early Childhood Programs Coordinator, students participate in a classroom art-making project. Photo by Michael Perle

"I tried what we've been learning in class. I pulled up a self-portrait by an artist, and we looked at the self-portrait and then we made self-portraits."

—Pre-K teacher, Southwark School, South Philadelphia

"Seldom do young children get such exposure to fine art and how it is relevant to them and their world. From the visual to the hands-on exploration, our students were excited, curious, and engaged throughout the program."

—Pre-K teacher, Early Childhood Development Center, Camden

also by Lauren Neath

Key Findings (Pre-K)

All surveyed teachers reported that their students felt welcome during their visit to the Barnes and had many opportunities to express ideas or feelings during the in-class lessons and gallery visit. One teacher commented that the in-class lessons allowed students to express the artistic concepts that they saw and then develop them in their own way.

All observed students demonstrated enthusiasm during the in-class lessons, with most to all being on task. The majority formulated and shared their opinions and volunteered to participate in the lessons. Students extensively used visual art vocabulary—particularly "color"—in their questions and answers during the in-class lessons, with all or most students demonstrating an understanding of texture, line, and shape.

After participating in the program, all teachers reported that they were likely to visit the Barnes again with their students. One teacher said that a program highlight was having the children

"experience the amazing works of art in such a beautiful museum." Another teacher said she was inspired by the program and used the lessons about "lines" for letter formation in her classroom as well as for part of her National Board Certification. The following findings are also of note:

- 100% of surveyed teachers agreed that the in-school lesson was successful in giving students the opportunity to express ideas and feelings.
- 100% of teachers found the teacher workshop to be an effective resource.
- 81% of teachers reported that students made personal connections to the artwork during the gallery visit.
- 81% of teachers said they were interested in integrating visual art into another content area after participating in the Barnes program—just 5% were interested prior to taking part in the program.

Percentage of pre-K teachers who thought their students were provided the opportunity to think critically about works of art

18 PICTURES AND WORDS (GRADE 3)

Percentage of pre-K teachers who thought the program components aligned with state grade-level curriculum standards

THE BARNES FOUNDATION 2019-20 EDUCATION REPORT 17

Pictures and Words (Grade 3)

To align with the SDP's third-grade literacy curriculum and the City of Philadelphia's Read by 4th Initiative, Barnes educators offer *Pictures and Words* to students in third grade, a pivotal year for literacy development. This program teaches students to read a painting just as they learn to read a text, thereby increasing their visual literacy. Students examine the characters, settings, and main ideas portrayed in an artwork and develop a narrative about their observations.

Students participate in class lessons, a gallery tour, and a dance workshop. The initial in-class lesson introduces students to reading a work of art in terms of literary elements. During their visit to the Barnes, students practice identifying stories in the artwork they see in person and then meet with a professional dancer to interpret storytelling elements through movement and learn about the story of breakdance. Throughout the program, students find out how artists use color, line, and shape to tell stories. As a final project, students create their own characters out of clay.

New this year, third graders visited the fall special exhibition *30 Americans* in addition to the permanent collection as part of their field trip experience. Through music and movement, students worked with Barnes educators and professional dancers to explore themes of identity, race, ethnicity, gender, and class addressed in the exhibition.

Also new this year, as an extension of *Pictures and Words*, 20 students in an ELL class of third, fourth, and fifth graders from Louis H. Farrell Elementary in Northeast Philadelphia participated in an activity about art and storytelling. Students looked at symbolism in a bronze sculpture from ancient Benin,

the capital of a precolonial African empire, and designed their own symbols to represent strength. COVID-19-related closures cut the program short, and students were unable to visit the Barnes and finish the final lessons.

Overall, *Pictures and Words* reached more than 1,580 students from 20 schools during this academic year. Some scheduled field trips and in-class lessons were canceled with the closures.

Program goals for *Pictures and Words* students included:

- Understanding how art tells a story and demonstrating critical-thinking skills by making inferences about artworks to support their opinions.
- Describing the story of a painting by identifying the character, setting, and main event in a work of art, thus using an artwork as a text.
- Identifying, through strong observational skills, how color, line, and shape work as key details and evidence to convey the story in a work of art.
- Creating works of art that show individual expression using a variety of artistic processes and materials.

"I wouldn't change anything. I loved how there were explicit connections when talking about elements of a story in both pictures and text."

—Third-grade teacher, Philadelphia

Percentage of third-grade teachers interested in integrating visual art into another curricular content area before and after their class participated in *Pictures and Words*.

Percentage of third-grade teachers who thought the program components aligned with state grade-level curriculum standards

18 PICTURES AND WORDS (GRADE 3)

THE BARNES FOUNDATION 2019-20 EDUCATION REPORT 18

Key Findings (Grade 3)

All teachers thought that the visit to the Barnes provided the opportunity for students to make personal connections to the works of art. They also reported that the program's art activities were successful in giving students the opportunity to express their ideas and feelings, and all said they were very likely to bring students to the Barnes again in the future. Half of the teachers named the dance workshop as a highlight of their Barnes visit, and 90% reported that a highlight during the second in-class lesson was creating the clay characters. One teacher commented that her students wrote stories for the sculptures as an extension activity in the classroom.

Upon observation in the classroom and gallery settings, more than half of the Pictures and Words students asked and answered questions and described details of the artworks, with over 70% making inferences in the gallery lesson. Students also demonstrated a rich use of English language arts vocabulary and concepts, especially when discussing character.

Above: Photo by Michael Perez

20 PICTURES AND WORDS (GRADE 3)

- 100% of surveyed teachers thought both the in-class lessons and the gallery tour provided students the opportunity to think critically about works of art.
- 100% of teachers reported that the program activity sheets and posters were effective resource materials.
- 100% of classes were observed to have all or most students on task and demonstrating enthusiasm during the in-class lessons and gallery tour.
- 83% of students were observed as volunteering to participate in the in-class lessons.

"[The way the figure stands] reminds me of Harriet Tubman and how she traveled between two cultures and got people to safety."

—Third-grade student, Philadelphia, in response to the question, "Where does this remind you of?" upon looking at Giorgio de Chirico's *The Arrival in the Barnes collection*

Key Findings (Grade 5)

Surveyed teachers reported that students enjoyed the program activities, especially when figuring out the medium used in different paintings. More than half of the teachers employed the provided curriculum binders, posters, and activity sheets during their lessons, and reported finding them and the teacher workshop to be effective resource materials.

Observation of the students participating in *Art of Looking* found that they were enthusiastic and focused throughout the in-class lessons and the visit to the Barnes. The students were very engaged during the gallery tour, listening to the teacher and consistently volunteering to participate in discussions. Students were observed to use CER most of the time during both the in-class and gallery lessons. Students used visual art vocabulary more frequently in the gallery than the classroom but used science-based vocabulary equally in both settings.

Most fifth-grade students surveyed as part of this study reported that they felt welcome during their visit to the Barnes and would be interested in visiting again. Over half of the students said the best part of their Barnes visit was seeing art and touring the galleries and that the opportunity to paint was a highlight of the in-class lessons. One student commented, "I really enjoyed seeing how people got inspired by others."

- 100% of teachers thought students had the opportunity to think critically about the artwork during the in-class lessons and the Barnes visit.
- 90% of teachers thought the students connected personally to the artwork during the Barnes visit.
- 100% of students were observed to listen to the teacher during the gallery lesson, while 93% voluntarily participated in the lesson.
- 93% of students reported that the lesson at the Barnes gave them some opportunity to express their ideas or feelings.

"Highlights of the classroom lessons were being given the opportunity to explore the art through several lenses—understanding space, line, light, and color; becoming more knowledgeable about the materials used; and learning how to ask questions."

—Fifth-grade teacher, Philadelphia

Art of Looking (Grade 5)

During the 2019–20 academic year, Barnes educators shifted the focus of *Art of Looking* to fifth-grade students, rather than both fifth and sixth graders. The STEAM-based (science, technology, engineering, art, and math) program cultivates problem-solving skills outlined in Philadelphia's Core Science Curriculum and the Next Generation Science Standards (a multi-state initiative for K–12 science content standards). It encourages students to develop problem-solving skills in an art context using curricular standards for inquiry and investigation.

Art of Looking students learn how to use the Claim, Evidence, and Reasoning (CER) model of scientific investigation, applying this strategy during their Barnes visit to analyze materials found in the artworks on display. Students use scientific inquiry and make claims about an artwork or its materials, citing evidence and explaining their reasoning. Students discover the different qualities of oil paint, watercolor paint, and pastels, and use CER to determine why an artist would choose one material over another to convey an idea. As a final project, students experiment with watercolors, using techniques such as wet and dry brush.

The program served more than 1,580 students from 25 schools during this school year, with some scheduled field trips and in-class lessons canceled due to closures.

Program goals for *Art of Looking* students included:

- Analyzing a work of art using art vocabulary including light, line, color, space, and shape.
- Using the CER model of scientific investigation to explore the materials used to make artworks.
- Creating claims about meaning in artworks supported by observable evidence and/or supplemental visual, oral, or written evidence.

Percentage of fifth-grade teachers who thought the in-class lessons and gallery tour aligned with state grade-level curriculum standards

Percentage of fifth-grade teachers who reported that their students felt welcome during their trip to the Barnes

Artist Voices (Grade 7)

Seventh graders use their artistic voice to analyze and create artwork in Artist Voices. The program responds to the SDP's English language arts curriculum where students are asked to identify the authorial voice and individual viewpoints in diverse media formats and evaluate the motives behind what is being presented. In this program, students investigate how artists break rules to express their individual voice. They learn how an artist's cultural and historical background can be revealed through the choice of subject and application of material in an artwork. Students examine radical artists from different time periods and places and identify how they broke with convention. They then explore their own creative voice and become artistic rebels.

During the initial in-class lesson, students learn about the backgrounds of certain artists and then connect them to the artists' choices of creative style. When the students visit the Barnes, they study these styles in person, analyzing works of art and exploring visual elements such as color, texture, and shape. As a final classroom project, students use their own artistic voice to create a graffiti tag, or personalized signature, that embodies themselves in words and in art.

As part of their field-trip experience this year, seventh-grade students visited the *30 Americans* special exhibition and participated in an art-making workshop. While touring *30 Americans*, students discussed concepts of race, identity, history, and beauty, and compared how these contemporary artists considered rule breaking in their work. Jean-Michel Basquiat's works, in particular, related well to students' discussions around street and graffiti art as examples of artistic rule-breaking. In

the workshop, students used a combination of writing and collage materials to respond to artwork in the exhibition.

The program reached over 1,320 participants from 24 schools during this academic year. As with the other programs, some field trips and in-class lessons were canceled due to COVID-19-related closures.

Program goals for Artist Voices students included:

- Developing visual literacy and critical-thinking skills by looking closely and interpreting works of art.
- Drawing on experiences to interpret artists' work and voices and support claims with visual evidence.
- Building art vocabulary and using aesthetic principles, including color, line, shape, and form, to analyze works in our collection.
- Expressing individual artistic voices and viewpoints in works of art using conventions established by the students.

Key Findings (Grade 7)

Teachers reported that the visit to the Barnes provided the opportunity for all students to make personal connections to the works of art. They commented that incorporating the special exhibition into the tour along with seeing the art in the permanent collection was beneficial, with 80% of teachers noting that *30 Americans* was a highlight of the Barnes visit. A majority of teachers said they were very likely to visit the Barnes again with their students.

Teachers agreed that the in-class lessons, gallery tour, and teacher resources aligned with the district's curricular standards. Artist Voices students were observed meeting English language arts skill requirements, such as citing evidence extensively while looking at art in the gallery setting and using program vocabulary in the classroom. During the visit to the Barnes, most students were observed to be on task, enthusiastic, listening to the Barnes educator, and volunteering to participate in the activities.

The program incorporated activities that resonated with seventh graders, with all teachers responding that the art activity was successful in giving their students the opportunity to express their ideas or feelings. Students were shown four artworks in the Artist Voices curriculum and asked which they felt connected to and why. The largest group of students chose a piece by graffiti artist Cornbread, saying that the imagery was familiar and the type of artwork seen around their neighborhoods. Additionally, students and teachers said the graffiti tag art activity was a highlight of the in-class lessons; one student said, "I did something I thought I couldn't do."

- 90% of teachers said they were likely to integrate visual art into other curricular content.
- 100% of teachers that received activity sheets and curriculum binders found them to be effective resource materials.
- 94% of students were observed as being enthusiastic about the Barnes visit and were seen listening to the Barnes educator.
- 98% of students reported feeling welcome during their trip to the Barnes.

24 ARTIST VOICES (GRADE 7)

"Having some time to look deeper at art helped my students learn how to do the same thing in their reading. Conceptually, students had never considered that there were rules in art, or ways of doing things, traditions. It was neat to see them learn that idea."

—Seventh-grade teacher, Philadelphia

"In the Artist Voices program, I learned that it's ok to be different, especially when it comes to art."

—Seventh-grade student, George W. Nebinger School, Philadelphia

26 ARTIST VOICES (GRADE 7)

Percentage of seventh-grade teachers who thought the art activity at the Barnes was successful in giving students an opportunity to express their ideas or feelings

Percentage of seventh-grade teachers who thought their students were provided the opportunity to think critically about works of art during the in-class lessons

THE BARNES FOUNDATION 2019-20 EDUCATION REPORT 25

2019–20 Creative Learning: Pre-K to 12 Education Program Donors

The Barnes Foundation gratefully acknowledges its donors for their generous support of pre-K to 12 education programs in the Philadelphia region.

Beneficial Foundation

Eugene and Joann Bissell

Caroline J. S. Sanders Trust 2

Christian R. and Mary F.
Lindback Foundation

Robert Cohen and Deborah Peikes

The Dean and Ann Witter Fund for
Charitable Giving

Dolfinger-McMahon Foundation

Dr. Andrew F. Drake

Ethel Sergeant Clark Smith
Memorial Fund

James Fernberger and Mary Walto

Goldsmith Weiss Foundation

Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance

Hamilton Family Charitable Trust

Anne and David Hilton

Philadelphia Cultural Fund Youth
Arts Enrichment

Jerome and Sandra Schwartz

Syde Hurdus Foundation

Anonymous

The Barnes Foundation is grateful for the lead support of *Puentes a las Artes/Bridges to the Arts* provided by the William Penn Foundation.

The Barnes smART Fund for Education, established by GSK, is an endowment that provides substantial annual support for K–8 education programs in the School District of Philadelphia.

Stavros Niarchos Foundation (SNF) generously supports the Barnes's education programs and *Puentes a las Artes/Bridges to the Arts* programming.

Subaru of America Foundation, Inc. critically supports education programs in Camden, NJ, and provides a vehicle for Barnes educators to use for travel to Philadelphia and Camden schools.

Connelly Foundation provides important support for the Barnes's education programs serving Catholic school students in Philadelphia and Camden.

Pre-K to 12 education programs for School District of Philadelphia students are generously supported by gifts made through the Educational Improvement Tax Credit (EITC) program. The Barnes gratefully acknowledges the following donors for their support:

Elliott-Lewis
Philadelphia Insurance Companies

This list reflects gifts made between January 1, 2019, and June 30, 2020.

APPENDIX C. PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART WEBSITE SOURCES

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020a. "An Overview of the Museum's History."

Collection Highlights: A Surprise at Every Turn

Our collection is the pride of Philadelphia. Highlights include:

The world's largest and most important collection of works by Marcel Duchamp

The greatest collection of sculpture by Constantin Brancusi outside Europe

The finest public collection of Auguste Rodin's sculpture in the United States

Superb Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings, including Paul Cézanne's *The Large Bathers*, Vincent van Gogh's *Sunflowers*, and important paintings by Édouard Manet, Claude Monet, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Camille Pissarro, and Edgar Degas

Exceptional American painting, sculpture, furniture, silver, and ceramics—including the remarkable creations of the Shakers and Pennsylvania Germans—that reflect Philadelphia's central role in American history

Extraordinary "period rooms" and architectural ensembles from around the world

Our landmark main building, opened in 1928 at the western end of the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, and the other buildings that make up our campus: the Perelman Building, the Rodin Museum, and the two great eighteenth-century houses in Fairmount Park, Mount Pleasant and Cedar Grove

An Overview of the Museum's History

The Museum began as a legacy of the great Centennial Exhibition of 1876, held in Fairmount Park. At the conclusion of the celebrations, Memorial Hall—which had been constructed as the Exhibition's art gallery--remained open as the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art "for the improvement and enjoyment of the people of the Commonwealth".

In the first few decades, the collections consisted of objects of an industrial nature, as well as fine and decorative art objects such as European ceramics. Books were also among the Museum's earliest acquisitions, as were antique furniture, enamels, carved ivories, jewelry, metalwork, glass, pottery, porcelain, textiles, and paintings.

In the early 1900s, the Museum published its first collection handbook and initiated an Education program for the general public. It wasn't long before a Membership program was in place, and plans for a new building gained momentum in the following decade.

Director Fiske Kimball set the tone for a new era in the 1920s, and the opening of the new building on Fairmount--what is now the Main Building--opened with an attendance record of one million visitors in its first year. Valiant marketing efforts and the skillful leadership of President J. Stogdell Stokes helped to keep the Museum vital during the Great Depression of the 1930s, while the 1940s witnessed extraordinary growth in the collections with a number of important gifts--including the John D. McIlhenny Collection and the George Grey Barnard Collection.

Acquisitions of the 1950s, such as the Louise and Walter Arensberg Collection and the A.E. Gallatin Collection, assured the Museum's prominence as a place in which to see masterpieces of early modern art. A number of period rooms were opened to the public as well, and the decade even saw the gift of Grace Kelly's wedding dress following her royal 1956 wedding to Prince Rainier III of Monaco.

Conservation of objects and the renovation of the building were themes of the 1960s, with major gifts including The Mr. and Mrs. Carroll S. Tyson, Jr. Collection, The Samuel S. White III and Vera White Collection, 71 objects from designer Elsa Schiaparelli, and Marcel Duchamp's enigmatic *Étant donnés*.

Renovation was a continued theme in [the 1970s](#), as the institution prepared for grand celebrations in honor of the Museum's Centennial and the nation's Bicentennial.

[The 1980s](#) witnessed still more growth, with acquisitions ranging from Edgar Degas's *After the Bath* to Cy Twombly's *Fifty Days at Iliam*. During [the 1990s](#), the Museum made great technological strides as it prepared to leap into the 21st century. Many operations became computerized, greater energy-saving measures were implemented, and new enhancements and re-organization projects were seen both inside the galleries and outside on the grounds.

The Museum transitioned into the new millennium with ease, and continued to navigate the changes that [the first decade](#) would bring with grace and strength. Now, with an astonishing history behind it, the Philadelphia Museum of Art is poised to meet the decades to come as one of the nation's foremost destinations in which to see world-class art.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020b. "Centennial Origins: 1874–1876."

Centennial Origins: 1874–1876

In 1876, Philadelphia marked the 100th anniversary of American independence with the International Exhibition of Arts, Manufacturers, and Products of the Soil and Mine--commonly referred to as the Centennial Exhibition. The first great international fair to be held in the United States, the Exhibition celebrated the country's thriving arts, industry, and commerce. It was staged on more than 285 acres in Fairmount Park. More than ten million visitors toured pavilions representing each of the American states and marveled at the artistic and industrial achievements on view in exhibits from thirty-seven foreign countries.

One of the Centennial's most enduring legacies was its Art Gallery, which eventually became known as Memorial Hall. The building had been constructed as a permanent structure in 1874–75 for \$1,564,000, intended to house more than 4,000 works of fine and applied arts.

Philadelphians recognized that the Centennial Exhibition was a unique opportunity to form a nucleus of objects that could, in time, grow and benefit the city's industries. So together, representatives of the city's leading educational institutions, as well as state and city authorities, actively pursued this goal--envisioning the creation of a museum along the lines of the recently completed South Kensington Museum in London (today known as the Victoria and Albert Museum). This museum would be different, however, in that it would also have an active school as a close adjunct; a place where creative craftsmen could be trained for the growing enterprises of the United States.

Thus the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art was chartered in February 1876, establishing "a Museum of Art, in all its branches and technical application, and with a special view to the development of the Art Industries of the State, to provide instruction in drawing, painting, modeling, designing, etc., through practical schools, special libraries, lectures and otherwise." The doors of Memorial Hall were reopened to the public on May 10, 1877, exactly one year after the inauguration of the Centennial Exposition.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020c. “The Early Decades: 1877–1900.”

The Early Decades: 1877–1900

At the close of the Centennial, appeal letters were sent out to the various exhibitors asking for donations of objects to the new Museum's permanent collection. Beyond these appeals, it wasn't long before gifts and bequests began to reach Memorial Hall from citizens who saw in the new institution both a continuation of the Centennial's ideals and an opportunity to provide the public and those in industry with objects of good design and craftsmanship. Soon, the collections would expand to encompass fine and decorative art objects as well, including those made in Europe and Japan. Books came in as donations as well--in fact, the Museum was the first to have a Library from its very beginning.

>For the first few years that it was open, the Museum charged a small admission fee. This policy was abandoned in 1881, however, and the Museum would remain free to the public for nearly 80 years.

Initially, the Corporation of the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art was managed by a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees of twenty-two members. The position of Museum Director grew out of the position of Curator--in fact, the first Curator, Dalton Dorr, was appointed Director in 1892.

In 1893, the Department of Textiles, Lace and Embroidery was organized (one of Museum's first three departments; the other two being Pottery and Numismatics). Originally, the department was to serve as a design and technical resource for textile students at the School.

... in 1893, ... Anna H. Wilstach, widow of a Philadelphia leather manufacturer, bequeathed her large painting collection to the city--as well as an endowment of half a million dollars to purchase additional works of art.. Among the first purchases with the fund she established were works by James Abbott McNeil Whistler and George Inness in 1895, and *The Annunciation* by Henry Ossawa Tanner, the first painting by the young African American artist to enter a public museum collection in the United States, in 1899.

With such growth, the need for additional space soon became obvious. Ever-increasing attendance made that need even more pressing--in 1894 alone, 379,419 visitors came through the Museum's doors. Thus, at the urging of the Fairmount Park Commission, Philadelphia's City Council appropriated funds to design a new museum.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020d. “1900–1910.”

1900 - 1910

The 20th century began at the Museum with the establishment, in 1900, of a Department of Oriental Pottery. Throughout the decade, specific departments operated under the auspices of honorary curators. These would also include Textiles, Lace, and Embroidery; Numismatics; European Porcelain; Arms and Armor; Furniture and Woodwork; Prints, Book Plates, and Historic Seals; Philately; Goldsmith Work, Jewelry, and Plate; Oriental Carpets; Sculpture, Marbles, and Casts; and Musical Instruments.

The premier issue of the Museum *Bulletin* was also published in 1903; the first art museum publication of its kind to appear in the country... The January issue of the *Bulletin* indicated that a Membership program was clearly in place at the Museum...

The Museum Library was also growing...

An Education program for the general public was initiated in 1905, with the first tours for public school children and the first art history lectures for adults being offered. From then on, groups of school children could be seen in the galleries on any given weekday sketching from the collections. The Museum recognized not only the importance of engaging with the public but also of working with other museums across the country, thus, it was an active participant in the formation of the Association of American Museums in 1906.

Plans for a New Building

In the years after the 1895 announcement that there would be a competition for a new Museum design, dozens of architects submitted their ideas and various sites in Fairmount Park and downtown Philadelphia were considered.

In 1907, it was proposed to Mayor John E. Rayburn that the Museum be erected atop Fairmount hill, the city's highest natural elevation (noted on William Penn's early maps) and the site of its first reservoir. The area recently had become available for development, as the city had decided to stop pumping its drinking water from the Schuylkill River. Furthermore, the property was immediately adjacent to the terminus of a proposed boulevard designed to link downtown Philadelphia with Fairmount Park. A grand building on top of the hill, it was determined, would make a fitting visual conclusion to the new Benjamin Franklin Parkway.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020e. "1920–1930."

1920 - 1930

The roaring twenties was a landmark decade for the Museum, inside and out.

Construction on the new building was progressing, and by 1923, the terracing of the granite hill on which the Museum was to stand had been completed. The foundations of the building, as well as the broad, now iconic steps leading up to it from street level, had been laid. This was also the year that the Museum began appointing specific professional (as opposed to volunteer) curators to its different areas of study and collecting.

It was in October of 1925 that the distinguished art and architectural historian Fiske Kimball was appointed Director of the Museum ... Kimball set the tone for a new era.

He believed that a museum should "express the world's artistic culture in all mediums, merging architecture, painting, sculpture and the decorative arts." In this capacity, he envisioned a "walk through time" for the new building, wherein works of art would be installed together in dramatic galleries enhanced with period architectural elements and historic interiors. His integrated and contextual approach spurred the installation plan, and continues to be a distinctive feature of the institution today.

In July 1926, restoration of Mount Pleasant was completed and the historic house was opened to the public ... Cedar Grove, the second Historic Fairmount Park home to be administered by the Museum, opened to the public as a "branch museum of colonial art and architecture" a year and a half later.

With an immense amount of interior work remaining, but with its exterior and Northern wing consisting of twenty second-floor galleries devoted to English and American art complete, the new Museum on Fairmount opened to the public on March 26, 1928. An inaugural exhibition included galleries devoted to the arts of Italy, the Netherlands, France, England, and America, featuring "not only paintings, but works of sculpture,

furniture, tapestry weaving, gold and silversmithing, and other crafts. . ." Temporary galleries of medieval art were also opened, though the southern wing where they would ultimately be housed had yet to be completed.

At either side of these galleries were newly installed, geographically corresponding period rooms, bringing "to Philadelphia the air and spirit of a time long passed. . .the atmosphere of another age." Among these rooms were a colonial Pennsylvania-German kitchen and bedroom from Millbach Township, Pennsylvania...

Also in the winter of 1929, the Museum held a series of six concert events ... presented by the Department of Chamber Music of the Curtis Institute of Music, and were fantastically successful. Over 30,000 people attended the first season, and the partnership between the Curtis Institute and the Museum continues to this day. Furthering the Museum's commitment to the public, Fiske Kimball officially founded the Division of Education this year as well.

Philadelphia's enthusiasm for its new Museum, whose name was now shortened from the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art to the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, was strikingly apparent right away. In May 1929, an attendance record of one million visitors was proclaimed for its first year. At this point, the Museum was operating out of two buildings--the new building on Fairmount was home to most of the Museum's holdings of European and American art; while its Oriental collections; prints and drawings; and study collections of ceramics, glass, metalwork, and textiles were still on view at Memorial Hall.

Major Exhibitions: 1927: Memorial Exhibition of the Work of Mary Cassatt

Major Gifts and Acquisitions: 1921: Impressionist works from the family of Alexander Cassatt

1929 and 1930: A collection of paintings by Thomas Eakins given to the Museum by his wife Susan Macdowell Eakins and their friend Miss Mary A. Williams

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020f. "1930–1940."

1930 - 1940

The Great Depression of the 1930s was a period of retrenchment for the Museum. Because funds from the hard-pressed city were sharply reduced, construction work on the new building's vast, unfinished interior was suspended for a time and several galleries had to be temporarily set up From 1931–1933, the city of Philadelphia reduced appropriations of the Museum over 70%. For a short time Memorial Hall had to close entirely, and the Rodin Museum, which had only just opened to the public in 1929, was only open one day a week. Despite setbacks, however, the 1930s witnessed many notable achievements.

In 1931 W. Norman Brown was appointed the first curator of Indian art ... A section of the Museum devoted to the art of the Medieval and Gothic periods was also completed in 1931...

Children remained an important focus of the Museum even in troubled times, and the Children's Story Hour, which began on Sundays in 1932, proved very popular with the younger crowd. The Museum also took advantage of radio popularity, with a program that ran for 5 minutes a week on Thursday evenings in the Winter/Spring of 1933. Sponsored by the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, the short evening broadcasts were sent over Station WIP and featured various curators giving glimpses into their collections and other items of Museum interest. Favorite works of art were a featured part of lengthier radio programs throughout the decade as well.

Also in 1932, the historic Letitia Street House came under the Museum's administration. Believed ... the first brick building in Philadelphia (circa 1682), ... a residence of William Penn... named for Penn's daughter...

In 1933, ... A suite of galleries ... was opened to the public ... and the following year eleven more galleries were completed with the aid of grants from the Works Progress Administration.

By early 1935, the Library (which was still located at Memorial Hall) owned about 15,000 volumes. It, too, benefited from WPA funding ...

... J. Stoddell Stokes, served as President from 1933 until his death in 1948. Working closely with Fiske Kimball, Stokes raised the funds necessary to install what are now some of the Museum's most celebrated and distinctive period rooms--the *Room from the House Called Het Scheepje (The Little Ship)*, the *Reception Hall from the Palace of Duke Zhao (Zhaogongfu)*, and the *Pillared Temple Hall* from India, among them. Stokes also launched the institution's first major capital campaign in February 1937. He announced a ten-year, \$15,500,000 program to strengthen the endowment of both the Museum and its Schools and to finish work on galleries to house "the pageant of the evolution of world art, and ... many rooms which, besides offering suitable atmosphere for their contents, are in themselves works of art." At the time of his announcement, the interior of the Museum was still only one-sixth completed, and more than five-sixths of the institution's holdings were in storage.

Later in the year, a philanthropic group...called the Friends of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art was formed.

At the end of the decade, the Museum officially changed its name to the Philadelphia Museum of Art, a name that it had been informally called for years. Under the direction of its Curator of Painting and Sculpture, Henri Marceau, the Museum also established its first on-site conservation laboratory in 1939.

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020g. "2000-2010."

With the advent of the new millennium, the Twentieth-Century Art Department became known as the Department of Modern and Contemporary Art.

A few months later, on June 15, the recently purchased Reliance Standard Life Insurance Building was dedicated as the Ruth and Raymond G. Perelman Building of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, in honor of the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and his wife.

In December, the Museum received an extraordinary \$10 million gift from Gerry and Marguerite Lenfest, one that coincided perfectly with the public launch of the 2001 FUND. This unprecedented \$200 million capital campaign aimed to increase endowment, help expand the Museum's physical facilities, and support scholarship, exhibitions, conservation, and programming.

The Museum kicked off its 125th Anniversary year in 2001 ... The Museum System (TMS), a new collections management system, went live later that month ...

The following year, the Museum offered free admission on the anniversary of Sept 11 in the hope that its galleries would serve as quiet spaces for reflection where visitors could experience the healing power of art.

In October 2001, the Museum began extending its hours on Friday nights until 8:45 p.m., providing ... a variety of exciting events. By early 2002, a new series of weekly performances by prominent and emerging jazz artists from around the world launched in conjunction with the extended hours, establishing the ever-popular Art After 5 program. ... Pennsylvania Governor ... designated the Museum a Commonwealth Treasure for the year, ... an outstanding example of the state's rich historical and cultural resources.

In early 2003, the Museum announced the publication of its Spanish-language *Handbook to the Collections--Museo de Arte de Filadelfia: Guía de las colecciones*. ... Also in July, the Museum launched a Kid's Audio Tour of the American collections--filled with music, sound effects, games, and unusual facts. The tour was an enormous hit with children aged five to twelve.

The 2001 FUND 125th Anniversary Campaign concluded the following year, exceeding its goal and raising over \$246 million. Further good news came during a summer ceremony in the Great Stair Hall, when Wachovia announced its generous gift to the Museum to create the Wachovia Education Resource Center, to be located in the new Perelman Building. Shortly thereafter, construction began on the building: the installation of temporary utilities, the separation of the Annex from the Fairmount and Pennsylvania building wings, and interior nonstructural demolition. A groundbreaking celebration ... held on October 26, 2004.

... 2005 also saw the publication of the first two titles in a new series of Primary Sources in American Art, *A Drawing Manual* by Thomas Eakins and *The 1772 Philadelphia Furniture Price Book*. ... With the *Drawing Manual*, the Museum was at last able to fulfill Eakins's dream of publishing the manuscript and illustrations created as instruction for his students in the 1880s.

In the summer of 2005, a three-year grant from the Freeman Foundation allowed the Museum to create materials and programs to teach children in kindergarten through 12th grade about the art and cultures of East Asia. As part of this course, the Division of Education published teaching kits inspired by the Museum's collections of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean art. A multi-year commitment from The Comcast Foundation also allowed the Museum to begin developing new learning materials for hundreds of thousands of children and their teachers in Philadelphia and beyond. Magnificent gifts indeed, especially as the Division of Education celebrated its 75th anniversary. In another remarkable development of the year, The Albert M. Greenfield Foundation made a generous commitment to establish a Visual and Digital Resources Center for the Library and Archives to provide staff, volunteers, and visiting speakers with easy and flexible access to digital images, slides, DVDs, CD-ROMs, videos, and other electronic resources on the Museum's collections and the visual arts in general. September saw the Museum receive the "Beyond the Ramp" Award from Creative Access, which salutes innovation in making the arts accessible to those who are deaf or hearing impaired, and the year ended with the first-ever Winter Family Studio, which served 1,066 children and adults during its four-day run.

2006 began with the launch of a redesigned Museum website. The new site, which featured a searchable database of the Museum's collections, video streaming, and an interactive map of the galleries, ...

The Board of Trustees announced in October 2006 that Frank O. Gehry and his team of talented architects had been selected to take on the challenge of expanding and restoring the Museum's main building, with the goal of providing beautiful and ample space for the Museum's rapidly growing collections ...

While the Museum began an exterior renovation ... of the Main Building in 2007, a great deal of ... anticipation of the fall opening of the Perelman Building. In March, members of the Library and Archives staff oversaw, with support from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the move of 200,000 volumes, 200,000 photographic slides, and 1,400 linear feet (or approximately 1.6 million pages) of archival materials to their new home. The Library also added 3,000 important volumes to its holdings during the year. Home to much needed space for the display, study, conservation, and enjoyment of the Museum's internationally celebrated collections, the Ruth and Raymond G. Perelman Building opened to enthusiastic visitors ... on September 15, 2007. Wachovia underwrote free admission to the new building through the end of the year to ensure that this new resource and its treasures could be ... accessible to as many people as possible.

In February 2009, the Museum's new parking facility opened to the public, increasing parking capacity by 442 spaces. Applauded for its low-impact, environmentally sensitive systems and design, the facility featured a spectacular 26,000-square-foot "green roof" among its sustainable features.

A monumental acquisition of two early Renaissance armors for horse and man was also made possible in October 2009 ... On October 21, the armors were unveiled by a group of 30 fourth graders ...

In January 2010, Auguste Rodin's celebrated sculpture, *The Thinker*, was reinstalled in its traditional spot outside the entrance of the Rodin Museum. ... restoration ... to renew and improve the grounds in the spirit of the original 1929 plan. The Rodin Museum and Garden Landscape Rejuvenation Project was part of an even larger long-term effort to renovate the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, ...

2010 drew to a close with an extraordinary acquisition in November: the core collection of photographs by Paul Strand. ... comprised more than 3,000 prints and lantern slides, ... made the Philadelphia Museum of Art the world's most important repository for the study of Strand's work.

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020h “Bringing Us Together Through the Power of Art.”

The Plan: Goals for Accomplishing Our Vision By 2020 and Beyond

Engage: We are engaging the next generation of museumgoers with extended hours and Pay What You Wish admission, plus the development of new digital communications through apps and our website.

Enhance: We are enhancing your experience by renovating galleries and creating new ones, adding educational facilities and tools, and improving public spaces through the comprehensive Facilities Master Plan—the current phase of which is the Core Project, which broke ground on March 30, 2017.

Reimagine: We are reimagining how we present, interpret, and share art through new collection-based programs, creative reinstallations, and the development of digital interpretive tools in galleries.

Impact: We are impacting arts education in the Philadelphia region by broadening our civic responsibilities through partnerships with other organizations and innovative educational programs, and by serving as the premier cultural venue for our community.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020i “Philadelphia Museum of Art Plans to Reopen on September 6, 2020.”

August 10, 2020

Philadelphia Museum of Art Plans to Reopen on September 6, 2020

The Philadelphia Museum of Art announced today that it will reopen to the public on Sunday, September 6, 2020, following a nearly six-month closure that was necessitated by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Looking Ahead

The completion of the Core Project phase of the Facilities Master Plan, overseen by architect Frank Gehry, has been delayed from fall 2020 to early 2021 (date to be announced) due to the pandemic. Visitors may look forward to seeing the newly refurbished and reopened Lenfest Hall (West Entrance), a vast new Forum space at the heart of the building, the completion of the Vaulted Walkway spanning 640 feet across the building from north to south at ground level, and two suites of generously sized new galleries on the first floor, each comprising more than 10,000 square feet. One suite will be inaugurated with a major reinstallation of American art spanning the years 1640 to 1840. New interpretations of this collection will explore the artistic ties linking North America, South America, and Asia; the role of enslavement in the production and financing of art throughout the period; Philadelphia's role as an influential cultural capital; and the stories and works of Black, women, and Indigenous artists. The other suite of new galleries will open with an exhibition celebrating art-making in Philadelphia today through the perspectives of a diverse selection of artists working in a variety of media. Together these new galleries will illuminate the exceptional range of creative expression that has flourished in Philadelphia past and present and reaffirm the spirit of resilience and innovation pervading the city today.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020j. "Online Collection Search."

Online Collection Search

Looking for an artist or artwork in our collection? Search our online collection database.

More than half of the works in our extensive collection are online: 158,807 objects from our collection of over 240,000. We add more objects to the database every week so be sure to check back to see what's new.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020k. "1960-1970."

1960 - 1970

The early 1960s witnessed still more growth ... with the opening of 17 painting galleries, the expansion of the Indian Art collection to include the arts of Nepal and Tibet, completion of a new Costume and Textile Library, and the projection of a Hall of Armor and several more South Wing galleries. There was so much growth, in fact, that in 1962 the Museum began to charge visitors an admission fee of 35 cents.

... the Library saw a 100% increase in college students, writers, artists, and researchers...

In 1963 ... the extraordinary bequest of Mr. and Mrs. Carroll S. Tyson, featuring 22 Impressionist masterpieces including Pierre-Auguste Renoir's *The Large Bathers*; Claude Monet's *The Japanese Footbridge and the Water Lily Pool, Giverny*; and Vincent van Gogh's *Sunflowers*. The second gift was the Louis E. Stern Collection ... included 19th- and 20th-century French painting (Henri Rousseau's *Carnival Evening*) to fine prints, watercolors, and Oriental, Mediterranean, and African sculpture.

Meanwhile, the Division of Education continued to grow with lecture series and Sunday concerts, art classes for adults and children, film screenings, and the inauguration of a successful "Tours out of Town" series that involved visits to different cities of artistic and architectural interest in the United States.

In the summer of 1965, the "Musettes" program was initiated under the guidance of the Women's Committee. This highly successful program afforded 28 girls the opportunity, through an 8-week training course, to obtain the beginning training necessary for a Museum career. The name was later changed to "Museum Aides."

In 1967 the Amory was completed, and the Museum's Education department saw continued growth with unprecedented numbers of visiting schoolchildren. On Wednesday evenings from September through May, the Museum stayed open until 10 p.m. Once again, however, the Museum faced the problem of space. Thus, a long-term plan was devised to create, among other areas, new Special Exhibition galleries and conservation laboratories, a new Library, and a Print Study and storage area.

In early 1968, a groundbreaking ceremony ... of the Bernice McIlhenny Wintersteen Student Center-- supported ... with generous gifts from Mr. and Mrs. Walter Annenberg and various Trustees and friends, ... also with appropriations from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the School District of Philadelphia.

The spring of 1969 saw the formation of the Museum Associates Program, a dedicated group of supporters with ... interest in the arts and a personal commitment to strengthening Philadelphia's cultural resources.

Finally, at the close of the 1960s, the Museum learned that it was the wish of Marcel Duchamp that one of his heretofore totally unknown works ... to join the collection. ... It had been widely assumed that Duchamp had "retired" from painting to play chess, making the appearance of *Étant donnés* all the more stunning.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020l. "1980-1990."

The 1980s proved to be one of the more active periods for major acquisitions in the Museum's history. The decade began, in fact, with the purchase of Edgar Degas's *After the Bath*, among the institution's important acquisitions since World War II.

The Museum Library also enjoyed continued growth, and became an associate member of the Research Libraries Group and its Information Network in 1980... The Corporate Partners Program was created in the fall of that year, with 24 area business leaders.

In March 1981, Stella Kramrisch's exhibition *Manifestations of Shiva* opened to great enthusiasm, with 129 sculptures, 64 paintings, and a film produced by The Asia Society expressly for the Museum. Kits of Indian art materials were sent out to schools, and dance performances, concerts, scholarly lectures, and a special "India Day", complete with elephant and camel rides on the East Terrace, rounded out the related events. The exhibition *Treasures of Ancient Nigeria* opened in February 1982. Co-organized with the National Museum of Nigeria, the show included a variety of special events, including a dance troupe performance from the University of Ibadan. Special materials for teachers were prepared in conjunction with the exhibition, and 31, 023 schoolchildren were able to visit it in person.

Unfortunately, despite these exciting events, the early 1980s also saw several organizational changes in the Museum as it faced reduced government spending on the arts...

The following year, ... The Division of Education concluded a successful two-year pilot project that year as well. Called the Philadelphia Museum of Art Institute, the program introduced nearly 70 primary and secondary school teachers from all over the area to the collections and to the potential of works of art to offer new insights within a school curriculum. Meanwhile, rethinking and reinstalling the Museum's galleries on an ongoing basis was considered crucial to the public understanding of the collections. Hence, during the special exhibition *Philadelphia and the China Trade*, examples of export porcelain were displayed in the American galleries together with European and American wares to illustrate the myriad sources from which American clients took inspiration.

The Associates and Corporate Partners also continued to grow, and the Friends of the Museum added a Young Friends category, bringing the Museum to a whole new and enthusiastic audience.

... the Museum also launched a reorganization project to study the galleries of European painting, sculpture, and decorative arts. ... The National Endowment for the Humanities provided funding for a survey that would allow the Museum's education and curatorial staff to ponder the entire reinstallation of the section.

1987 also saw the Division of Education initiate its VAST summer seminars for area school teachers, as well as art history courses and programs specifically designed for families. A few weeks later, the Museum hosted the first annual College Day for colleges and universities all over the Delaware Valley area.

The decade came to a close with the reopening of the Rodin Museum to the public after being renovated for the first time since it was built in 1929.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020m. "1990-2000."

philamuseum.org/information/45-604-504.html

Open today 10:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. [Locations & Hours](#) [Buy Tickets](#)

[Visit](#)
[Calendar](#)
[Collection](#)
[Learn](#)
[Join](#)

1990 - 2000

The 1990s began with several reorganization endeavors, first among them the enormous task of photographing objects in the collection—part of a two-year cataloguing project ...

An exhibition devoted to Henry Ossawa Tanner, the foremost African American artist at the turn of the century, opened in early 1991 to great enthusiasm. A record number of school-age visitors attended the show, and the *Philadelphia Tribune* published a special supplement specifically for schoolchildren. In addition, 54 different outreach programs were created as part of the exhibition for groups with special needs. In June of that year, the Museum reached even more audiences with the first Foreign Language tour. Over 50 visitors attended a Polish version of the popular "Highlights of the Collection" tour, part of an expanded series of such tours with eight different languages offered.

1995 ... October also marked the beginning of Art Talk, a six-week art appreciation course by telephone designed to bring the Museum's collections to those unable to leave their homes.

... 1996 ... In March, eight art history graduate students from area universities presented papers at the First Annual Philadelphia Symposium on the History of Art, co-sponsored by Museum and Bryn Mawr College.

Finally, Museum educators produced a supplement for the *Philadelphia Inquirer* that was distributed to 40,000 schoolchildren in the Delaware Valley. It presented stories, pictures, and activities relating to the exhibition *The Peale Family: Creation of an American Legacy, 1770–1870*.

1997 ... In March, the Museum hosted over 400 young people at its first Korean Family Day; a heritage celebration including a Korean dance performance, hands-on studio experiences, and guided tours.

The Conservation Department and the Division of Education, meanwhile, collaborated to create a video on the Kienbusch Collection of Arms and Armor, which was then provided via teleconferencing to 5,000 subscriber schools. A few months later, a grant ... would launch the examination and treatment of over 400 objects in this collection ... allowing visitors to witness the work in progress.

In March 1998, ... *Art: The Picture Book of History*, a special distance-learning project involving a collaboration between the Museum, the New York Institute of Technology, and schools in New York and California, was launched ...

On October 21, 1999 ... recommend that the Board of Trustees purchase the Reliance Standard Life Insurance Building (designed in 1926), the Museum's neighbor... on December 16, Raymond and Ruth Perelman announced ... they would donate \$15 million to the Museum for the advancement of its mission.

© 2020 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020n. *2019 Year in Review*.

It's been an exciting
and challenging year — and
there's much more to come.

Few other times in the history of the Philadelphia Museum of Art have been as challenging or as full of promise as the past year. As we write this, we are entering final construction of the Core Project, the name we have given to the second, and without doubt the most complicated, phase of our facilities master plan. Although much remains to be done before the project is completed next fall, we can discern the shape of things to come and the many ways in which the changes now being made will benefit our visitors.

Over the past twelve months we have opened a new restaurant and café and, in the bargain, renovated an entire section of the museum that was long past due for a makeover. Work also proceeded on the transformation of two additional wings on the Lower Level that will display American art, prints, drawings, photographs, and modern and contemporary art, providing additional galleries for important areas of our collection. Finally, we have nearly completed the transformation of the grand space that for many years served, incongruously, as our loading dock, but now serves as an entrance, providing street-level access to the museum on the side of the building that faces Kelly Drive. And there's more to come in the year ahead.

Looking back, it is helpful to remind ourselves that we have not closed

the museum, even briefly, during the process, but rather kept it open and in operation. This has not been an easy task, but it has been a rewarding one. We have managed to keep our entire staff on board, which would not have been possible had we gone dark. This, in turn, has allowed us to continue to offer a full schedule of exhibitions and programs. The response from our audiences continues to be encouraging: this past year we welcomed over 773,000 visitors, just 20,000 shy of our attendance in the year prior to the start of the Core Project.

A good deal of credit for this success is due to our staff and the many creative ways in which they utilize our most important resource: the museum's exceptional collection. It served as the basis for several popular exhibitions in the Dorrance Galleries, including *Fabulous Fashion: From Dior's New Look to Now*, which attracted more than 173,000 visitors, and *The Impressionist's Eye*, seen by nearly 208,000 visitors. Fulfilling an important goal of our 2013 strategic plan, we also continued the renewal of spaces in which we display our collection on an ongoing basis. Evidence of this can be seen in our newly renovated galleries of Chinese art—which opened in February and have proven to be enormously popular with the public—and in the work now being done on our galleries

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020o. “Learn: 4-12 Collection Tours.”

4–12 Collection Tours

Museum tours are designed as interactive lessons that encourage students to examine objects and ideas through a variety of activities including discussions, worksheets, and small-group work. Observation, critical thinking, problem solving, and literacy skills are incorporated in all lessons. These programs take place in the Museum’s permanent galleries. Lessons are 1 1/2 hours long except where noted. Expect to visit approximately four to six galleries during your tour.

All tours are appropriate for grades 4–12 (except where noted).

[Standards Alignment for School Tours >>](#)

Introductory Lessons

These lessons are ideal for a first visit or for a general introduction to broad aspects of the collection.

Learning to Look: How can we learn to see more when we look at art? [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Around the World (grades 4–6): What can art tell us about different times and cultures? [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Treasures of the Museum: ... explore a selection of masterpieces in the collection ... [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Art Investigation: Exploring works of art ... engages our inquiring minds and encourages critical thinking. [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Painters and Paintings: Why do painters make the choices they do? How do they create their illusions or abstractions?

Introduction to Sculpture: What is Sculpture? What artistic choices must sculptors make?

Introduction to Architecture: What is architecture? ... students explore different styles, materials building methods, and functions ...

Subject-Area Lessons

These lessons are designed to relate to classroom studies. If you do not see a lesson that connects with your studies, we can work with you to design a lesson that supports your curriculum.

American Art: From Colony to Nation: What was art like in George Washington’s day? [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Survey of American Art: What are the important themes in American art? How are changes in American society reflected in its art?

Greek and Roman Mythology in Art: ... students explore how artists have interpreted the ideas and mythology of the classical world.

Medieval Art: What can the architecture, sculpture, textiles, and armor of medieval Europe tell us ...?

Arms and Armor: Who used arms and armor? How were they made?

Art of the Renaissance: How did art of the Renaissance reflect ideas of that time?

Medieval and Renaissance Art: A combination of two lessons, Medieval Art and Art of the Renaissance.

Renaissance to Modern: ... a chronological look at European artistic styles from the Renaissance to today. [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

The Impressionist Era: What made the art of the Impressionists so different? [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Modern and Contemporary Art: What is modern art and what makes it look the way it does? [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Islamic Art (1 hour): How does Islamic art reflect the ideas of Islamic culture?

Art of Asia: Students examine and compare the art of several Asian countries ...

Treasures of French, German, or Spanish Art (grades 9–12) (1 hour): Students studying French, German, or Spanish learn about that culture's art.

The Mixed-Up Files (grades 4–8): In this companion lesson to *From the Mixed-Up Files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler* by E. L. Konigsburg, students learn about the Museum and its collections ...

STEAM at the Museum: How is being an artist like being a scientist or a mathematician? ... students practice core STEAM skills, learning directly from objects how artists create innovative solutions to complex problems. [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Art and Language Arts: Activities encourage careful observation, analysis, and discussion, and include creative, persuasive, and descriptive writing and poetry. This lesson can be adapted for English-language learners. [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Art Speaks, a Target® Field Trip (for 4th-graders in Philadelphia public schools only)

Designed to help fourth-grade students practice literacy skills while exploring art at the Museum and in the classroom. During the Museum lesson, students use a variety of language-arts skills (such as comparing, describing, interpreting, and expressing opinions) as they share their observations and ideas about works of art.

Each class receives: a [teaching booklet](#) with literacy-based pre- and post-visit activities; [image cards](#) to use in the classroom; and a flash drive with [printable worksheets](#) and a [classroom presentation](#) of the images with looking questions. Before your visit, a Museum educator will come to your classroom to introduce students to Art Speaks and the Museum.

Thanks to generous funding, Art Speaks Museum admission and busing are free this school year.

Art Speaks is made possible by the Victory Foundation, Target, The Anne M. and Philip H. Glatfelter, III Family Foundation, Lincoln Financial Group, and TD Charitable Foundation. *Credits as of August 28, 2017*

HERstory: This lesson will explore women as artists and women as subjects. By analyzing works of art, students will learn about the changing roles and perspectives of women in society. [Pre-Visit Guide](#)

Clothing, Costume, and Culture: ... explore clothing and costume in historical and cultural contexts ...

Multiple-Visit Programs (grades K–12): The more you visit, the more you learn! These lessons offer an opportunity to explore classroom curriculum and the Museum's collection in greater depth. You and a Museum teacher work together to create a two-, three-, or four-visit program that connects to your curriculum. Your class works with the same Museum teacher each visit. Students pay regular school admission fees for each visit.

Artists and the Natural World: ... artists have been inspired by, recorded, and incorporated elements of the natural world in their art. Students have a chance to respond to nature themselves through writing and drawing activities.

Pennsylvania Artists: This lesson introduces artists who were born or worked in Pennsylvania from colonial times to today.

The Artist and Society (grades 9-12): What does art reflect about the time in which it was created?

Drawing and Discovery (grades 5-12): How does drawing aid our understanding of art? ... explore sculpture, architecture, and decorative arts ...

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020p. “Standards Alignment for School Tours.”

Standards Alignment for School Tours

All K-3rd grade school tours meet the following standards.

All 4th-12th grade school tours meet the following standards.

Common Core Academic State Standards

1. CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.R.1

Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

2. CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.SL.1

Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

National Visual Arts Standards

1. Responding, Anchor Standard #7: Perceive and analyze artistic work.
2. Responding, Anchor Standard #8: Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work.

3, 6

Art Speaks, a Target® Field Trip (Philadelphia public school grade 4 only)

Common Core Academic State Standards

• CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.L.1

Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.

• CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.4

Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.

National Visual Arts Standards

- Connecting, Anchor Standard #10: Synthesize and relate knowledge and personal experiences to make art.
- Connecting, Anchor Standard #11: Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural, and historical context to deepen understanding.

8

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020q. “Community Engagement: Delphi Programs.”

<https://philamuseum.org/educationpartners?page=1>

Community Engagement

Delphi Programs

The Delphi Project Foundation, funded by [Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company](#), a member of the Tokio Marine Group, supports innovative arts education programs to enhance the education for Philadelphia public school students and increase accessibility to the arts. [Learn More >>](#)

Delphi After School Art Club

The Delphi After School Art Club is a weekly comprehensive arts education program held at the museum. Each year, up to 240 middle school-level students in the School District of Philadelphia participate in the program. Students tour the museum's galleries and create their own works of art inspired by our collection. In addition to weekly studio art classes and gallery tours, the program includes a student art exhibition, a cultural performance, conservation demonstrations, and a collaborative community art project. The Delphi Art Club focuses on both the creative and academic aspects of visual arts and, most importantly, provides students with a safe and inspiring place to gather after school.

Delphi Art Partners Program

The Delphi Art Partners Program is an artist-in-residence program that pairs six professional teaching artists with six middle schools in the School District of Philadelphia. The professional artists spend thirty hours in residence working with classroom art teachers and students to design and implement engaging art projects. The program is enhanced with customized museum gallery visits. Through hands-on classroom art projects and museum tours, students experience an added dimension of innovative visual art in their school curriculum. The program also features a student art exhibition at the museum.

Delphi Art Futures Program

The Art Futures Program pairs professional teaching artists with high school art programs. The artists spend thirty hours in residence working with classroom art teachers and students to design and implement art projects that reflect both the classroom curriculum goals and the particular expertise of the resident artist. Both the artist and the schools are selected through a competitive process. In addition to classroom art-making, the program features customized museum tours and a juried student art exhibition at the museum. Each year, Delphi Project Foundation provides funding for five Philadelphia public schools to participate in the program.

The Philadelphia Museum of Art secures additional funding for five Philadelphia area Catholic schools to also participate in the Art Futures Program.

Delphi Summer Teen Media Program

The Delphi Summer Teen Media Program provides unique training both in the visual arts and filmmaking. For six weeks during the summer, students work with professional filmmakers to learn camera techniques, acting exercises, script writing, and film editing. The students create a portfolio of short films inspired by the museum's collections, public works of art, and current social issues. Once the films are complete, the students participate in film screenings at the museum and in their community. Throughout the summer, the program also exposes students to career opportunities in the visual and media arts.

The museum currently partners with the Big Picture Alliance, Taller Puertorriqueño, and Esperanza Academy Charter High School in the implementation of the Delphi Summer Teen Media Program.

Curriculum-based Teaching Resources for the Classroom

Delphi Project Foundation has supported the creation of a variety of teaching materials for use at all grade levels in Philadelphia public schools. Based on the museum's permanent collections, these resource kits include full-color reproductions of works of art, background information, teacher guides with learning activities, posters, and PowerPoint presentations. These teaching resources encourage all classroom teachers, not just art teachers, to use visual art as part of their core curriculum instruction. Free to all Philadelphia public schools, these resources serve as pre-trip materials for classrooms visiting the museum and as permanent classroom resources for classes that are unable to visit.

Learn more about [resources for teachers >>](#)

Philadelphia Museum of Art. 2020r. *Impact Report, 2020 Edition.*

The City's Classroom

Students and educators
do great things with
our collection.

37,300

School group
and camp visits

+

18,800

Programs at
schools led by
museum staff
and artists

+

4,300

After-school/
out-of-school
programs

=

60,400

student visits across all programs
in the 2018–19 school year

Philadelphia Museum of Art

2017–18

2018–19

Because we
never charge fees
to Philadelphia
public and charter
schools, **50%** of
student visits
came at no cost.

Private and parochial schools
on the other hand are charged
discounted rates for student visits.

32% growth
in attendance
from the previous
year (45,806).

Educational programs in the museum support skills that matter in the classroom and in life. Sherlock, our program for fifth- and sixth-graders, helps build observational skills through a series of classroom and gallery visits.

"The Sherlock program was awesome. The kids in the class started feeling ownership of the museum space, and they also started owning their ability to observe artwork. They came away from Sherlock feeling very confident that you could show them any work of art, and they'd be able to talk about it. That would not have occurred without multiple visits. It wouldn't have gelled. When it does gel, it's magic, and it will never go away."

Lisa Tyler, art teacher,
Baldi Middle School

"Students' *observation skills* advanced, particularly in looking holistically across a work of art. Students' *critical thinking skills* advanced, particularly evidential reasoning. Students' *creative thinking skills* advanced, particularly questioning and wondering."

Executive summary of Sherlock study by RK&A, a planning, evaluation, and research firm that supports museums and cultural organizations

APPENDIX D: NATIONAL EDUCATION DATA

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2016a. "2016 Arts Music and Visual Arts Grade 8 Assessment Report Card: Summary Data: Performance Results Visual Arts."

https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/arts_2016/files/2016_arts_appendix_tables.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics

2016 Arts Music and Visual Arts Grade 8 Assessment Report Card: Summary Data Tables for National Sample Sizes, Participation Rates, Proportions of SD and ELL Students Identified, and Additional Detail for National Average Responding Scores and Mean Percentage Correct for Multiple Choice Questions
Percentage of students and average responding scale score in NAEP visual arts at grade 8, by selected student and school characteristics: 2008 and 2016

	Student and school characteristics	Percentage of students		Average score	
		2008	2016	2008	2016
— Not available.	Gender				
# Rounds to zero.	Male	51	51	145	142
‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.	Female	49	49	155	156
* Significantly different (p < .05) from 2016.	Race/ethnicity				
	White	61 *	52	160	158
	Black	14	13	129	128
	Hispanic	17 *	26	134	139
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	6	156	166
	Asian	—	5	—	167
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	—	#	—	‡
	American Indian/Alaska Native	2	1	‡	‡
	Two or More Races	1	2	‡	155
	Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch				
	Eligible	37 *	47	132 *	137
	Not eligible	56 *	45	161	159
	Information not available	8	8	156	161
	Highest level of parental education				
	Did not finish high school	8	8	137	137
	Graduated from high school	17 *	14	138	139
	Some education after high school	17 *	14	154	150
	Graduated from college	47 *	53	161	159
	Type of school				
	Public	92	92	149	148
	Private	8	8	159	164
	Catholic	5	4	169	164
	School location				
	City	29	30	144	145
	Suburb	36	44	155	152
	Town	13	8	149	147
	Rural	22	19	151	148
	Region				
	Northeast	17	16	160	160
	Midwest	24	21	155	148
	South	36	40	147	146
	West	24	23	143	148
	Students with disabilities (SD)				
	SD	11	12	116	113
	Not SD	89	88	154	154
	English language learners (ELL)				
	ELL	6	6	111	113
	Not ELL	94	94	152	151

NOTE: Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Results are not shown for students who reported highest level of parental education was unknown. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The results for students with disabilities and English language learners are based on students who were assessed and cannot be generalized to the total population of such students. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Arts Assessments.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2016b. “NAEP Data Explorer, Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab: National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories.”

<https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/ndecore/xplore/NDE>

DATA TOOLS

NAEP Data Explorer

Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab - Think I have talent for art, National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories

Data Table 1

Average scale scores and percentages for grade 8 visual arts, by I have talent for art [BV00003], National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories [SLUNCH3] and jurisdiction: 2016 and 2008

National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories	Year	Agree		Not sure		Disagree	
		Average scale score	Percent-age	Average scale score	Percent-age	Average scale score	Percent-age
Eligible	2016	140	20	140	37	135	43
	2008	136	24	133	36	131	40
Not eligible	2016	166	21	162	33	154	46
	2008	166	24	162	33	158	43
Information not available	2016	165	22	162	31	156	47
	2008	160	23	154	35	150	42

NOTE: Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Visual Arts Assessments.

Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab - Visual arts taught by full-time specialist, National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories

Data Table 2

Average scale scores and percentages for grade 8 visual arts, by visual arts taught by full-time specialist [SQ00901], National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories [SLUNCH3] and jurisdiction: 2016 and 2008

			Yes		No	
National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories	Year	Jurisdiction	Average scale score	Percent-age	Average scale score	Percent-age
Eligible	2016	National	140	72	133	28
	2008	National	134	74	128	26
Not eligible	2016	National	161	77	154	23
	2008	National	163	81	153	19
Information not available	2016	National	165	63	155	37
	2008	National	153	54	151	46

NOTE: Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Visual Arts Assessments

Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab - District or state has curriculum in visual arts, National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories

Data Table 3

Average scale scores and percentages for grade 8 visual arts, by district or state has curriculum in visual arts [SQ00204], National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories [SLUNCH3] and jurisdiction: 2016 and 2008

			Yes		No	
National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories	Year	Jurisdiction	Average scale score	Percent-age	Average scale score	Percent-age
Eligible	2016	National	139	68	134	32
	2008	National	133	67	129	33
Not eligible	2016	National	160	68	158	32
	2008	National	163	73	158	27
Information not available	2016	National	157	35	163	65
	2008	National	152	52	161	48

NOTE: Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Visual Arts Assessments.

Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab - Space for teaching of visual arts, National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories

Data Table 4

Average scale scores and percentages for grade 8 visual arts, by space for teaching of visual arts [SQ00072], National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories [SLUNCH3] and jurisdiction: 2016 and 2008

		Not Taught		Studio with equipment		Room with no equipment		Classroom only	
National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories	Year	Average scale score	Percentage	Average scale score	Percentage	Average scale score	Percentage	Average scale score	Percentage
Eligible	2016	130	12	140	50	138	28	133	9
	2008	124	11	136	47	131	27	127	12
Not eligible	2016	146	9	163	60	156	23	156	6
	2008	143	5	165	64	157	21	149	7
Information not available	2016	‡	10	167	52	‡	16	‡	8
	2008	‡	16	151	44	159	31	‡	7

‡ Reporting standards not met.

NOTE: Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Visual Arts Assessments.

Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab - Taking art course, National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories

Data Table 5

Average scale scores and percentages for grade 8 visual arts, by taking art course [BV00007], National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories [SLUNCH3] and jurisdiction: 2016 and 2008

			Yes		No	
National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories	Year	Jurisdiction	Average scale score	Percent-age	Average scale score	Percent-age
Eligible	2016	National	142	38	136	62
	2008	National	136	38	131	62
Not eligible	2016	National	165	44	155	56
	2008	National	165	48	157	52
Information not available	2016	National	165	61	153	39
	2008	National	162	57	144	43

NOTE: Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Visual Arts Assessments.

Visual Arts, Grade 8, cross tab - Outside of school make artwork, National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories

Data Table 6

Average scale scores and percentages for grade 8 visual arts, by make artwork outside of school [BV80024], National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories [SLUNCH3] and jurisdiction: 2016 and 2008

			Yes		No	
National School Lunch Program eligibility, 3 categories	Year	Jurisdiction	Average scale score	Percent-age	Average scale score	Percent-age
Eligible	2016	National	143	56	132	44
	2008	National	136	62	127	38
Not eligible	2016	National	165	56	152	44
	2008	National	166	62	153	38
Information not available	2016	National	164	56	154	44
	2008	National	156	61	153	39

NOTE: Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2008 and 2016 Visual Arts Assessments.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2016c. "Achievement Gaps Dashboard."

https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/dashboards/achievement_gaps.aspx#

Achievement Gaps Dashboard

PRINT

The charts on this page show achievement gaps, which are significant differences in assessment scores between two groups of students (for example, male and female students, White and Black students, or White and Hispanic students). Over the years, achievement gaps may widen, narrow, or remain the same depending on the amount of change in the average scores for the two student groups. Find out more about [achievement gaps](#). The tutorial below lists the steps to take to generate achievement gap results.

Achievement Gap Results [VIEW TUTORIAL](#)

JURISDICTION:	STUDENT GROUP 1:	STUDENT GROUP 2:	ADD CROSTAB:		
Nation public an...	Eligible for Natio...	Not eligible for N...	No crosstab	ADD GAP	CLEAR ALL

ARTS: MUSIC (0-300)
Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible-Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

KEY: Eligible Not eligible Significant difference

NOTE: NAEP scales were derived separately by subjects and grades, and therefore scores cannot be compared across subjects and grades. Results for each subject are shown for assessments that are created using the most recent [NAEP frameworks](#). At the national level, accommodations were not permitted in NAEP geography assessments prior to 2001, in NAEP mathematics assessments prior to 1996, in NAEP reading assessments prior to 1998, and in NAEP U.S. history assessments prior to 2001. At the state level, accommodations were not permitted in NAEP mathematics assessments prior to 2000 and in NAEP reading assessments prior to 1998. Results are not shown for data points where the state/jurisdiction or district did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting in a given assessment year. Results are also not shown for those states/jurisdictions or districts with insufficient sample sizes to permit reliable estimates for certain student groups. For the full schedule of NAEP assessments administered at the national, state, and district levels, visit <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/assessmentsched.aspx>. See more information about the history of state participation at <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/state.aspx> and for district participation

at <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/district.aspx#table>. For TUDA districts, beginning in 2009, results for charter schools are included in district results only if they contribute to the district's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report to the U.S. Department of Education. See more detailed information about major reporting groups at <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/guides/groups.aspx>. Although the estimates (e.g., average scores) are shown as rounded numbers in the chart, the positions of the data points in the graphics are based on the unrounded numbers. Unrounded numbers were used for calculating the differences between the estimates, and for the statistical comparison test when the estimates were compared to each other. Not all apparent differences

ARTS: VISUAL ARTS (0-300)

Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible-Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

GRADE 4

GRADE 12

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference * Significant difference ($p < .05$) from most recent year.

between estimates are statistically significant.

CIVICS (0-300)

Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible-Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference

— MATHEMATICS (0–500 AT GRADES 4 AND 8, 0–300 AT GRADE 12)

Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible–Not eligible Score Gap

✖ DELETE GAP

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference * Significantly different ($p < .05$) from most recent year.

— READING (0–500)

Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible–Not eligible Score Gap

✖ DELETE GAP

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference * Significantly different ($p < .05$) from most recent year.

SCIENCE (0-300) Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible-Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference

TECHNOLOGY & ENGINEERING LITERACY (TEL) (0-300) Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible-Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

GRADE 4

NO DATA AVAILABLE

GRADE 12

NO DATA AVAILABLE

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference

U.S. HISTORY (0–500) Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible–Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference

WRITING (0–300) Number of Gaps: 1

Eligible–Not eligible Score Gap

DELETE GAP

GRADE 4

NO DATA AVAILABLE

KEY: ○ Eligible + Not eligible ● Significant difference

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years and subjects: 2008 and 2016 Arts; 1998–2018 Civics; 2006 and 2012 Economics; 1994–2018 Geography; 1990–2019 Mathematics; 1992–2019 Reading; 2009, 2011, and 2015 Science; 2014 and 2018 Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL); 1994–2018 U.S. History; and 1998, 2002, and 2011 Writing Assessments.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2020. “Arts Assessment, 2016, Grade 8.”
https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/arts_2016/#/

REPORTS DASHBOARDS DATA TOOLS [NEWSROOM](#) [FOCUS ON NAEP](#) [SAMPLE QUESTIONS](#)

Arts Assessment

2016 | Grade 8 [Home](#) [Music](#) [Visual Arts](#) [About](#)

63 percent of eighth-graders took a music class; 42 percent took an art class in 2016

Average scores and coursetaking not significantly different from 2008; regional and gender score differences apparent

Average scores for eighth-graders were not significantly different between 2008 and 2016, nor were there significant differences in the percentages of students who reported taking music and/or visual arts classes. However, lower percentages of students reported engaging in some music or visual arts activities outside of school between 2008 and 2016. In addition, average scores differed by gender and regionally across the country in 2016. Students were assessed separately on [responding](#) to existing works of music and visual art and [creating](#) their own original artwork.

In 2016, a total of 8,800 eighth-graders in the nation's public and private schools responded to and critiqued existing works of music and visual art and created their own original artwork. View [summary information about the assessments below](#) or [read complete information in the About section](#).

Average responding score gaps for eighth-grade students assessed in NAEP music and visual arts, by selected student groups: 2016

Music score gap		Visual Arts score gap	
Female	15 pts	Male	Female 14 pts
NSLP Not eligible	26 pts	NSLP eligible	NSLP Not eligible 22 pts
Suburb	13 pts	City	Suburb 8 pts
Private	14 pts	Public	Private 16 pts

● Significant score gap in 2016 **Bold** font indicates higher scoring student group

This report provides additional details about trends in student group performance. For example, in 2016 the score gap between White and Hispanic students narrowed in both music and visual arts. Asian/Pacific Islander students scored higher on average than White students in 2016 in visual arts, while there was no significant difference between their scores in 2008.

Key findings in the 2016 results are as follows:

- Students in the Northeast scored higher on average in visual arts than their peers in the other regions.
- A higher percentage of students in the Northeast reported taking a visual arts course than their peers in the other regions.

Average responding score of eighth-grade students assessed in NAEP visual arts and percentage of students who reported taking a visual arts course in school, by region of the country: 2016

ABOUT THE ASSESSMENT

Visual arts portion of the assessment

The assessment measured students' ability to [respond](#) to art as well as their ability to [create](#) original artwork. Responding questions asked students to analyze and describe works of art and design. For example, a responding question asked students to analyze the aesthetic properties of two self-portraits created by twentieth-century artists and to identify technical similarities between the two artworks. The average responding score for visual arts was reported on a 0–300 scale.

Creating questions required students to design and create their own works of art. For example, students were asked to create a self-portrait that was scored for identifying detail, compositional elements, and use of a variety of provided [arts materials](#). The average [creating task score](#) was reported separately from responding scores as the average percentage of the maximum possible score from 0–100.

The Story of NAEP

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a continuing and nationally representative measure of trends in academic achievement of U.S. elementary and secondary students in various

subjects. It is the largest continuing and nationally representative assessment of what our nation's students know and can do in select subjects. It was first administered in 1969 to measure student achievement nationally. Teachers, principals, parents, policymakers, and researchers all use NAEP results to assess progress and develop ways to improve education in the United States. [Read more](#)

APPENDIX E. EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS

Common Core State Standards Initiative. 2020. “Development Process.”

<http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/>

The state-led effort to develop the Common Core State Standards was launched in 2009 by state leaders, including governors and state commissioners of education from 48 states, two territories and the District of Columbia (<https://www.nga.org/cms/home/special/col2-content/common-core-state-standards-init.html>), through their membership in the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). State school chiefs and governors recognized the value of consistent, real-world learning goals and launched this effort to ensure all students, regardless of where they live, are graduating high school prepared for college, career, and life.

The standards are informed by:

- The best state standards already in existence
- The experience of teachers, content experts, states, and leading thinkers
- Feedback from the public

The full list of criteria used to develop the standards is available here (<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Criteria.pdf>).

Timeline for the Development of College- and Career-Readiness Standards and K-12 Standards

State education standards have been around since the early 1990s. By the early 2000s, every state had developed and adopted its own learning standards that specify what students in grades 3-8 and high school should be able to do. Every state also had its own definition of proficiency, which is the level at which a student is determined to be sufficiently educated at each grade level and upon graduation. This lack of standardization was one reason why states decided to develop the Common Core State Standards in 2009.

The development of the Common Core State Standards is a success story of meaningful, state-led change to help all students succeed.

During the development process, the standards were divided into two categories:

- **First, the college- and career-readiness standards**, which address what students are expected to know and understand by the time they graduate from high school
- **Second, the K-12 standards**, which address expectations for elementary school through high school

The college- and career-readiness standards were developed first and then incorporated into the K-12 standards in the final version of the Common Core we have today. The National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) received nearly 10,000 comments on the standards during two public comment periods. Many of the comments from teachers, parents, school administrators, and other citizens concerned with education policy helped shape the final version of the standards.

Teachers played a critical role in development

The Common Core State Standards drafting process relied on teachers and standards experts from across the country. Teachers were involved in the development process in four ways:

- 1) They served on the Work Groups and Feedback Groups for the ELA and math standards.
- 2) The National Education Association (NEA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), among other organizations were instrumental in bringing together teachers to provide specific, constructive feedback on the standards
- 3) Teachers were members of teams states convened to provide regular feedback on drafts of the standards.
- 4) Teachers provided input on the Common Core State Standards during the two public comment periods.

Adoption

Once the development process concluded, [states began voluntarily adopting](http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/) (<http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/>) the Common Core State Standards based on their existing process for education standard adoption. In most states, the state school board members formally adopted the standards. In others, the decision was made or ratified by the state superintendent of education, State Legislature, or governor.

Today, 41 states, the District of Columbia, four territories, and the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) have adopted the Common Core and are implementing the standards according to their own timelines. To learn more about the standards in your state and for information on how states that adopted the Common Core are implementing them, visit the [“Standards in Your State”](http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/) (<http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/>) section.

National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. 2014a.
 “Philosophical Foundations and Lifelong Goals.”

<https://sites.google.com/nccas.org/nccas-wikispace/standards-components/philosophical-foundations-lifelong-goals>

Philosophical Foundations & Lifelong Goals

The philosophical foundations and lifelong goals establish the basis for the new standards and illuminate artistic literacy by expressing the overarching common values and expectations for learning in arts education across the five arts disciplines. For a full explanation of artistic literacy please see the Conceptual Framework.

The Arts as Communication

In today's multimedia society, the arts are the media, and therefore provide powerful and essential means of communication. The arts provide unique symbol systems and metaphors that convey and inform life experience (i.e., the arts are ways of knowing). Artistically literate citizens use a variety of artistic media, symbols and metaphors to independently create and perform work that expresses and communicates their own ideas, and are able to respond by analyzing and interpreting the artistic communications of others.

The Arts as Creative Personal Realization

Participation in each of the arts as creators, performers, and audience members enables individuals to discover and develop their own creative capacity, thereby providing a source of lifelong satisfaction. Artistically literate citizens find at least one arts discipline in which they develop sufficient competence to continue active involvement in creating, performing, and responding to art as an adult.

The Arts as Culture, History, and Connectors

Throughout history the arts have provided essential means for individuals and communities to express their ideas, experiences, feelings, and deepest beliefs. Each discipline shares common goals, but approaches them through distinct media and techniques. Understanding artwork provides insights into individuals' own and others' cultures and societies, while also providing opportunities to access, express, and integrate meaning across a variety of content areas. Artistically literate citizens know and understand artwork from varied historical periods and cultures, and actively seek and appreciate diverse forms and genres of artwork of enduring quality/significance. They also seek to understand relationships among the arts, and cultivate habits of searching for and identifying patterns, relationships between the arts and other knowledge.

The Arts as Means to Wellbeing

Participation in the arts as creators, performers, and audience members (responders) enhances mental, physical, and emotional wellbeing. Artistically literate citizens find joy, inspiration, peace, intellectual stimulation, meaning, and other life-enhancing qualities through participation in all of the arts. The Arts as Community Engagement The arts provide means for individuals to collaborate and connect with others in an enjoyable inclusive environment as they create, prepare, and share artwork that bring communities together. Artistically literate citizens seek artistic experience and support the arts in their local, state, national, and global communities.

National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (2014) National Core Arts Standards. Rights Administered by the State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education. Dover, DE, www.nationalcoreartsstandards.org all rights reserved.

National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. 2014b. *National Core Arts Standards: A Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning*.

<https://www.nationalartsstandards.org/sites/default/files/Conceptual%20Framework%202007-21-16.pdf>

3

The Context for Arts Education

Arts education has had a formal place in American schools at least since the early 1800s. The unique and essential contributions of the arts to every child's growth and development were as clear to Americans then as they are to us today. Unfortunately, children's access to arts education as part of their core education continues to be uneven across our nation's nearly 14,000 school districts. Some local education agencies currently offer a full, balanced education that includes rich and varied arts opportunities for their students. However, too many schools have succumbed to funding challenges or embraced a narrow focus on tested subjects, resulting in minimal, if any, arts experiences for the children they serve.

Narrow curricula and wide variances in the breadth of subject areas offered are incompatible with the ideal of a comprehensive public education. The underlying challenge seems to be how we can organize concepts, manage systems, and leverage resources to provide a better education for every child. The original 1964 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was designed to address problems of educational equity, particularly for high-poverty students. Through its most recent revision, the 2001 act known as *No Child Left Behind*, ESEA continues to be a driving force in education at the federal and consequently at the state and local levels.

The status of arts education in federal law (and, more importantly, in American schools) has also evolved over time. While arts education has been subject to less data-gathering than subjects such as mathematics and English language arts, we do know enough to present a relatively accurate picture of the status of arts education in today's schools. The Department of Education's Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) report, *Arts Education In Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1999-2000 and 2009-10*, affirmed that there is a real and robust infrastructure of arts education in American schools. However, it also revealed extreme inequities in students' access to arts education, indicating that arts education is not universally available, is too often limited to music and art, and is inconsistent across grade levels.¹

These inequities in learning opportunity have, not surprisingly, resulted in lackluster achievement, as evidenced in student scores on the *2008 National Assessment of Education Progress* (NAEP) in music and visual arts. (NAEP did not test theatre and dance students, nor were the media arts a part of the study.)

- ¹ At the elementary level, 94% of our schools offer music, 83% offer visual arts. Fewer schools at this level offer dance or theatre: 3% included dance and 4% offered theatre.
- At the elementary level (at least three times per week) is offered in the following percentages of schools: 15% for music, 8 percent for visual arts. The percentages for dance and theatre were not measured.
- At the elementary level, 88% of classroom teachers include arts as part of their ongoing instruction
- At the eighth grade level, 57% of eighth graders attend schools offering a credible level of instruction in music; the figure for visual arts is 47%, while data for dance and theatre were not collected.
- At the eighth grade level, there are differences (many of which are statistically significant) in achievement levels between some of the diverse ethnic, economic and geographic groups served by American schools. That is, minorities, poorer children, and urban schools seem to achieve less in the arts.
- Some arts programs are provided on a co-curricular (having an academic and extra-curricular component) or extra-curricular basis. At the middle and secondary levels, for example, 82% of queried theatre educators classified their programs as co-curricular, and 13% said that their programs were strictly extra-curricular.
- At the secondary level, 91% of our schools offer music, 89% offer visual arts, 12% offer dance, and 45% offer theatre.
- Americans' reports of lifetime learning in the arts (as children or as adults) show that about one-third of our citizens have taken lessons or classes in music; about 17% have done so in visual arts, about 12 percent in dance, and about six percent in theatre. These percentages have been declining at least for the past three decades.

11

Artistic processes The Artistic Processes are the cognitive and physical actions by which arts learning and making are realized. Inspired by the [1997 National Assessment of Education Progress](#) (NAEP) Arts Education Assessment Framework, the National Core Arts Standards are based on the artistic processes of Creating; Performing/ Producing/Presenting; Responding; and Connecting. Each of the arts disciplines incorporates these processes in some manner. These processes define and organize the link between the art and the learner.

The identification of these Artistic Processes was informed by two studies conducted by the College Board: [A Review of Selected State Arts Standards](#) and [International Arts Education Standards: A Survey of the Arts Education Standards and Practices of Fifteen Countries and Regions](#). The former reviewed a series of recently revised arts education standards from states and large districts nationwide, noting trends in the structure and organization of these standards, as well as finding commonalities among their guiding philosophies. The researchers found that the NAEP framework was a significant source of influence in many recent standards revisions. The framework of creating, performing, and responding became a foundational element for the structure and content of the standards of several states: Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Washington, among others. In the other study, College Board researchers reviewed the recently created standards of 15 countries worldwide. In 14 of the studied countries, the skills of creating, performing, and responding were found to form the core of these international examples as well, though the terminology varied.

Included in the NAEP framework were definitions for creating, performing, and responding. The writing groups of the National Core Arts Standards have broadened the NAEP definitions and in some cases made them discipline-centric. Though the NCCAS definitions are shorter, the use of verbs suggests that the arts operate in an active “hands-on” and “minds-on” capacity.

CREATE (NAEP definition)	CREATING (NCCAS definition)
Creating refers to generating original art.	Conceiving and developing new artistic ideas and work.
PERFORM (NAEP definition)	PERFORMING/PRODUCING PRESENTING (NCCAS definition)
Performing/interpreting means performing an existing work, a process that calls upon the interpretive or re-creative skills of the student.	Performing (dance, music, theatre): Realizing artistic ideas and work through interpretation and presentation. Presenting (visual arts): Interpreting and sharing artistic work. Producing (media arts): Realizing and presenting artistic ideas and work.
<i>Note: The various arts disciplines have chosen different words to represent this artistic process; however, they are clustered here as essentially parallel.</i>	

12

RESPOND (NAEP definition)	RESPONDING (NCCAS definition)
Responding varies from that of an audience member to the interactive response between a student and a particular medium.	Understanding and evaluating how the arts convey meaning
NAEP definition	CONNECTING (NCCAS definition)
N/A	Relating artistic ideas and work with personal meaning and external context.

The current set of arts standards emerge from the Artistic Processes of Creating, Performing/Presenting/Producing, Responding, and Connecting. Each artistic process branches into two or three anchor standards. The performance standards, which describe student learning in each of the specific arts disciplines, align with anchor standards. Collectively, the design reflects a cohesive and aligned system that allows for commonality across the disciplines and specificity within each discipline, therefore establishing the appropriate level of breadth and depth required for national standards. The model below represents a portion of the full design.

Anchor standards

Anchor standards describe the general knowledge and skill that teachers expect students to demonstrate throughout their education in the arts. These anchor standards are parallel across arts disciplines and grade levels and serve as the tangible educational expression of artistic literacy.

National Core Arts Standards Artistic Processes and Anchor Standards			
Artistic Processes			
Creating Definition: Conceiving and developing new artistic ideas and work.	Performing/Presenting/Producing Definitions: Performing: Realizing artistic ideas and work through interpretation and presentation. Presenting: Interpreting and sharing artistic work. Producing: Realizing and presenting artistic ideas and work.	Responding Definition: Understanding and evaluating how the arts convey meaning.	Connecting Definition: Relating artistic ideas and work with personal meaning and external context.
Anchor Standards			
Students will: 1. Generate and conceptualize artistic ideas and work. 2. Organize and develop artistic ideas and work. 3. Refine and complete artistic work.	Students will: 4. Select, analyze, and interpret artistic work for presentation. 5. Develop and refine artistic techniques and work for presentation. 6. Convey meaning through the presentation of artistic work.	Students will: 7. Perceive and analyze artistic work. 8. Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work. 9. Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work.	Students will: 10. Synthesize and relate knowledge and personal experiences to make art. 11. Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural and historical context to deepen understanding.

Performance standards

Performance standards are discipline-specific (dance, media arts, music, visual arts, theatre), grade-by-grade articulations of student achievement in the arts PK-8 and at three proficiency levels in high school (proficient, accomplished and advanced). As such, the performance standards translate the anchor standards into specific, measurable learning goals.

Instructional resources

Completing the design features of the model, instructional resources are provided to support teachers as they build understanding about the new standards and consider multiple ways to implement the standards in their classrooms. The instructional resources include: enduring understandings and essential questions; process components; glossaries; and model cornerstone assessment with key traits. Instructional resources receive different emphasis based on various approaches to teaching and learning in individual disciplines. The web application of each discipline's resources reflects these differences.

National Core Arts Standards. 2019. "State Adoption of New Arts Education Standards since 2014."

<https://www.nationalartsstandards.org/map>

State Adoption of New Arts Education Standards Since 2014

Scroll over each state to see its revision status. Click to be directed to more information from each state's education department.

A State-by-State Breakdown

- States with revised arts standards in all disciplines
- States with revised arts competencies
- States with arts standards revised in 1+ disciplines
- States currently in revision cycle
- States with no current plans for revision

Note: The Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools across the world have revised their arts standards to adopt the core arts standards (Music, Theatre, Visual Arts). Read the standards here: www.dodea.edu/Curriculum/FineArts

Data as of November 2019

Since the June, 2014 release of the National Core Arts Standards, twenty seven states and the Department of Defense have adopted revised arts standards in one or more arts disciplines. An additional state, New Hampshire, has updated Arts Competencies for its schools. Currently, ten states are in the process of revising their state arts standards. Some states have adopted the voluntary national standards as their own, other states reviewed or made changes to their standards employing the National Core Arts Standards as one of their revision sources. Many states have acknowledged the emerging art form of media arts by adopting standards for education in the media arts as a part of their revision processes. As of January 31, 2018, of the states who have revised their standards or competencies, twenty two have added standards for media arts education and an additional three other states who are in the process of revising will be including media arts standards.

In many ways, the standards revision process can serve as an intersecting point of dialogue and communication as communities reflect on what it means to have access to a high quality education in the arts and why it is important. The creation of the National Core Arts Standards themselves prompted deep and meaningful conversations among the member organizations that created them and the more than 130 arts educators and 6,000 reviewers who participated in their creation. In turn, the publication of these voluntary National Core Arts Standards can prompt a rich dialogue between students, educators, administrators, policy makers, parents and community members about access and advocacy for the arts to ensure artistic literacy for all.

Read the complete report, [The Status of Arts Standards Revision in the United States Since 2014](#).

National Science Teaching Association. 2020. "About the Next Generation Science Standards."

<https://ngss.nsta.org/about.aspx#>

ngss.nsta.org/about.aspx#

nsta
National Science Teaching Association

NGSS@NSTA
STEM STARTS HERE

[Log In]

Search NGSS@NSTA. Q

Home About NGSS The Standards Curriculum Planning Classroom Resources Professional Learning NGSS Blog

About the Next Generation Science Standards

Less Memorizing, More Sense Making

Making Connections to Common Core

Grounding Practice in Research

Applying Knowledge in Context

What is NGSS?

- What is a "standard"?
- How are they organized?
- How were the standards developed?
- Compare NGSS to existing state standards
- View the standards
- A New Vision for Science Education

Why Do We Need NGSS?

- This is what good science education looks like
- Research shows students learn better with this three-dimensional model
- Why is NGSS Important Now

Support for NGSS

- NSTA Position Statement
- NARST Position Statement

K-12 Science Standards Adoption

Click on a state for more information!

Adopted NGSS Standards based on the Framework

Forty-four states (representing 71% of U.S. students) have education standards influenced by the *Framework for K-12 Science Education* and/or the *Next Generation Science Standards*.

Adopted NGSS Twenty states and the District of Columbia (representing over 36% of U.S. students) have adopted the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). The 20 states are Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington.

Standards based on the Framework Twenty-four states (representing 35% of U.S. students) have developed their own standards based on recommendations in the NRC Framework for K-12 Science Education. The 24 states are Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

For Parents

- Parent Q&A
- NGSS K-12 Parent Guides

For Administrators

- NGSS Overview for Principals

Copyright © 2014 NSTA

Next Generation Science Standards. 2020a. “Developing the Standards.”

<https://www.nextgenscience.org/developing-standards/developing-standards>

Developing the Standards

NGSS Development Overview

The NRC, NSTA, AAAS, and Achieve completed a two-step process to develop the Next Generation Science Standards.

Step One: Getting the Science Right The NRC, the staff arm of the National Academy of Sciences, began by developing the *Framework for K–12 Science Education* (http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13165). The *Framework* was a critical first step because it is grounded in the most current research on science and [science learning](#) (/standards-background-research-and-reports) and identified the science all K–12 students should know upon completion of high school.

To undertake this effort, the NRC convened a committee of 18 individuals who are nationally and internationally known in their respective fields. The committee was composed of practicing scientists, including two Nobel laureates, cognitive scientists, science education researchers, and science education standards and policy experts. In addition, the NRC used four design teams to develop the Framework. These design teams, in physical science, life science, earth/space science, and engineering, developed the framework for their respective disciplinary area. A public draft was released in July of 2010. The NRC reviewed comments and considered all feedback prior to releasing the final Framework on July 19, 2011. Read more about the *Framework* online [here](#) (http://sites.nationalacademies.org/dbasse/bose/framework_k12_science/index.htm).

Step Two: States Developing Next Generation Science Standards In a process managed by Achieve, states led the development of K–12 science standards that are rich in content and practice and arranged in a coherent manner across disciplines and grades to provide all students an internationally-benchmarked science education. The NGSS are based on the *Framework* and will prepare students for college and careers. The NGSS were developed collaboratively with states and other stakeholders in science, science education, higher education, and industry. Additional review and guidance were provided by advisory committees composed of nationally-recognized leaders in science and science education as well as business and industry.

As part of the development process, the standards underwent multiple reviews from many stakeholders including two public drafts, allowing all who have a stake in science education an opportunity to inform the development of the standards. This process produced a set of high quality, college- and career-ready K–12 *Next Generation Science Standards* ready for state adoption. The standards were published on this website after their completion in April 2013.

Next Generation Science Standards. 2020b. "Appendix M. Connections to CCSS-Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects," *Getting to Know the Standards*.

https://www.nextgenscience.org/sites/default/files/Appendix%20M%20Connections%20to%20the%20CCSS%20for%20Literacy_061213.pdf

APPENDIX M – Connections to the Common Core State Standards for Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects¹

Literacy skills are critical to building knowledge in science. To ensure the CCSS literacy standards work in tandem with the specific content demands outlined in the NGSS, the NGSS development team worked with the CCSS writing team to identify key literacy connections to the specific content demands outlined in the NGSS. As the CCSS affirms, reading in science requires an appreciation of the norms and conventions of the discipline of science, including understanding the nature of evidence used, an attention to precision and detail, and the capacity to make and assess intricate arguments, synthesize complex information, and follow detailed procedures and accounts of events and concepts. Students also need to be able to gain knowledge from elaborate diagrams and data that convey information and illustrate scientific concepts. Likewise, writing and presenting information orally are key means for students to assert and defend claims in science, demonstrate what they know about a concept, and convey what they have experienced, imagined, thought, and learned.

Every effort has been made to ensure consistency between the CCSS and the NGSS. As is the case with the mathematics standards, NGSS should always be interpreted and implemented in such a way that they do not outpace or misalign to the grade-by-grade standards in the CCSS for literacy (this includes the development of NGSS-aligned instructional materials and assessments). Below are the NGSS Science and Engineering Practices and the corresponding CCSS Literacy Anchor Standards and portions of the Standards for Science and Technical Subjects.

Connections to the English/language arts (ELA) CCSS are included across all disciplines and grade bands in the final version of the NGSS. However, Appendix M focuses on connections to the Standards for Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects, which only cover grades 6–12. Therefore this appendix likewise only lists connections for grades 6–12. The K–12 ELA connections that are currently listed in the NGSS connection boxes will also be added to this appendix in the near future. See the Common Core State Standards website for more information about the Literacy standards: <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy>.

¹ Many thanks to the contributions of Susan Pimentel in the development of this document..

Science and Engineering Practice: Asking Questions and Defining Problems Students at any grade level should be able to ask questions of each other about the texts they read, the features of the phenomena they observe, and the conclusions they draw from their models or scientific investigations. For engineering, they should ask questions to define the problem to be solved and to elicit ideas that lead to the constraints and specifications for its solution. (NRC <i>Framework</i> 2012, p. 56)	
Supporting CCSS Literacy Anchor Standards and Relevant Portions of the Corresponding Standards for Science and Technical Subjects	Connection to Science and Engineering Practice
CCR Reading Anchor #1: Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text. • RST.6-8.1: "...support analysis of science and technical texts." • RST.9-10.1: "...support analysis of science and technical texts, attending to the precise details of explanations or descriptions." • RST.11-12.1: "...support analysis of science and technical texts, attending to important distinctions the author makes and to any gaps or inconsistencies in the account."	Evidence plays a critical role in the kinds of questions asked, information gathered, and findings reported in science and technical texts. The notion of close reading in Reading Standard 1 emphasizes the use of asking and refining questions in order to answer them with evidence that is either explicitly stated or implied.
CCR Reading Anchor #7: Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse formats and media, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words. • RST.6-8.7: "Integrate quantitative or technical information expressed in words in a text with a version of that information expressed visually (e.g., in a flowchart, diagram, model, graph, or table)." • RST.9-10.7: "Translate quantitative or technical information expressed in words in a text into visual form (e.g., a table or chart) and translate information expressed visually or mathematically (e.g., in an equation) into words." • RST.11-12.7: "...evaluate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats and media (e.g., quantitative data, video, multimedia) in order to address a question or solve a problem."	Scientists and engineers present data in a myriad of visual formats in order to reveal meaningful patterns and trends. Reading Standard 7 speaks directly to the importance of asking questions about and evaluating data presented in different formats.
CCR Reading Anchor #8: Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence. • RST.6-8.8: "Distinguish among facts, reasoned judgment based on research findings, and speculation..." • RST.9-10.8: "Assess the extent to which the reasoning and evidence in a text support the author's claim or a recommendation for solving a scientific or technical problem." • RST.11-12.8: "Evaluate the hypotheses, data, analysis, and conclusions in a science or technical text, verifying the data when possible and corroborating or challenging conclusions with other sources of information."	Challenging or clarifying scientific hypotheses, arguments, experiments or conclusions—and the evidence and premises that support them—are key to this practice. Reading Standard 8 emphasizes evaluating the validity of arguments and whether the evidence offered backs up the claims logically.

CCR Writing Anchor #7: Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation. • RST.6-8.7: "...answer a question (including a self-generated question)...generating additional related, focused questions that allow for multiple avenues of exploration." • RST.9-12.7: "...narrow or broaden inquiry when appropriate..."	Generating focused questions and well-honed scientific inquiries are key to conducting investigations and defining problems. The research practices reflected in Writing Standard 7 reflect the skills needed for successful completion of such research-based inquiries.
CCR Speaking & Listening Anchor #1: Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. • SL.8.1: "...Pose...specific questions by making comments that contribute to the discussion..." • SL.9-10.1: "...posing and responding to questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas..." • SL.11-12.1: "...posing and responding to questions that probe reasoning and evidence..."	The ability to pose relevant questions, clarify or elaborate on the ideas of others or request information from others are crucial to learning and conducting investigations in science class. Speaking and Listening Standard 1 speaks directly to the importance of asking and refining questions to clarify ideas that generate solutions and explanations.
CCR Speaking & Listening Anchor #3: Evaluate a speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric. • SL.8.3: "...evaluating the soundness of the reasoning and sufficiency of the evidence, and identifying when irrelevant evidence is introduced." • SL.9-10.3: "...identifying fallacious reasoning or exaggerated or distorted evidence." • SL.11-12.3: "...assessing the stance, premises, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis."	Evaluating the soundness of a speaker's reasoning and evidence concerning scientific theories and concepts through a series of inquiries teaches students to be discriminating thinkers. Speaking and Listening Standard 3 directly asserts that students must be able to critique a point of view from the perspective of the evidence provided and reasoning advanced.

U.S. Department of Education. 1994. *National Standards for Arts Education: Summary Statement: Education Reform, Standards, and the Arts.*

<https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/ArtsStandards.html>

Archived Information

National Standards for Arts Education

Summary Statement: Education Reform, Standards, and the Arts

Dance, Music, Theatre, Visual Arts

What Students Should Know and Be Able to Do in the Arts

There are many routes to competence in the arts disciplines. Students may work in different arts at different times. Their study may take a variety of approaches. Their abilities may develop at different rates. Competence means the ability to use an array of knowledge and skills. Terms often used to describe these include creation, performance, production, history, culture, perception, analysis, criticism, aesthetics, technology, and appreciation. Competence means capabilities with these elements themselves and an understanding of their interdependence; it also means the ability to combine the content, perspectives, and techniques associated with the various elements to achieve specific artistic and analytical goals. Students work toward *comprehensive* competence from the very beginning, preparing in the lower grades for deeper and more rigorous work each succeeding year. As a result, the joy of experiencing the arts is enriched and matured by the discipline of learning and the pride of accomplishment. Essentially, the Standards ask that students should know and be able to do the following by the time they have completed secondary school:

- *They should be able to communicate at a basic level in the four arts disciplines--dance, music, theatre, and the visual arts.* This includes knowledge and skills in the use of the basic vocabularies, materials, tools, techniques, and intellectual methods of each arts discipline.
- *They should be able to communicate proficiently in at least one art form,* including the ability to define and solve artistic problems with insight, reason, and technical proficiency.
- *They should be able to develop and present basic analyses of works of art* from structural, historical, and cultural perspectives, and from combinations of those perspectives. This includes the ability to understand and evaluate work in the various arts disciplines.
- *They should have an informed acquaintance with exemplary works of art from a variety of cultures and historical periods,* and a basic understanding of historical development in the arts disciplines, across the arts as a whole, and within cultures.
- *They should be able to relate various types of arts knowledge and skills within and across the arts disciplines.* This includes mixing and matching competencies and understandings in art-making, history and culture, and analysis in any arts-related project.

As a result of developing these capabilities, students can arrive at their own knowledge, beliefs, and values for making personal and artistic decisions. In other terms, they can arrive at a broad-based, well-grounded understanding of the nature, value, and meaning of the arts as a part of their own humanity.

Summary Statement

These *National Standards for Arts Education* are a statement of what every young American should know and be able to do in four arts disciplines--dance, music, theatre, and the visual arts. Their scope is grades K-12, and they speak to both content and achievement.

The Reform Context The Standards are one outcome of the education reform effort generated in the 1980s, which emerged in several states and attained nationwide visibility with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. This national wake-up call was powerfully effective. Six national education goals were announced in 1990. Now there is a broad effort to describe, specifically, the knowledge and skills students must have in all subjects to fulfill their personal potential, to become productive and competitive workers in a global economy, and to take their places as adult citizens. With the passage of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*, the national goals are written into law, naming the arts as a core, academic subject--as important to education as English, mathematics, history, civics and government, geography, science, and foreign language.

At the same time, the Act calls for education standards in these subject areas, both to encourage high achievement by our young people and to provide benchmarks to determine how well they are learning and performing. In 1992, anticipating that education standards would emerge as a focal point of the reform legislation, the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations successfully approached the U.S. Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities for a grant to determine what the nation's school children should know and be able to do in the arts. This document is the result of an extended process of consensus-building that drew on the broadest possible range of expertise and participation. The process involved the review of state-level arts education frameworks, standards from other nations, and consideration at a series of national forums.

The Importance of Standards Agreement on what students should know and be able to do is essential if education is to be consistent, efficient, and effective. In this context, Standards for arts education are important for two basic reasons. First, they help define what a good education in the arts should provide: a thorough grounding in a basic body of knowledge and the skills required both to make sense and make use of the arts disciplines. Second, when states and school districts adopt these Standards, they are taking a stand for rigor in a part of education that has too often, and wrongly, been treated as optional. This document says, in effect, "an education in the arts means that students should know what is spelled out here, and they should reach clear levels of attainment at these grade levels."

These Standards provide a vision of competence and educational effectiveness, but without creating a mold into which all arts programs must fit. The Standards are concerned with the *results* (in the form of student learning) that come from a basic education in the arts, *not with how those results ought to be delivered*. Those matters are for states, localities, and classroom teachers to decide. In other words, while the Standards provide educational goals and not a curriculum, they can help improve all types of arts instruction.

The Importance of Arts Education Knowing and practicing the arts disciplines are fundamental to the healthy development of children's minds and spirits. That is why, in any civilization--ours included--the arts are inseparable from the very meaning of the term "education." We know from long experience that no one can claim to be truly educated who lacks basic knowledge and skills in the arts. There are many reasons for this assertion:

- The arts are worth studying simply because of what they are. Their impact cannot be denied. Throughout history, all the arts have served to connect our imaginations with the deepest questions of human existence: Who am I? What must I do? Where am I going? Studying responses to those questions through time and across cultures--as well as acquiring the tools and knowledge to create one's own responses--is essential not only to understanding life but to living it fully.
- The arts are used to achieve a multitude of human purposes: to present issues and ideas, to teach or persuade, to entertain, to decorate or please. Becoming literate in the arts helps students understand and do these things better.
- The arts are integral to every person's daily life. Our personal, social, economic, and cultural environments are shaped by the arts at every turn--from the design of the child's breakfast placemat,

to the songs on the commuter's car radio, to the family's night-time TV drama, to the teenager's Saturday dance, to the enduring influences of the classics.

- The arts offer unique sources of enjoyment and refreshment for the imagination. They explore relationships between ideas and objects and serve as links between thought and action. Their continuing gift is to help us see and grasp life in new ways.
- There is ample evidence that the arts help students develop the attitudes, characteristics, and intellectual skills required to participate effectively in today's society and economy. The arts teach self-discipline, reinforce self-esteem, and foster the thinking skills and creativity so valued in the workplace. They teach the importance of teamwork and cooperation. They demonstrate the direct connection between study, hard work, and high levels of achievement.

The Benefits of Arts Education Arts education benefits the *student* because it cultivates the whole child, gradually building many kinds of literacy while developing intuition, reasoning, imagination, and dexterity into unique forms of expression and communication. This process requires not merely an active mind but a trained one. An education in the arts benefits *society* because students of the arts gain powerful tools for understanding human experiences, both past and present. They learn to respect the often very different ways others have of thinking, working, and expressing themselves. They learn to make decisions in situations where there are no standard answers. By studying the arts, students stimulate their natural creativity and learn to develop it to meet the needs of a complex and competitive society. And, as study and competence in the arts reinforce one other, the joy of learning becomes real, tangible, and powerful.

The Arts and Other Core Subjects The Standards address competence in the arts disciplines first of all. But that competence provides a firm foundation for connecting arts-related concepts and facts across the art forms, and from them to the sciences and humanities. For example, the intellectual methods of the arts are precisely those used to transform scientific disciplines and discoveries into everyday technology.

What Must We Do? The educational success of our children depends on creating a society that is both literate and imaginative, both competent and creative. That goal depends, in turn, on providing children with tools not only for understanding that world but for contributing to it and making their own way. Without the arts to help shape students' perceptions and imaginations, our children stand every chance of growing into adulthood as culturally disabled. We must not allow that to happen.

Without question, the Standards presented here will need supporters and allies to improve how arts education is organized and delivered. They have the potential to change education policy at all levels, and to make a transforming impact across the entire spectrum of education.

But only if they are implemented.

Teachers, of course, will be the leaders in this process. In many places, more teachers with credentials in the arts, as well as better-trained teachers in general, will be needed. Site-based management teams, school boards, state education agencies, state and local arts agencies, and teacher education institutions will all have a part to play, as will local mentors, artists, local arts organizations, and members of the community. Their support is crucial for the Standards to succeed. But the primary issue is the ability to bring together and deliver a broad range of competent instruction. All else is secondary.

In the end, truly successful implementation can come about only when students and their learning are at the center, which means motivating and enabling them to meet the Standards. With a steady gaze on that target, these Standards can empower America's schools to make changes consistent with the best any of us can envision, for our children and for our society.

APPENDIX F. ADDITIONAL WEBSITE SOURCES

A+ Schools of North Carolina. 2020. "A+ Schools as a Change Agent."

<https://www.ncarts.org/aplus-schools/impact/schools-change-agent>

A+ SCHOOLS AS A CHANGE AGENT

A+ Schools of North Carolina is research-based school reform. From the beginning, A+ Schools has been the subject of a comprehensive program evaluation to understand the efficacy and effectiveness of our education model. Additionally, the North Carolina Arts Council, in collaboration with the Department of Public Instruction, collects data on participating schools each year to determine how individual A+ schools are doing over time, what specific professional development is needed, and if any broader program-wide course corrections should be considered.

To better understand what happens to a school when it first adopts the A+ model, our research team analyzed a seven-year sample of data from more than 20 A+ schools. The data mining started two years before each school entered the program through the first three years of A+ training. Here is what we discovered:

Participation in A+ increases overall school performance. Following the initial three years of implementation, schools meet growth goals. The School Performance Score increased by a full letter grade for each of the schools that entered the network in 2013.

A+ students gain proficiency. The number of students achieving grade-level proficiency increases as students experience A+ implementation. In the 2013-16 cohort, the number of students achieving grade-level proficiency increased by an average of 22 percent.

A+ levels the playing field. Students who are traditionally the most marginalized show the largest and quickest gains in student achievement following A+ implementation.

There is a positive cumulative effect on student growth and achievement with prolonged A+ engagement. The more years that a school actively engages with A+, the stronger the achievement of its students.

Successful A+ schools report **improved attendance, fewer disciplinary problems, stronger teacher satisfaction, and higher levels of community and parental involvement.**

The North Carolina Arts Council is a division of the Department of Natural and Cultural Resources, a state agency.

Susi H. Hamilton, Secretary; Roy Cooper, Governor

Copyright © 2020 North Carolina Arts Council. All rights reserved.

American Alliance of Museums, Education Committee. 2005. *Excellence in Practice: Museums Education Principles and Standards*.

Today most museums continue to struggle with the political realities of implementing the primary premise of *Excellence and Equity*: to combine “intellectual rigor with the inclusion of a broader spectrum of our diverse society.” With increased responsibility and scrutiny, the museum educator’s role has been shifted, revised, reformed, and stretched in unimaginable ways. As the Committee on Education releases its revised Principles and Standards, it does so a little older and a little wiser.

For two years a working draft has circulated to members of the museum community, through mailings to EdCom members, discussions at regional and national meetings, and finally at working roundtables during the 2001 Annual Meeting at St. Louis. The final product, *Excellence in Practice: Museum Education Principles and Standards* combines key concepts of the 1990 standards with current directions in best practice. The 2002 document is more descriptive of the complexity of engaging a diverse audience in vital and meaningful learning experiences. It stresses the importance of interdepartmental teamwork in the achievement of the museum’s education mission; the responsible use of new technologies; an emphasis on rigorous planning, implementation, and assessment; and the importance of public advocacy to the future stability and strength of museums.

Museums are committed to sharing their remarkable resources for the advancement of knowledge and the nourishment of the human spirit. All museum trustees, employees, and volunteers should work together to ensure that:

- a museum’s mission articulates its commitment to present its educational resources with accuracy, clarity, and relevance to a wide variety of audiences;
- interpretive programs seek out multiple perspectives in the exchange of ideas and in the collection and presentation of objects;
- information gathering and assessment provide evidence of visitor learning and the museum’s impact;
- appropriate technologies are used to expand access to knowledge and self-directed learning;
- the museum working environment is respectful of different voices as institutional policies, programs, and products are shaped.

Museum educators are specialists who help museums fulfill their educational mission. They recognize that many factors affect the personal, voluntary learning that occurs in museums. They seek to promote the process of individual and group discovery and to document its effect. On museum teams, museum educators serve as audience advocates and work to provide meaningful and lasting learning experiences for a diverse public.

Since there is no single way to fulfill a museum’s educational mission, and museum education includes a broad range of responsibilities, the following principles of best practice for education in museums and professional standards for museum educators provide guidelines for all museum professionals who are concerned with the needs of museum visitors.

These principles and standards are organized into three functional areas related to museum education: accessibility, accountability and advocacy.

Principles of Best Practice for Education in Museums

ACCESSIBILITY

1. ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY AND SERVE THE MUSEUM'S AUDIENCES.

- Develop and maintain sound relationships with community organizations, schools, cultural institutions, universities, other museums, and the general public.
- Reflect the needs and complexities of a changing society.
- Shape content and interpretation toward relevant issues and create a broad dialogue.

2. ADDRESS AND EMPLOY A DIVERSITY OF PERSPECTIVES.

- Acknowledge that a variety of interpretive perspectives—cultural, scientific, historic, and aesthetic—can promote greater understanding and engagement.
- Provide multiple levels and points of entry into content, including intellectual, physical, cultural, individual, group, and intergenerational.
- Engage members of diverse communities to contribute their perspectives to museum collections and interpretation.
- Promote the elimination of physical, socio-economic, and cultural barriers to museums.

ACCOUNTABILITY

3. DEMONSTRATE EXCELLENCE IN CONTENT KNOWLEDGE.

- Master the content related to the museum's collections, exhibitions, and mission.
- Collaborate with scholars and specialists.
- Conduct research to advance and improve the museum profession.
- Provide professional development and training for new and established staff to share current education methods, new media, developments in scholarship related to learning theory and evaluation, and best practices in the field.

4. INCORPORATE LEARNING THEORY AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE.

- Base methods and design of interpretation on museum and educational learning theories.
- Apply knowledge of cognitive development, educational theory, and teaching practices to the types of voluntary, personal, and lifelong learning that occur in museums.

5. EMPLOY A VARIETY OF APPROPRIATE EDUCATIONAL TOOLS TO PROMOTE LEARNING.

- Demonstrate a broad understanding of communication strategies and media.
- Use techniques and technology appropriate to educational goals, content, concepts, and audience.
- Involve education staff in the design and use of technology to advance learning.
- Evaluate the educational tools used by the institution.

ADVOCACY

6. PROMOTE EDUCATION AS CENTRAL TO THE MUSEUM'S MISSION.

- Ensure that education is clearly incorporated into the mission, goals, and financial strategy of the museum.
- Include educational considerations in interdepartmental discussions involving planning, development, and implementation from conception to completion.
- Integrate educational expertise into exhibition design and interpretation.
- Contribute museum education expertise to a broad array of institutional efforts to discover and address the needs of the community.
- Share responsibility for the economic health of the institution and demonstrate management skills related to fiscal and human resources.

7. SET GOALS AND MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES AND ADOPT STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE AND DOCUMENT THEM.

- Develop interpretation with specific educational goals supported by integrating content and learning objectives for targeted audiences.
- Develop interpretation to serve the academic mandates of school, college, and university standards or mandated state education frameworks for schools.

- In an ongoing and ethical manner, collect data from and about visitors to measure learning and document the impact of the museum experience.
- Collect data from visitors and non-visitors to determine the best education services to meet their needs and interests.
- Incorporate evaluation findings into the planning and/or revision of interpretation.
- Distribute research results to the learner, the museum community, relevant academic institutions, funders, and the greater public to strengthen the field of museum education.

8. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE MUSEUM COMMUNITY.

- Recognize and share the value of continuous learning with colleagues.
- Persistently seek opportunities to expand the knowledge of learning theory, education methods, evaluation, media, management, scholarship related to the museum's collections, and best practices in the field.
- Foster an institutional atmosphere that encourages professional development.
- Disseminate current ideas through publications and other appropriate media.

9. PROMOTE A SPIRIT OF INQUIRY AND OPENNESS TO NEW IDEAS AND APPROACHES.

- Recognize and share the joys of learning with all people.
- Promote the complementary nature of formal and informal learning at every stage of life.

10. INFLUENCE PUBLIC POLICY IN SUPPORT OF MUSEUM LEARNING.

- Work individually and with professional associations to influence public policy at the regional, state, and national levels.
- Demonstrate to public policy decision-makers the importance of museum learning in a pluralistic society.

Professional Standards for Museum Educators

ACCESSIBILITY

1. FOCUS ON AUDIENCES AND COMMUNITY.

Museum educators have knowledge of and respect for the audiences their museums serve. They promote museums' public service role within our changing society.

2. DIVERSITY OF PERSPECTIVES.

Museum educators use interpretive practices that acknowledge the variety of cultural, scientific, and aesthetic points of view that contribute to visitors' understanding. They create opportunities that enable informed viewpoints to receive judicious consideration.

ACCOUNTABILITY

3. EXCELLENCE IN CONTENT AND METHODOLOGY.

Museum educators have a solid grounding in the history, theory, and practice of the disciplines relevant to their institutions. They demonstrate knowledge of human development, educational theories, and teaching practices related to the personal and group learning that takes place in museums.

ADVOCACY

4. ADVOCACY FOR AUDIENCES.

Museum educators facilitate a spirit of teamwork and collaboration within the museum to promote the best interest of audiences.

5. ADVOCACY OF EDUCATION.

Museum educators promote education as central to advancing the mission and goals of the museum.

6. DEDICATION TO LEARNING.

Museum educators possess a love of learning and a commitment to nurture and develop an informed and humane citizenry.

American Alliance of Museums. 1992. *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums.*

Executive Summary

Against a backdrop of global change, this report from the American Association of Museums—prepared by its Task Force on Museum Education and adopted by the AAM Board of Directors in May 1991—speaks to a new definition of museums as institutions of public service and education, a term that includes exploration, study observation, critical thinking, contemplation, and dialogue. Museums perform their most fruitful public service by providing an educational experience in the broadest sense: by fostering the ability to live productively in a pluralistic society and to contribute to the resolution of the challenges we face as global citizens. The public educational responsibility of museums has two facets: excellence and equity. In every aspect of their operations and programs, museums must combine a tradition of intellectual rigor with the inclusion of a broader spectrum of our diverse society. By making a commitment to excellence in public service, museums can assure that decisions about collecting, exhibitions, programs, and other activities are supported both by rigorous scholarship and by respect for the many cultural and intellectual viewpoints that museum collections stand for and stimulate. By making a commitment to equity in public service, museums can be an integral part of the human experience, thus helping to create the sense of inclusive community so often missing in our society.

Excellence and Equity is based on an expanded notion of public service and education as a museum-wide endeavor that involves trustee, staff, and volunteer values and attitudes; exhibitions; public and school programs; publications; public relations efforts; research; decisions about the physical environment of the museum; and choices about collecting and preserving. These elements are among the many that shape the educational messages museums convey to the public.

This report urges action on critical issues related to excellence and equity, issues that the museum community must address if museums are to fulfill their positions as vital institutions in service to society. It poses some thought-provoking questions: How can museums, which have so much to contribute to the collective human experience, welcome the broad spectrum of our society? How can they use the abundance of their collections and their scholarly resources to enrich and empower citizens from all backgrounds? How can museum professionals and trustees effect the serious and lasting change needed to assure that museums are integral to the social fabric? This report presents a plan for action that centers on the following ten principles with accompanying recommendations:

- 1 Assert that museums place education—in the broadest sense of the word at the center of their public service role. Assure that the commitment to serve the public is clearly stated in every museum’s mission and central to every museum’s activities.
- 2 Reflect the diversity of our society by establishing and maintaining the broadest possible public dimension for the museum.
- 3 Understand, develop, expand, and use the learning opportunities that museums offer their audiences.
- 4 Enrich our knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of our collections and of the variety of cultures and ideas they represent and evoke.
- 5 Assure that the interpretative process manifests a variety in cultural and intellectual perspectives and reflects an appreciation for the diversity of museums’ public.
- 6 Engage in active, ongoing collaborative efforts with a wide spectrum of organizations and individuals who can contribute to the expansion of the museum’s public dimension.
- 7 Assess the decision-making processes in museums and develop new models that enable an expanded public dimension and a renewed commitment to excellence.
- 8 Achieve diversity among trustees, staff, and volunteers to assure a breadth of perspective throughout the museum.
- 9 Provide professional development and training for new and established professionals, trustees, and volunteers that meets the needs of the museum profession so that museums may carry out their responsibility to their diverse public.
- 10 Commit leadership and financial resources—in individual museums, professional organizations, and training organizations and universities—to strengthen the public dimension of museums.

These are complex challenges that require time, resources, and commitment. But museums must seek solutions if they are to play a pivotal role as educational institutions. Guided by the spirit of excellence and equity, museums have the potential to nurture an enlightened, humane citizenry that appreciates the value of knowing about its past, is resourcefully and sensitively engaged in the present, and is determined to shape a future in which many experiences and many points of view are given voice.

Introduction

The educational role of American museums has been central to their history, evolving through the years in relationship to the changing public dimension of museums. Today, as we consider museums and education against a backdrop of global change, a central question shapes the dialogue: How can museums—as multidimensional, socially responsible institutions with a tremendous capacity for bringing knowledge to the public and enriching all facets of the human experience—help to nurture a humane citizenry equipped to make informed choices in a democracy and to address the challenges and opportunities of an increasingly global society? Museums can no longer confine themselves simply to preservation, scholarship, and exhibition independent of the social context in which they exist. They must recognize that the public dimension of museums leads them to perform the public service of education—a term that in its broadest sense includes exploration, study, observation, critical thinking, contemplation, and dialogue.

Museums have a dual public responsibility suited to today's world. One element of this responsibility is excellence: A hallmark of museums is intellectual rigor, a tradition that must continue to be applied in the context of a wider public dimension. The other element is equity: In reexamining their public dimension, museums must include a broader spectrum of our diverse society in their activities. Museums must fulfill both elements of this dual responsibility—excellence and equity—in every aspect of their operations and programs.

Three key concepts are embodied in this report:

- ▶ First, the educational role of museums is at the core of their service to the public. This assertion must be clearly stated in every museum's mission and central to every museum's activities.
- ▶ Second, museums have the potential to be enriched and enlivened by the nation's diversity. As public institutions in a democratic society, museums must achieve greater inclusiveness. Trustees, staff, and volunteers must acknowledge and respect our nation's diversity in race, ethnic origin, age, gender, economic status, and education, and they should attempt to reflect that pluralism in every aspect of museums' operations and programs.
- ▶ Third, dynamic, forceful leadership is needed within and outside the museum community. Strong leadership on the part of individuals, institutions, and organizations will provide vision, inspire broad-based commitment, and generate resources; it is the key to meeting the challenges and fulfilling the promise expressed in this report.

This report is based on the premise that every area of museum activity contributes to museums' public dimension and to the important public service museums provide. The traditional term "museum education" is too specialized to encompass the multifaceted educational role of museums. This report focuses instead on the expanded notion of public service, defined here as a museum-wide endeavor that involves trustee, staff, and volunteer values and attitudes; exhibitions; public and school programs; publications; public relations efforts; research; decisions about the physical environment of the museum; and choices about collecting and preserving. These are just some of the elements that shape the educational messages museums convey to the public and the public service they provide.

This report also affirms the premise that museums have an aggregate importance as educational institutions, recognizing that not every museum can be all things to all people. Museums' fullest public service derives from their collective contribution to their audiences. Each museum has individual qualities and a local and regional significance; together museums are a pluralistic group of institutions working to benefit society. Consistent with their missions, individual museums of different sizes and types must ensure that they are accessible to a broad audience and that they do not intentionally or even subtly and unintentionally exclude anyone.

This report also stresses the significance of museums in the educational complex of a democratic society. Museums have a vital place in a broad educational system that includes formal institutions such as universities, schools, and professional training institutes and informal agents of socialization such as the family, workplace, and community. Museums have the capacity to contribute to formal and informal learning at every stage of life, from the education of children in preschool through secondary school to the continuing education of adults.

They add a tangible dimension to learning that occurs in formal settings. Museum relationships with schools and universities, in particular, have great future potential as new curriculum efforts call for a strengthening of the sciences, arts, and humanities. Museums also have the potential to create partnerships in their communities with other organizations that serve the public in informal settings, such as libraries, civic groups, and social service organizations.

Education—in its broadest sense includes exploration, study, observation, critical thinking, contemplation, and dialogue.

Conclusion 1992

The issues this report considers go to the very core of what museums are all about: How can museums, which have so much to contribute to the collective human experience, welcome people from all racial, ethnic, social, economic, and educational backgrounds? How can they use the abundance of their collections and their scholarly resources to enrich and empower their visitors? How can we, as museum professionals, trustees, and volunteers, effect the serious and lasting institutional and professional change necessary to resolve these issues? The complex challenges at hand require time, resources, and continuous review and assessment, but above all they require commitment.

The community of museums in the United States shares the responsibility with other educational institutions to enrich learning opportunities for all individuals and to nurture an enlightened, humane citizenry that appreciates the value of knowing about its past, is resourcefully and sensitively engaged in the present, and is determined to shape a future in which many experiences and many points of view are given voice. In this endeavor, museums will play a powerful, beneficial role for the people of the next century.

Bonnie Pitman (chair)
Deputy Director
University Art Museum/Pacific Film Archive
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

James Affolter
Director
Cornell Plantations
Ithaca, New York

Gail Anderson
Director, Center for Museum Studies
John F. Kennedy University
Orinda, California

Nina Archabal
Director
Minnesota Historical Society
St. Paul, Minnesota

American Alliance of Museums. 2020a. “Professional Networks: Education (EdCom).”
<https://www.aam-us.org/professional-networks/education-committee/>

AAM PROFESSIONAL NETWORKS

Education (EdCom)

The American Alliance of Museums’ Education Professional Network (EdCom) advances the purpose of museums as places of lifelong learning, serves as an advocate for diverse audiences and educators, and promotes professional standards and excellence in the practice of museum education.

Through mentoring, conference activities, professional development, and awards, EdCom works to define, foster, and celebrate best practices in museum education and investigate, articulate, and provoke next practices. EdCom offers something for everyone, from seasoned veterans of museum education looking to continue as life-long learners, or educators new to the field just trying to figure out the basics.

EdCom serves our community by:

- Sponsoring national awards for excellence in museum education
- Conceiving and implementing professional development opportunities at the AAM annual meeting and beyond
- Providing access to the most up-to-date information about the informal learning field and the profession
- Offering networking opportunities for those engaged in fostering the educational purposes of museums

Get involved in EdCom by **volunteering to serve on a committee!**

Awards

EdCom recognizes outstanding museum educators and supporters, programs and resources that exemplify excellence.

- Excellence in Practice
- Excellence in Programming
- Excellence in Resources
- Innovation in Museum Education
- John Cotton Dana Award

The American Alliance of Museums' mission is to champion museums and nurture excellence in partnership with our members and allies.

© 2020 American Alliance of Museums

American Alliance of Museums. 2020b. “EdCom Task Force to Explore an Education-Related Core Document.”

<https://www.aam-us.org/professional-networks/education-committee/edcom-task-force-to-explore-an-education-related-core-document/>

Login

Education (EdCom)

EdCom Task Force to Explore an Education-Related Core Document

The EdCom Task Force will test whether there is a general field-wide agreement in support of all museums having a [core document](#) that clearly states their educational philosophies and principles and/or guides their decisions about the development and delivery of their educational role; and, if so, what the common elements of such a guiding document are. If there is not agreement, the Task Force will suggest resources in other forms to help museums in this area.

August 2020 update: Over the past twelve months the Task Force created a draft set of potential required elements and presented them for feedback from AAM Professional Networks, selected discipline-specific organizations, at a 2020 AAM Annual Meeting session, and via a July 2020 EdComversation webinar ([recording](#)). Based on the feedback received, the Task Force is developing a revised draft for greater field-wide circulation and final feedback.

Between Fall 2018 and December 2020 the Task Force will:

- Conduct a field-wide survey and literature review to identify the types of documents, other guidance, and the terminology being used by the field; [read the highlights of the survey results and next steps for the Task Force](#).
- Determine if the results of the survey, the literature review, and examples of documents indicate a general field-wide agreement on a guiding education document;
- If the survey finds general field-wide agreement on the need for and content of an education document that all museums should have, create a proposal for AAM leadership that provides clarity on generally accepted field-wide exemplary practices; defines education, learning, interpretation and engagement; and identifies the required elements for an education-related Core Document;
- Circulate the document across the field for comments and revise as needed;
- Make final recommendations with regard to a new potential education-related Core Document or other resources to advance excellence in the field.

The composition of the Task Force was designed to ensure that the perspectives of a wide range of museums of all types and sizes, as well as those of a diversity of museum professionals, are represented.

The American Alliance of Museums' mission is to champion museums and nurture excellence in partnership with our members and allies.
© 2020 American Alliance of Museums

Camden City School District. 2020a. "CCSD: Facts & Figures."

! Not Secure | camdencity.ss12.sharpschool.com/divisions/superintendent_s_office/c_c_s_d_facts_figures

Home COVID-19 Updates News & Announcements Calendar For Families For Students For Staff Divisions Community

CCSD: FACTS & FIGURES

Camden City School District / Divisions / Superintendent's Office / CCSD: Facts & Figures

Camden's K-12 public school enrollment numbers:

- 6,800 students attend Camden City School District's 18 district public schools.
- 3,850 students attend renaissance schools run by KIPP, Mastery, and Uncommon Schools.
- 4,350 students attend charter schools in the City.

Camden City School District quick facts:

- Graduation rate: 66% (up from 49% in 2012)
- Drop out rate: 11% (down from 21% in 2012)
- 11:1 staff to student ratio
- 250+ high school students are taking college credits at Camden County College this year
- 45% increase in SAT participation
- 53% fewer out of school suspensions in 2016/17 compared to previous years
- 11 new or significantly renovated school building projects launched, 10 of which are serving students this year
- \$336 million investment in new school buildings since 2012

Camden City School District. 2020b. "School Nutrition."

! Not Secure | camdencity.ss12.sharpschool.com/for_families/school_nutrition

Home COVID-19 Updates News & Announcements Calendar For Families For Students For Staff Divisions

SCHOOL NUTRITION

Camden City School District / For Families / School Nutrition

School Nutrition Department

Healthy Meals Create Happy Children!!!

The District is now participating in the Federal Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act program, Camden is now able to offer free meals to students attending any of the District's 26 schools. The Act's Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) eliminates the need for parents to complete applications for free and reduced school meals, saving parents time and hassle. For the 2019-220 school year, all students attending a District school are being served free meals.

Center for the Future of Museums. 2014. *Building the Future of Education: Museums and the Learning Ecosystem*.

Copyright Creative Commons

ISBN 978-1-933253-97-8

Copyright 2014 American Alliance of Museums

Building the Future of Education: Museums and the Learning Ecosystem

Foreword

**By Michael Robbins, Senior Advisor
for Nonprofit Partnerships,
U.S. Department of Education**

I recently joined my 6-year-old niece for a museum visit. As she combed through exhibits, she discovered a drawer on a display wall, pulled it out and gleefully exclaimed, “OOOOHH! More information!”

Wouldn’t it be great if we heard this each day in classrooms across the nation? Museums can help us get there.

Dedicated teachers and school leaders are advancing education success across the United States—turning around low-performing schools, implementing world-class curriculum standards and demonstrating that students can succeed in the classroom regardless of challenges they might face outside school. But schools can’t and shouldn’t go it alone.

Our students need more opportunities for inquiry-based learning that inspires curiosity and fuels their passions. Our parents need to be better supported as co-learners and learning coaches with their children. Learning needs to better connect students to their communities, culture and history. We need more professionally

5

trained teachers of all kinds who have the expertise and dedication to make all of these things work together. Where can we find all these things? Museums!

How can museums and schools collaborate to create this new future for education?

Invest in the capacity to manage partnerships. Museum administrators (like school principals) have endless to-do lists and can’t be expected to be the day-to-day leads on managing external partnerships. Dedicate full-time staff to develop and sustain successful partnerships, and have them work across schools and museums.

Strengthen family engagement. Develop resources for parents and students to connect the dots between learning in school and museum environments. Study guides and sample assignments that bridge school curriculum to museum assets are more than just education resources—they are tools for parents to advocate for more and better education experiences that blur the lines between school-based and community-based learning.

Build learning networks across community institutions. When museums join together and with other community-based learning organizations (such as

libraries and after-school programs) they can offer a broader range of experiences for students and build school partnerships with greater scale and impact. One such example is the Hive Learning Networks (hivelearningnetwork.org) operating in New York, Chicago and Pittsburgh.

Leverage digital learning and collaborative technology. The digital learning revolution is more than trading textbooks for tablets—it is an opportunity to accelerate collaboration among schools, families and community organizations to propel student engagement and learning. Museums can be community hubs that help expand Internet access and digital literacy. Internet-based resources and collaboration tools can facilitate learning projects involving teachers, students and museum staff. Digital tools such as badges (openbadges.org) recognize and document student learning, and can even be used to grant school credit for learning that happens in museums.

Students know that schools are only one node in their broader network of learning, and our education structures should reflect this reality. Working together, schools and museums can design learning experiences that are engineered from the student perspective and create a better future for education.

As the senior advisor for nonprofit partnerships at the U.S. Department of Education, **Michael Robbins** works to strengthen partnerships among schools, families and community organizations to propel student outcomes and turn around the nation’s lowest-performing schools. He supports the White House Office of Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships, an office within the Domestic Policy Council that forms partnerships between the federal government and faith-based and neighborhood organizations to more effectively serve Americans in need. Robbins focuses on how digital learning transforms collaborations among schools, parents, communities and youth to boost student engagement and learning.

■ About This Convening

By Elizabeth Merritt, Founding Director, Center for the Future of Museums, American Alliance of Museums, and Paula Gangopadhyay, Chief Learning Officer, The Henry Ford

In September 2013, over four dozen educational policy experts, practitioners, funders, education innovators, reformers, student activists and others shaping the conversation about U.S. education converged on the National Building Museum in Washington, DC. Their goal: to launch a national dialogue about the future of education and how leaders from the worlds of education and museums can work together to integrate the nation's educational assets into a vibrant learning grid.

They came at the invitation of the American Alliance of Museums' Center for the Future of Museums (CFM), and The Henry Ford, in response to forecasts from CFM and other futures organizations that America is on the cusp of transformational change in the educational system. The current structure has been destabilized by rising dissatisfaction with the formal educational system, the proliferation of nontraditional forms of primary education and funding crises at state and local levels. Simultaneously new

horizons are being opened by technological advances in communications, content sharing and cultural expectations regarding access, authority and personalization. A new era is beginning, characterized by new learning economies based on diverse methods of sharing and using educational resources.

The CFM and The Henry Ford see this transition as an opportunity to ensure museum resources are used to their fullest advantage in 21st-century education. What role can museums play in this new era? How can they help their communities understand and navigate the coming changes? Can museums help forge a common vision of a preferred future for education and play a leadership role in its creation?

For a day and a half, convening participants grappled with how to start a national dialogue on the future of learning and expand the educational impact of museums. The first day set the stage with short presentations. CFM's Elizabeth Merritt and KnowledgeWorks' Katherine Prince presented forecasts on educational change and potential scenarios of the future. Paula Gangopadhyay, from The Henry Ford, led panels of educators and innovators presenting examples of museums and other educational innovators exploring ways to structure new learning platforms. The Smithsonian's Michael Edson and Laura

White from Ashoka wrapped up the day with a look at the challenges and rewards of scaling up such experiments to meet the needs of American students. The morning of the second day, attendees assembled into small groups to brainstorm next steps. We challenged them to address: What can we do at the national, state, city and neighborhood level to shape the future of education? How can we integrate museums into a network of learning resources?

This white paper summarizes the content and shares some of the ideas coming out of the convening. The staff and leadership of the Alliance and The Henry Ford hope this report will inspire you to become involved in this process as well: building bridges among museums, schools and other learning resources, including libraries, archives, makerspaces, learning labs and others. As you read the contributions of those who presented at the convening, think about your assumptions, hopes and dreams for the learning landscape, and decide what actions you will take to build a bright future.

Our deepest thanks to the Robert & Toni Bader Charitable Foundation, whose support made this convening possible, and to the National Building Museum for serving as our gracious host.

Yours from the future,

Elizabeth Merritt
Founding Director
Center for the Future of Museums
American Alliance of Museums

Paula Gangopadhyay
Chief Learning Officer, The Henry Ford
Member, National Museum and Library
Services Board

Duncan, Arne. 2011. "Lessons from High-Performing Countries."

<https://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/lessons-high-performing-countries>

Skip to main content | About Us (<https://www2.ed.gov/about/landing.jhtml>) | Contact Us (<https://www2.ed.gov/about/contacts/gen/>) | FAQs (<https://www.ed.gov/answers/>) | Language Assistance ▼

ARCHIVED INFORMATION

Lessons from High-Performing Countries

Secretary Duncan's Remarks at National Center on Education and the Economy National Symposium

MAY 24, 2011

Contact: (202) 401-1576, press@ed.gov / <mailto:press@ed.gov>

I welcome this opportunity to reflect on what the United States can learn from the nations with the best-performing education systems. My thanks to Marc Tucker and the National Center on Education and the Economy for having me here today.

As Marc mentioned, last December, the OECD released a report entitled *Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education: Lessons From PISA for the United States*.

I asked OECD to prepare that study for a very simple reason: A number of nations today are out-educating the United States. I wanted to know what the U.S. could learn from the practices of those high-performing and rapidly improving countries. In a globally competitive economy, the value of benchmarking the practices of high-performing education systems seemed like a no-brainer.

These top performing nations not only were doing a better job of accelerating achievement and attainment nationwide than America, they also were doing a better job of closing achievement gaps among minority and disadvantaged students. What were their recipes for success?

As you've just heard, we followed up on the OECD study. At the smart suggestion of Dennis Van Roekel and John Wilson of the NEA, our department co-sponsored in March, along with OECD and Education International, the first-ever International Summit on the Teaching Profession. I was amazed to learn that this kind of summit had never happened before.

Today, I'm here to give a first take on some of what we have learned. I want to give a special shout-out to the Asia Society, which has completed a report on the Summit on behalf of the Summit co-sponsors. That report will be available in the next few weeks.

I would sort the lessons of the OECD study and the International Summit into three baskets.

First, I think it is clear now that most high-performing nations establish a number of common principles and cornerstones to build a strong education system and high-quality teaching profession. Every nation, of course, has unique characteristics of its teaching profession, culture, and education system, which may not be directly analogous to the U.S. But to the extent that the U.S. can copy or adapt, and beg, borrow, and steal, successful practices from other nations, we should do so.

As I'll get to in a moment, I am much more optimistic than Marc that the U.S., including state and local governments, is in the midst of adopting a number of the core elements of high-performing education systems.

In the second basket of lessons are reforms that, while important and invaluable, cannot be easily replicated or exported to the U.S. at a national level.

In the final, or third basket of lessons, I would place educational innovations here in the U.S. that are of considerable interest overseas and may help lead the way to strengthening the education system both here and abroad. The U.S. absolutely has much to learn from other nations. But we can also lead by example in some areas as well.

Let me start with some areas of agreement at the Summit.

Virtually every education minister and union leader who spoke at the Summit affirmed the singular and urgent importance of elevating and strengthening the teaching profession in a knowledge economy. Throughout the globe, education is now recognized as the new game-changer that drives economic growth and social change. And it is great teachers who help build the higher-order skills that students need to succeed in the 21st century.

The overwhelming sentiment at the Summit was that teachers today need to be treated more as professionals and knowledge workers, and less as interchangeable cogs in an educational factory line out of the last century.

Teachers need and deserve more autonomy and respect—and they must become real participants and partners in reform if outcomes for children are to dramatically improve.

A second, shared theme of the summit was that outcomes and data matter. We cannot return to the days when educational policy was primarily propelled by concern with inputs, instead of outcomes. In the information age, student learning and student growth are the ultimate barometers of success. Children are our first and foremost clients.

High-performing nations may differ on how they assess learning. Yet every top performer is using data in one form or another to inform instruction, and to monitor and improve performance. As Michael Gove, the UK education minister, said at the summit, top-performing countries use data to identify what is working in order to "shout it and share it."

Finally, the summit highlighted the importance of one familiar, and one not-so familiar, statement of fact. The familiar sentiment was that a nation's education system can only be as good as the quality of its teachers. But several education ministers and union leaders amended that thought. They added that the quality of a country's teachers can only be as good as the system that recruits, prepares, provides professional development, and compensates teachers.

Contrary to popular wisdom, a top-notch teaching force does not just naturally bloom out of traditions of cultural respect and reverence for teachers. Instead, success stems from coherent, deliberate policy choices, carefully implemented over a period of years.

High-performing education systems pursue a comprehensive set of reforms—not piecemeal, reform-by-addition. They don't push reforms in isolated silos. They commit to system-wide reform.

Now, the International Summit highlighted not just the similarities of high-performing countries but also their differences. There is no single recipe for building a strong teaching profession. It is not that easy. And it is clear that some of the nationwide reforms adopted in high-performing education systems are not likely to be adopted nationwide in the United States.

As Marc Tucker points out in his paper, nearly all of the high-performing nations and regions in the OECD study have national standards, a national curriculum, a grade-by-grade curriculum framework, and high-stakes national exams given to students at key gateways, like exiting secondary school.

In his concluding remarks at the Summit, Gene Wilhoit, the extraordinary leader of the chief state school officers, pointed out that the United States has an unusual confederated education system. The federal government plays a very different role in the U.S. than in many countries, including Singapore, South Korea, Japan, and Finland.

The tradition of local control and local financing is much stronger here than in most top-performing countries and provinces. The federal government does not set national standards. We have not and will not prescribe a national curriculum—and in fact we are barred by law from doing so.

And the fact that schools in the U.S. are funded in significant measure out of local property taxes makes it more challenging, on a national basis, to direct extra resources to low-income students and the communities that most need support.

In the U.S., the primary federal roles are to incentivize reform and innovation, enhance equity in educational access and outcomes, and protect the rights of disadvantaged children, minority students, English-language learners, and disabled students.

Our department also helps to document and share effective practices and provides technical assistance. We support states, districts, and 14,000 school boards. As Marc Tucker accurately describes in his paper, "two centuries of practice have vested a great deal of authority in local boards of education [in the United States] to a degree that has no parallel in most other countries."

In addition to having unusual governance challenges, the U.S. also faces questions of scale when it comes to copying or adapting the practices of high-performing countries. Many of the high-performing countries and regions are much smaller than the U.S.

I was excited to hear at the Summit about how Finland has built a high-quality system for recruiting, preparing and training teachers, with agreed-upon goals of what teachers are expected to know and be able to do in specific subject areas.

Finland's strong teacher unions contribute to building a top-notch teaching profession by serving as professional organizations that train and develop teachers. They have evolved far beyond the traditional adversarial focus on bread and butter issues to build trusting but tough-minded partnerships with management.

They have retained their role to speak truth to power—yet accepted fully the responsibility for quality and professional accountability to one another.

Educators and teacher preparation programs here in the United States have so much to learn from Finland's example in all of these areas. The United States must do everything in its power to make sure teachers receive world-class preparation for the classroom and are recruited from the most able students with a gift and passion for teaching. In Finland, that mean the top 10 percent of college graduates enter the teaching profession.

Yet transforming teacher preparation programs in the U.S. along the lines of Finland's example is more challenging here than in a small nation or province. Finland has a total of eight university-based teacher preparation programs. The United States has more than 1,400 education schools, regulated by 50 states and voluntary accreditation bodies.

Professional development for teachers in the U.S. is similarly fragmented. Particularly in tough economic times like today, I lose a lot of sleep when I think about our results in this area. We spend at least \$4 billion every year in federal funds on professional development—and don't have good results to show for it. When I talk to great teachers across the country, they are stunned by this number—and by how little this investment has benefitted them or their colleagues. The Summit similarly highlighted that Finland has done an extraordinary job of narrowing achievement gaps. Again, American educators have a lot to learn from the Finns about how to get the

Friends Select School. 2020. “Distinctive Programs: Upper School.”

Distinctive Programs Upper School

Philadelphia Museum of Art Research Project

Ninth graders select an Asian, Middle Eastern, Medieval or Renaissance artwork or artifact to study at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Over the course of the school year, museum curators guide our students as they research the history, cultural milieu and technique that inform the art or artifact they have chosen. On a Saturday morning in late spring, students present their research to a public audience of parents, peers, faculty and museum guests.

Gardner, Howard. 2005. “Multiple Lenses on the Mind.”

Copyright Howard Gardner, 2005

Paper presented at the ExpoGestion Conference,
Bogota Colombia, May 25, 2005

Pages 2-10: Let me provide a few contextual remarks. ... I had been a good student and a serious musician. When I began to study ‘real’ psychology, I was intrigued by the fact that the arts were rarely mentioned in serious psychology circles. To have a mind was to be a scientist, or at least to think scientifically; ... Early on, I decided that I wanted to illuminate the nature of artistic thinking. Also, I was particularly interested in issues of creativity—how does a person conjure up something new, whether it is a sonnet a symphony, a sketch, or a scientific theory?

The Science of Psychology and The Cognitive Revolution For much of the 20th century, psychology was dominated by behaviorism—the science of the black box. The leading figure was B. F. Skinner. Skinner believed that the purpose of psychology was to predict and control behavior, and controllers achieved their ends by varying rewards and punishment. Skinner was good at molding behavior—he could take pigeons from a Cambridge park and teach them to play ping pong. But the limits of behaviorism were well illustrated by a famous joke. Two behaviorists make love: the first says to the second, “Well, it was great for you—but how was it for me?”

As I was beginning my formal doctoral studies in the middle 1960s, an intellectual revolution was beginning. It was called the Cognitive Revolution and, later on, in my book *The Mind’s New Science*, I became the first chronicler of the Cognitive Revolution. ... For our purposes, the major goal of the cognitive revolution was ... to figure out how the mind, and ultimately, the brain operate. Cognitive psychologists believe that the mind deals with various kinds of mental languages—which are called ‘mental representation.’ The job of cognitive scientists is to identify the key mental representations and to figure out how they work. Among the famous cognitive scientists are Jean Piaget, the developmental psychologist; Noam Chomsky, the linguist; and Herbert Simon, the inventor of artificial intelligence. And

nowadays, almost everyone would add that cognitive science has merged with the study of the brain, *in vivo*, as well as *in vitro*. We no longer talk much of cognitive science—we speak now of cognitive neuroscience.

My First Studies For the first ten years of my professional career, I studied how the mind develops in children and how it breaks down under conditions of brain damage. As you may know, the single most important thing about a brain lesion is where the damage is. If one is right handed, and suffers injury in the middle areas of the left hemisphere, one is likely to become aphasic—to have a major disturbance of one's language facilities. But if you suffer injury to the right hemisphere, your language will be ostensibly fine, but depending on the location and depth of the lesion, you are likely to be impaired in musical cognition, spatial cognition, and/or our understanding of other people.

With normal and gifted children and with brain damaged adults, I studied how human beings deal with various kinds of symbols. ... I had a particular interest in the arts. And so I studied the development and breakdown of musical abilities, graphic abilities, metaphoric and narrative capacities, and other abilities crucial in the arts. Of course, when you look at these abilities, you necessarily encounter nonartistic capacities as well—mastery of ordinary language, calculation, understanding of other persons, and the like.

At the time that my studies began, I had been a convinced Piagetian—I believed that logical-mathematical thought was the center of all cognition. I believed that children passed through a series of qualitatively different stages, and that their mental world gets remade, whenever they enter the next stage. I believed that cognitive development is completed by the middle of adolescence, at the latest. And I never thought at all about intelligence tests.

I still think that Piaget is the greatest student of the development of the mind. ... And yet, ... I can see that during that decade, I gradually lost my Piagetian religion. By 1980, I believed that there were a series of relatively independent cognitive capacities of which logical-mathematical thought was only one. I believed that stages were much looser than Piaget had envisioned, and more importantly, that one's sophistication with one kind of mental representation did not predict one's sophistication with other mental representations. I believe that cognitive development continues well past adolescence, and that various cognitive capacities—like creativity, leadership, and the ability to change the minds of other persons—remain to be illuminated, despite Piaget's remarkable achievements. Finally, I had become deeply estranged from standard intelligence (IQ) testing.

... I want to review three major lines of work:

1. How the mind is organized—That introduces the theory of multiple intelligences.
2. How individuals—and particularly leaders—succeed or fail in changing the minds of other persons;
3. What kinds of minds we will need to cultivate in the future.

The Organization of the Mind In the West, a certain view of mind has held sway for a century. Dating back a century to the time of the French psychologist Alfred Binet, psychologists believe that there is a single intelligence, often called 'g' for general intelligence; we are born with ... our intelligence comes from our biological parents and, as a result, intelligence is not significantly alterable; we psychologists can tell you how smart you are—traditionally, by giving you an IQ test, more recently, by examining the shape of your brain waves, perhaps ultimately, by looking at a chip on which your genes are encoded.

My research in cognitive development and cognitive breakdown convinced me that this traditional view of intellect is not tenable. Individuals have different human faculties and their strength (or weakness) in one intellectual sphere simply does not predict whether a particular individual will be strong or weak in some other intellectual component. I developed a definition of intelligence—a biopsychological information-processing capacity to solve problems or fashion products that are valued in at least one community and culture. I think of the intelligences as a set of relatively independent computers. One computer deals with language, a second with spatial information, a third with information about other people.

But how to figure out what is the right set of computers? I came up with a set of eight criteria of what counts as an intelligence. Unlike most approaches to intelligence, the criteria were not dependent on results of a paper and pencil test. Rather I looked at criteria from neurology—which brain regions mediate particular skills; anthropology—which abilities have been valued in different cultures across history and pre-history; special population, such as prodigies, savants, and individuals with learning disabilities. All these individuals have jagged intellectual profiles, ones not easily explained if one believes in a single ‘general intelligence.’

Ultimately, I came up with a list of eight, possibly nine intelligences. ...

1. Linguistic intelligence—the intelligence of a writer, orator, journalist.

2. Logical mathematical intelligence—the intelligence of a logician, mathematician, scientist—Piaget thought that he was studying all of intelligence, but he was really focusing on this particular intelligence.

Most tests of intelligence focus on logical and linguistic intelligence. They do a pretty good job at predicting success in school—but not nearly as good a job as last year’s grades! My goal is not to denigrate these traditional scholastic intelligences, but rather to give equal attention to other intellectual faculties.

3. Musical intelligence. The capacity to create, perform, and appreciate music. Some people call this a talent. That is fine, so long as you recognize that being good with words or with numbers is also a talent. What I cannot accept is that linguistic facility is deemed intelligence, while skill with music or with other persons is *merely* a talent.

4. Spatial intelligence. The capacity to form mental imagery of the world—the large world of the aviator or navigator, or the more local world of the chess player or the surgeon—and to manipulate those mental images.

5. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. The capacity to solve problems or fashion products using your whole body, or parts of your body, like your hands or mouth. This intelligence is exhibited by athletes, dancers, actors, craftspeople, and again, surgeons.

The next two intelligences have to do with the world of human beings.

6. Interpersonal intelligence involves the understanding of other persons—how to interact with them, how to motivate them, how to understand their personalities, etc. This skill is obviously important for people in business, teachers, clinicians, and those involved in politics or religion.

7. Intrapersonal intelligence is the capacity to understand oneself—one’s strengths, weaknesses, desires, fears. Access to one’s emotional life is important for intrapersonal intelligence.

... What Daniel Goleman means by emotional intelligence is similar to what I mean by the personal intelligences.

8. Naturalist intelligence involves the capacity to make consequential distinctions in nature—between one plant and another, among animals, clouds, mountains, and the like. Scientist Charles Darwin had naturalist intelligence in abundance. Most of us no longer use our naturalist intelligence to survive in the jungle or the forest. But it is likely that our entire consumer culture is based on our naturalist capacity to differentiate one car make from another, one sneaker from another, and the like.

9. I have speculated that there may be a ninth or existential intelligence. I call this the ‘intelligence of big questions.’ When children ask about the size of the universe, when adults ponder death, love, conflict, the future of the planet, they are engaging in existential issues. My hesitation in declaring a full blown existential intelligence stems from my uncertainty about whether certain regions of the brain are dedicated to the contemplation of issues that are too vast or too infinitesimal to be perceived. And so, recall a famous Fellini movie, I speak of 8½ intelligences.

... Even if my approach is correct, I am sure that I have not identified all of the intelligences and that I have not described them perfectly. I am equally confident that each intelligence itself has separable components.

But I am not interested in proving the existence of 8 or 9 intelligences, or 40-50 sub-intelligence, in particular. I am trying to make the case that we have a multiplicity of intelligence, each relatively independent of the others.

From this claim—that we possess eight or nine relatively autonomous intellectual computers—three interesting claims follow.

- a. All of us have these 8 or 9 intelligences. That is what makes us human beings, cognitively speaking. Rats might have more spatial intelligence, hummingbirds might have more musical intelligences, but we are the species that exhibits these particular intelligences. And that is important to know—whether you are a teacher, a businessman, or a parent.
- b. No two individuals have exactly the same profile of intelligence, not even identical twins. And so whether you are a teacher, business person or parent, you may assume that every person's profile differs from yours, and from every other person, even clones of one another.
- c. Having an intelligence does not mean that you will behave morally or intelligently. Intelligences are simply computers that can be put to work. But you can use your interpersonal intelligence for moral purposes—like Nelson Mandela—or for immoral purposes, like Slobodan Milosevic. By the same token, you might have a computer that works very well, and yet use it very stupidly. A mathematically-talented person might prove an important new theorem, but she might also waste her time multiplying ever bigger figures in her head.

Gardner, Howard. 2011. "The Theory of Multiple Intelligences:
As Psychology, As Education, As Social Science."

Howard Gardner gave this address on the occasion of his receipt of an honorary degree from José Cela University in Madrid, Spain and the Prince of Asturias Prize for Social Science.

October 22, 2011

© Howard Gardner 2011 All Rights Reserved

MI as education

Just as I had not expected the resistance and even hostility of my colleagues in psychology, I had not anticipated the extensive interest in the theory on the part of educators—initially in the United States, ultimately in many parts of the world. In 2009, my colleagues and I published a book called Multiple Intelligences Around the World. In this collection, 42 scholars and practitioners, from 15 countries on five continents, described the ways in which they have used multiple intelligences ideas for various age groups (from preschool to university), in various educational settings (schools, museums, theme parks, after school activities) and with various populations (language learners, gifted students, students with learning or emotional difficulties). Needless to say, in 1983, I could hardly have anticipated this state of affairs.

Why did MI theory catch on in education, in a way that it has never been picked up in psychology? Educators are much less wedded to disciplinary standards of evidence and acceptability. If an idea seems plausible and has at least a trace of support within the academy that suffices. MI passes that test almost everywhere.

MI theory also had the benefit of being a Rorschach test—that is, like a subject interpreting an inkblot, educators could use the claim of several intelligences to support almost any pet educational idea that they had. My original book had very few educational suggestions—after all, I was the psychologist, casting only a sideways glance into the classroom. For that very reason, the theory provided ample running room for practitioners to suggest approaches to curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, learning differences, use of computers, place of the arts—indeed, almost any issue in which educators are interested. And since I had not precluded any educational use of the theory, practitioners in many places felt liberated to make use of the theory in whatever way they liked.

As a result of this experience and of my general observations, I took two steps. First of all, I wrote a paper called “Reflections on Multiple Intelligences: Myths and Messages.” I delineated seven common misunderstandings of the theory.

The second step was to state explicitly the most important educational implications of MI theory. They can be captured in two words: Individuation and Pluralization. Human beings differ from one another and there is absolutely no reason to teach and assess all individuals in the identical way. Rather, in the future, good practice should particularize the modes of presentation as well as the manner of assessment as much as feasible; and that individuation should be based on our understanding of the intellectual profiles of individual learners.

Interestingly, such individual education has always been possible for one group—the affluent. These individuals hire tutors and the tutor’s job is to make sure that Pablo and Paloma learn what they need to know, and to use whatever pedagogical approaches work. We are fortunate enough to live in an era where individualized education is no longer an option only for the wealthy. Computers make it possible to provide individualized teaching and assessment options for every person.

Pluralization can be undertaken in any era and with classes of any size. It simply means that important ideas, topics, theories and skills ought to be taught in more than one way, indeed in several ways—and these several ways should activate the multiple intelligences. When one pluralizes an educational approach, two wonderful things happen. First of all, one reaches more individuals—since some individuals learn better through stories, others through work of art, or hands on activities or group work—and by argument, each of these approaches activates a distinctive set of intelligences. Second of all, pluralized education exemplifies what it means to understand something well. Because if you understand an entity well—be it a school subject, an avocation, your own home, your own family—you can think of it in many ways. Conversely, if you can only represent this entity in a single way, using a single intelligence, then your own mastery is probably tenuous.

Note that neither of these educational implications—individuation, pluralization—depends explicitly on MI theory. Indeed, dating back to the ancient Greeks and Romans, I am certain that you could find recommendations for approaches based on the same underlying ideas. MI Theory provided some scientific and empirical evidence for these approaches. And, perhaps more importantly, because of the list of 7-10 intelligences, it gave names for, and made suggestions about how to individualize and how to pluralize. As my colleague Mindy Kornhaber once quipped “MI theory is a closet organizer. It helps teachers organize their practices and see what is missing.”

Guidestar. 2020. "Philadelphia Museum of Art."

The Philadelphia Museum of Art

Mission

The Philadelphia Museum of Art, in partnership with the city, the region, and art museums around the globe, seeks to preserve, enhance, interpret, and extend the reach of its great collections in particular, and the visual arts in general, to an increasing and increasingly diverse audience as a source of delight, illumination and lifelong learning.

Our programs

SOURCE: Self-reported by organization

Special exhibitions, acquisitions, education programs

Showcasing more than 2,000 years of human creativity, the Museum's encyclopedic collections, ranked in the top five nationally and which currently contain more than 227,000 objects, are continually enhanced through an active acquisition program. The collection of Asian art includes ceramics, sculpture, paintings, and decorative objects as well as a Japanese ceremonial teahouse, a Chinese palace hall, a temple hall from Southern India, and a celebrated collection of Oriental carpets. The European collections include medieval sculpture, stained glass, and a 13th-century French cloister; masterpieces of Renaissance painting; a suite of 18th-century French interiors; and superb Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings. The American collections include extensive holdings of refined furniture and silver by early Philadelphia craftsmen; Pennsylvania German art; and the most important collection in the world of works by Philadelphia artist Thomas Eakins. Modern and Contemporary Art can be traced from the early innovations of Picasso, Braque, Matisse, and Duchamp to great works of abstract expressionism, pop art, color field painting, and contemporary work in many media. A vibrant and wide-ranging roster of lectures, gallery talks, courses, symposia, performances and programs for teachers and students reaches visitors of all ages, abilities, and levels of interest. The Conservation Department is dedicated to the examination and treatment of works of art, materials research, education, and preservation activities throughout the Museum. As one of the major art reference libraries in the United States, the Museum Library houses approximately 200,000 books, auction catalogues, and periodicals dating from the sixteenth century to the present. The Philadelphia Museum of Art administers the Rodin Museum and two historic houses in Fairmount Park.

Population(s) Served

General/Unspecified
Families

Budget

\$51,142,000

International Council of Museums. 2020. “Museum Definition.”

[ICOM](#) | [Resources](#) | [Standards and guidelines](#) | [Museum Definition](#)

Museum Definition

Creating a new museum definition – the backbone of ICOM

THE NEED OF A NEW MUSEUM DEFINITION

In the aftermath of the 2016 ICOM General Conference in Milan, a new Standing Committee has been appointed to study the current definition. The Committee on Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials (MDPP, 2017-2019) explored the shared but also the profoundly dissimilar conditions, values and practices of museums in diverse and rapidly changing societies. ...

Following the processes of active listening, collecting and collating alternative definitions through its standing committee on Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials (MDPP), the Executive Board of ICOM, at its 139th session in Paris on 21-22 July 2019, selected the below as a new alternative museum definition for a vote to be included in the ICOM Statutes instead of the current museum definition:

“Museums are democratising, inclusive and polyphonic spaces for critical dialogue about the pasts and the futures. Acknowledging and addressing the conflicts and challenges of the present, they hold artefacts and specimens in trust for society, safeguard diverse memories for future generations and guarantee equal rights and equal access to heritage for all people. Museums are not for profit. They are participatory and transparent, and work in active partnership with and for diverse communities to collect, preserve, research, interpret, exhibit, and enhance understandings of the world, aiming to contribute to human dignity and social justice, global equality and planetary wellbeing.”

ICOM’s Extraordinary General Assembly (EGA), which took place on 7 September 2019, in Kyoto, Japan, postponed the vote on the new museum definition. For more information on the EGA decision please visit [here](#).

As a result, according to the ICOM Statutes, adopted by the 22nd General Assembly in Vienna, Austria, on 24 August 2007, the current definition is still as follows:

“A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.”

THE WAY FORWARD

In January 2020, ICOM Executive Board (EB) appointed a new Standing Committee on Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials (MDPP2) that will start working with a new brief and a road map conceived by the EB. The EB Brief can be consulted [here](#). ...

Kennedy Center. 2020. CETA Evaluation Findings.

https://www.kennedy-center.org/globalassets/education/networks-conferences--research/networks--strategic-leadership/changing-education-through-the-arts-schools/ceta-learn-more-ceta_evaluation_findings.pdf

CETA Evaluation Findings

Formal evaluations of the CETA program have been conducted by:

- Dr. Ann Cale Kruger, Georgia State University (1999-2004)
- Real Visions (Drs. Bennett Lentzner, Linda Whitesitt, and Elda Franklin) (2004-2007)
- George Mason University (GMU) (2005-2008)

The program evaluations have focused on the following areas: impact on student achievement, impact of the professional learning on teachers' instructional practice, and effect on school culture.

Impact on Student Learning

"CETA students' 3rd grade ... scores in English and history improved significantly over time compared to Controls. ... CETA students showed significant improvement over a four-year span in academic achievement, academic effort, health/physical education achievement, and health/physical education effort grades. ... The findings strongly suggest ... CETA ... leads teachers to significantly increase their implementation strategies over time and that student achievement increases in a comparable fashion." (Kruger, 2005)

"Arts-integrated teaching was found to be particularly beneficial for students who might not be able to succeed or express themselves in traditional ways of classroom instruction." (GMU)

"Arts-integrated teaching was found to positively influence student engagement and create meaningful learning experiences for children across all content areas." (GMU)

"Commenting on the impact of arts integration on their students, they [teachers] repeatedly pointed to the high level of student engagement as a barometer of the success of their arts integration efforts. They described students as being more engaged socially and academically and viewed such engagement as a powerful factor in motivating student involvement with 2 learning experiences.... Teachers attributed the increased level of motivation to a number of things: among others, the appeal of movement to kinesthetic learners, the opportunity to become invested in projects with real-life connections, the chance to express themselves and find their voices, and the promise that all students could be successful.... In addition ..., teachers and leaders reported improvement in other significant student outcomes, including:

- Academic skills;
- Attitudes about learning and the arts;
- Self-confidence;
- Cognitive skills;
- Expressive abilities;
- Ownership of learning; and
- Cooperative learning skills." (Real Visions)

"It must be noted that arts integration instruction in the model schools may have been only one of a number of variables affecting the increase or maintenance of the percentage of students scoring in the advanced and proficient levels on MSA [Maryland State Assessment] reading and math tests. Yet, coupled with the perceptions of model school teachers and leaders that arts-integrated instruction made it possible for them to engage all students in learning, it is reasonable to consider arts integration a positive factor in increasing student achievement. The dramatic improvement noted at Drew is consistent with arts integration research indicating that arts integration instruction has a significant impact on students who begin from a point of lower achievement." (Real Visions)

"Teachers report their students have become more confident, more comfortable taking risks, and more socially adept." From 2002-2006, all 3rd and 5th grade test scores improved. Grade 3 Reading Scores increased 18.9% while the comparison school scores increased 1.4%. (Real Visions)

Impact on Teachers' Instructional Practice

"One goal of the evaluation was to examine CETA teachers' and CETA administrators' attitudes, knowledge, and skill in arts integration subsequent to their participation [in professional development]. Teachers claim they are approaching the curriculum differently, taking more risks, open to serendipity in the lessons, excited by the changes and the possibilities, and motivated by the professionalization of their work made real by continuing education." (Kruger, 2002)

"The professional development opportunities provided by CETA was another major topic of interest that emerged spontaneously among the participants in the interviews and focus groups.... Outlined below are some commonly cited themes.

- Kennedy Center Courses: Motivation. The conversations about professional development became emotional when participants talked about the treatment they received while studying at the Kennedy Center. It is clear from their discussion that the respect they were shown touched and motivated them.
- Kennedy Center Courses: Training Effects. One of the frequently cited benefits ... is that faculty learn the real meaning of arts integration and acquire some ways of thinking about the transition to that way of teaching.... Another ... grew out of the opportunity to reflect and plan with colleagues away from the pressures of school.
- In School: Study Groups. The ongoing professional development that takes place in study groups was mentioned as an important component. The external regulation of this aspect of the program was considered especially helpful.
- In School: Arts Coaches. The availability of mentors to assist teachers in practice is cited as an effective addition to training. Again, the external regulation by CETA allowed teachers to feel comfortable seeking the help of a colleague and helped in allocating the time necessary." (Kruger, 2002)

"... Teachers remarked favorably on the immediate practicality and adaptability of its instruction and lesson plans to a variety of subjects and grade levels, the usefulness of student assessment materials, the focus on students' creative work, the effectiveness of the classroom management tools, the impact of offering arts specialists the opportunity to connect with their colleagues at other schools, the well-developed curriculum, and the importance of modeling and coaching with their own students." (Real Visions)

Impact on School Culture

"CETA has increased teacher collaboration within and across grade levels as well as content areas, which has a positive influence on the schools' culture." (GMU)

"Teacher support, belief in, and use of CETA strategies plays a key role in infusing CETA into a school culture. As more teachers gain knowledge and skill with CETA strategies, join CETA and implement the learned strategies into their classrooms, the program reaches a point of sustainability." (GMU)

"Arts integration and implementation grows as specialists redefine their roles and teachers seek them out as collaborators for help in planning, modeling, and co-teaching arts-integrated lessons." (GMU)

"Teachers and leaders indicated that, to varying degrees, their school's arts integration program precipitated whole school change. They remarked that arts integration had come to define the way things are done at their school, made the entire atmosphere of their school more positive and cohesive, and helped make their school more child-centered.... Repeatedly teachers and leaders reported that their school's arts integration program had strengthened staff collegiality and collaboration." (Real Visions)

"The most critical component in improving teacher practice was professional development in arts integration.... It appears that the amount and consistency of arts integration professional development play a significant role in the emergence of an effective cadre of teacher leaders within a strong community of learners." (Real Visions)

Klein, Alyson. 2015. “No Child Left Behind: An Overview.”

<https://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/no-child-left-behind-overview-definition-summary.html>

Education Week

April 10, 2015

No Child Left Behind: An Overview

By [Alyson Klein \(@politicsk12\)](#)

UPDATE: NCLB has been replaced. For information about the latest education law, [read our explainer on ESSA, the Every Student Succeeds Act](#).

The No Child Left Behind law—the 2002 update of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—effectively scaled up the federal role in holding schools accountable for student outcomes.

In December 2015, Congress passed the Every Student Succeeds Act to replace NCLB. ESSA moved in the opposite direction—it seeks to pare back the federal role in K-12 education. ...

NCLB was the product of a collaboration between civil rights and business groups, as well as both Democrats and Republicans on Capitol Hill and the Bush administration, which sought to advance American competitiveness and close the achievement gap between poor and minority students and their more advantaged peers. Since 2002, it’s had an outsized impact on teaching, learning, and school improvement—and become increasingly controversial with educators and the general public. ...

What is ESEA?

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society program. [Passed in 1965](#), it created a clear role for the federal government in K-12 policy, offering more than \$1 billion a year in aid under its first statutory section, known as Title I, to districts to help cover the cost of educating disadvantaged students. The law has been reauthorized and changed more than half a dozen times since that initial legislation. And, for the most part, each new iteration has sought to expand the federal role in education.

What is NCLB?

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which passed Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support in 2001 and was [signed into law](#) by President George W. Bush on Jan. 8, 2002, is the name for the most recent update to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The NCLB law—which grew out of concern that the American education system was no longer internationally competitive—significantly increased the federal role in holding schools responsible for the academic progress of all students. And it put a special focus on ensuring that states and schools boost the performance of certain groups of students, such as English-language learners, students in special education, and poor and minority children, whose achievement, on average, trails their peers. States did not have to comply with the new requirements, but if they didn’t, they risked losing federal Title I money.

What do states and schools actually have to do under the law?

Under the NCLB law, states must test students in reading and math in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school. And they must report the results, for both the student population as a whole and for particular “subgroups” of students, including English-learners and students in special education, racial minorities, and children from low-income families.

States were required to bring all students to the “proficient level” on state tests by the 2013-14 school year, although each state got to decide, individually, just what “proficiency” should look like, and which tests to use. (In early 2015, the deadline had passed, but no states had gotten all 100 percent of its students over the proficiency bar.) ...

The law also requires states to ensure their teachers are “highly qualified,” which generally means that they have a bachelor’s degree in the subject they are teaching and state certification. Beginning with the 2002-03 school year, all new teachers hired with federal Title I money had to be highly qualified. By the end of the 2005-06 school year, all school paraprofessionals hired with Title I money must have completed at least two years of college, obtained an associate’s degree or higher, or passed an evaluation to demonstrate knowledge and teaching ability. States are also supposed to ensure that “highly qualified” teachers are evenly distributed among schools with high concentrations of poverty and wealthier schools.

What are some of the main criticisms of the current law?

Major portions of the NCLB law have proven problematic, particularly as the law has matured without any congressional update or reauthorization. For instance, it’s unclear that the two main remedies for low-performing schools did much to improve student achievement. In many cases, students did not take advantage of the opportunity to transfer to another school, or get free tutoring. States and districts also had difficulty screening tutors for quality. Some districts, including Chicago, successfully petitioned to offer their own tutoring services. States also generally shied away from employing dramatic school turnaround strategies for perennially failing schools.

The NCLB law has also been criticized for growing the federal footprint in K-12 education, and for relying too heavily on standardized tests. And others say its emphasis on math and reading tests has narrowed the curriculum, forcing schools to spend less time on subjects that aren’t explicitly tested, like social studies, foreign language, and the arts.

Education advocates also claim the law has been underfunded. The original legislation called for major increases in education spending to offset the cost of reaching NCLB’s ambitious goals for student achievement, but federal spending never reached the lofty levels outlined in the law. By fiscal year 2007, for example, annual funding for the main NCLB program, Title I, was supposed to rise to \$25 billion. It never got there. In fiscal year 2015, for example, Title I receives about \$14.5 billion.

What’s more, many states and districts have ignored parts of the law, including the requirement to ensure that highly qualified teachers are evenly distributed between poor and wealthier schools.

In order to improve implementation of the NCLB law, President George W. Bush’s second secretary of education, Margaret Spellings, allowed states to apply to participate in pilot projects to try out changes to the law, including a growth-model pilot that let states consider student progress in rating schools instead of comparing different cohorts of students to one another.

What happened to the 2013-14 school-year deadline for all students to be “proficient”?

By 2010, it was clear that many schools were not going to meet NCLB’s achievement targets. As of that year, 38 percent of schools were failing to make adequate yearly progress, up from 29 percent in 2006. ... several states did see failure rates of more than 50 percent. [In 2011] the Obama administration [offered states a reprieve](#) from many of the law’s mandates through a series of waivers.

What do the Obama administration’s NCLB waivers do?

The waivers, which are now in place in 42 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, allow states to get out from under many of the mandates of the NCLB law in exchange for embracing certain education redesign priorities. ... The Obama administration has made a number of adjustments to its initial waiver requirements, especially in the area of teacher evaluation, which has been the biggest struggle for states. ...

NCLB Terms to Know

Title I: The section of the law providing federal funding to school districts to educate disadvantaged children. The Title I program was initially created under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is now part of the No Child Left Behind Act, the most recent reauthorization of that law.

Lock, S. 2019. "Number of visitors to the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C. from 2007 to 2018."

Lui, Angela. 2012. “Teaching in the Zone: An Introduction to Working Within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to Drive Effective Early Childhood Instruction.”

White Paper

Teaching in the Zone

An introduction to working within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to drive effective early childhood instruction

Angela Lui

© Copyright 2012 Children's Progress. All rights reserved.

What is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)?

We can think of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) as the difference between what a child can do independently and what he or she is capable of doing with targeted assistance (scaffolding).

Psychologist Lev Vygotsky coined this term in the 20th century to describe the sweet spot where instruction is most beneficial for each student – just beyond his or her current level of independent capability.

What the child is able to do in collaboration today, he will be able to do independently tomorrow.

Lev Vygotsky

Instruction focused within each student's ZPD is not too difficult or too easy, but just challenging enough to help him or her develop new skills by building on ones that have already been established. Students are most receptive to instruction within their ZPD because it represents the next logical step in their ongoing skill development. In contrast, without reliable information on students' constantly evolving ZPDs, it is difficult to identify who is ready for more challenging material and who needs additional assistance.

The concept of the ZPD was originally established as a framework to describe the process of self development (Chaiklin, 2003; Van der Veer, 2007) as it occurs with the guidance of adults and peers in the learning environment. This concept arose as Vygotsky's

LOCATING THE ZPD

response to the use of intelligence testing as a measure of student knowledge and skills as well as an indication of what should be taught (Blanck, 1990; Van der Veer, 2007). Vygotsky's pioneering research focused on the role of social interactions in human development. In his investigation of cognition, he examined the

complex relationships between language and thought as well as learning and play. What he found was that children's social interactions with significant individuals in their lives (parents, peers, teachers, and other adults) profoundly shape their interpretations of the world and higher order thought processes.

Vygotsky suggested that instruction located at or below a student's current level of understanding would not be challenging enough to promote further development; at the same time, instruction that is beyond what a student can comprehend is ineffective for stimulating learning. He postulated that instruction should therefore be targeted somewhere in between, "offer[ing] tasks that are above the child's intellectual level, but not too far above it" (Van der Veer, 2007, p. 79). He proposed that this would enable students to build on current knowledge in order to advance in their learning.

Students' exposure to and interaction with others is a critical element of their educational growth (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Tudge, 1990).

With the level of potential development as a goal to work toward, students' learning can be visualized as their journey – aided by the support of peers, teachers, and family – through the constantly evolving ZPD.

As an extension of this concept, Wood, Bruner, and Ross used the term *scaffolding* to refer to the instructionally supportive activities and social interactions that occur between the child and other individuals as they guide effective learning and development in the ZPD.

Instructional scaffolding may include skill modeling, initializing and maintaining interest and motivation, and simplifying problems to a level that the student understands (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976)

Malburg, Sarah. 2008. "What Are Title 1 Schools?
Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Students."

What Are Title 1 Schools? Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Students

By Sarah Malburg 2008-10-13 [Teaching Methods, Tips & Strategies](#)

... Title 1 is the nation's oldest and largest federally funded program, according to the U.S. Department of Education. Annually, it provides over \$14 billion to school systems across the country for students at risk of failure and living at or near poverty. In fact, over the course of the 2009-2010 school year, federal funding through this program was used by over 56,000 public schools nationwide in order for struggling students to meet state standards in a variety of subject areas. ... the idea of Title 1 was enacted in 1965 under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This policy committed to closing the achievement gap between low-income students and other students. The policy was rewritten in 1994 to improve fundamental goals of helping at-risk students. With the implementation of **No Child Left Behind**, schools must make adequate yearly progress on state testing and focus on best teaching practices in order to continue receiving funds.

What is the Purpose of Title 1 Funding?

According to the U.S. Department of Education, the purpose of Title 1 funding, "is to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high quality education and reach, at minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments." The basic principles of Title 1 state that schools with large concentrations of low-income students will receive supplemental funds to assist in meeting students' educational goals. Low-income students are determined by the number of students enrolled in the free and reduced lunch program. For an entire school to qualify for Title 1 funds, at least 40% of students must enroll in the free and reduced lunch program.

How are Title 1 Funds Used?

How to use Title 1 funds rests with each school. Title 1 funds can be used to improve curriculum, instructional activities, counseling, parental involvement, increase staff and program improvement. The funding should assist schools in meeting the educational goals of low-income students. According to the U.S. Dept. of Education, Title 1 funds typically support supplemental instruction in reading and math. Annually, this program reaches over six million students, primarily in the elementary grades. Types of students that might be served by Title 1 funds include migrant students, students with limited English proficiency, homeless students, students with disabilities, neglected students, delinquent students, at-risk students or any student in need. Students can be classified as at-risk for numerous reasons. ... include: low academic performance, being held back a grade ..., or being homeless. There are other criteria ... as well.

References

- History of Title 1. *U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Office of Education*. 1969. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED033459.pdf>

- Title 1: Improving the Academic Achievement of the disadvantaged. *The U.S. Department of Education*, <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg1.html>
- Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies: Title 1 Part A. *U.S. Department of Education*, <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html>

Copyright © 2020 Bright Hub Education. All Rights Reserved.

McCluskey, Neal. 2015. “Has No Child Left Behind Worked?”

<https://www.cato.org/publications/testimony/has-no-child-left-behind-worked>

FEBRUARY 9, 2015 TESTIMONY

Has No Child Left Behind Worked?

BY [NEAL MCCLUSKEY](#)

Ranking Member Scott, members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to speak with you today. My name is Neal McCluskey and I am the associate director of the Center for Educational Freedom at the Cato Institute, a nonprofit, non-partisan public policy research organization. My comments are my own, and do not represent any position of the institute.

The No Child Left Behind Act was a well-intentioned law, but like federal education law generally, the reality of what it has likely accomplished has not lived up to its promise.

I’d like first to look at the evidence of the law’s academic achievement effects, especially on underserved populations. I do this with a few important provisos. First, standardized test scores generally only provide limited information about how children are performing, and NCLB focuses on reading and mathematics. Not only does that mean NCLB ignores art, social studies, physical education, and other academic subject areas, it also ignores character development, preparation to become active citizens, and other, broader educational goals. Second, test scores often tell us how well students were prepared to take certain kinds of tests, which does not always translate into useable skills or other desired educational outcomes. Finally, sundry variables influence academic outcomes — students’ health, home lives, motivation levels, district policies, state policies, etc. — and controlling for all of them in order to isolate the effect of a federal law is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

With those caveats in mind, what does the National Assessment of Educational Progress — the federal “Nation’s Report Card” — suggest about NCLB?¹

The good news is that below high school level there were gains during the time of NCLB for underserved student populations on both the “main” NAEP, which has been administered since the early 1990s, and the Long-Term Trend NAEP administered since the 1970s.

On the main NAEP, for free and reduced-price lunch eligible 4th graders, math scores rose from 222 to 230 (out of 500) between 2003 and 2013, and for 8th graders, from 259 to 270. ...

In reading less progress was made. Between 2002 and 2013 4th grade, free and reduced-price lunch eligible reading scores rose only from 203 to 207, and for 8th grade from 249 to 254.

The long-term trend results are similar. ...

These are generally good gains, but there are big problems with attributing them to NCLB. The first, of course, is pinpointing when to start the NCLB clock. The second is, again, that numerous variables affect test scores, and while controlling for income or race helps a bit, it does not tell us, for instance, how motivation to do well in mathematics and reading may have changed over time regardless of NCLB, or whether states set their tests to be more like NAEP without actually increasing useful learning. They also

don't tell us whether schools increasingly taught testing strategies rather than more effectively teaching course content.

Efforts to pinpoint the effect of NAEP empirically have suggested smaller effects, though they have difficulty controlling for hard-to-capture variables like motivation and culture. For instance, Dee and Jacob found that comparing main NAEP scores of states with and without accountability systems before NCLB suggests that NCLB improved math scores for the youngest and most disadvantaged students, but had no effect in reading. The study, however, had no control for potentially changing motivation or attitudes toward learning.² They also found evidence that NCLB had encouraged schools to devote more time to “narrow test preparation activities.” Looking at Wisconsin, Chakrabarti examined the effect of adequate yearly progress failure on subsequent high- and low-stakes test scores, and found a positive effect for reading but no statistically significant effect for mathematics.³ In addition, Chakrabarti found no evidence of improvement for weaker student groups — which NCLB was specifically supposed to help — and perhaps some “deterioration in performance... especially in the Economically Disadvantaged group.” This may be the result of triaging students to focus on those on the margins of passing. Where Chakrabarti did find a powerful effect was in schools that faced a serious threat of students being able to move to other, well-performing schools, but those were rare overall.

It is worth noting that, looking at long-term trend results, we see several periods before NCLB that had larger gains for underserved populations. For instance, math scores for African-American 9-year-olds rose 10 points between 1986 and 1994, or 1.25 points per year, but only 5 points between 2004 and 2012, or .63 points per year. Similarly, reading scores for Hispanics rose 9 points between 1994 and 1999, or 1.8 points per year, but only 8 points between 2004 and 2012, or 1 point per-year. Again, it is very hard to determine how much of these gains are attributable to federal policy, but they show that it is difficult to conclude that No Child Left Behind has been as a major difference maker.

Perhaps the most negative evidence we have for NCLB is test scores for, roughly, high school seniors, the school system's “final products.” (The trends report uses age, and the main NAEP uses grade, so the scores are for 17-year-olds and 12th graders, respectively.) Here we see, first, overall stagnation since the 1970s, an indicator that, despite roughly a doubling of both real federal spending and overall per-pupil outlays, we have not made much progress, at least as measured by federal tests.⁴

What do the scores show for NCLB, especially on the groups most likely to struggle? On the long-term trends test, they show little, if any, improvement. Between 1999 and 2012, scores for African Americans rose from 283 to only 288 in math, and scores for Hispanics increased just one point. In reading, African-American scores rose only 5 points and Hispanic scores went up only 3 points. ...

Given all this, at best one can say that No Child Left Behind may have had some positive effect on underserved 4th and 8th graders, but no discernable effect by the time students neared the end of elementary and secondary education. That means we have no evidence of any lasting effect — by far the most important outcome — and some evidence of short-term effects for students when in grades four and eight. And none of this can be conclusively pinned to NCLB because numerous variables affect outcomes.

Given the evidence of overall ineffectiveness, there is a good argument for eliminating No Child Left Behind completely. Indeed, the Constitution — which grants the federal government no authority to govern education outside of Washington, DC, federal installations and territories, and prohibiting state and local discrimination in provision of education — seems to require the end of laws such as NCLB.

Notes:

¹ All National Assessment of Educational Progress Scores come from the NAEP website: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/> Various website tools were used to pinpoint scores.

² Thomas S. Dee and Brian A. Jacobs, “The Impact of No Child Left Behind on Students, Teachers, and Schools,” *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), pp. 149–194.

³ Rajashri Chakrabarti, “Incentives and Responses under No Child Left Behind: Credible Threats and the Role of Competition,” Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports, no. 525, http://www.newyorkfed.org/research/staff_reports/sr525.pdf, November 2011.

⁴ Federal expenditure (not including major, temporary increases of ARRA funds) from National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2013*, Table 401.10, http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_401.10.asp?current=y..., and total per-pupil expenditure from Table 236.55, http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_236.55.asp?current=y....

McMurrer, Jennifer. 2007. Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era.

Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era

A report in the series From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 5 of the No Child Left Behind Act
Center on Education Policy

REVISED DECEMBER 2007

Summary of Key Findings

For the past five years, the Center on Education Policy (CEP), an independent nonprofit organization, has been conducting a comprehensive study of the No Child Left Behind Act. This year, we studied the issue of changes in curriculum and instructional time in greater depth. We included specific questions about curriculum and instruction in our annual, nationally representative survey of 349 responding school districts. We also asked specific questions about this topic during district- and school-level interviews in 13 school districts. This report—one in a series of CEP reports on year 5 of NCLB implementation—describes our findings. Our key findings include the following:

- **Increased time for tested subjects since 2002.** About 62% of districts reported that they have increased time for English language arts¹ (ELA) and/or math in elementary schools since school year 2001-02 (the year NCLB was enacted), and more than 20% reported increasing time in middle school ... the average increase in minutes per week ... was substantial, ... a 47% increase in ELA, a 37% increase in math, ...
- **Reduced time for other subjects.** To accommodate this increased time in ELA and math, 44% of districts reported cutting time from ... other subjects or activities (social studies, science, art and music, physical education, lunch and/or recess) at the elementary level. Again, the decreases reported ... were relatively large, ... a total of 145 minutes per week across all of these subjects, on average, ... represent an average reduction of 32% ...

¹The CEP district survey questions used the term “reading/language arts” at the elementary school level and “English language arts” at the middle and high school levels, but for simplicity’s sake, this report uses the term “English language arts” for all grade levels.

- **Increases and decreases more prevalent in districts with schools identified for improvement.** Greater proportions of districts with at least one school identified for NCLB improvement than of districts without schools in improvement reported that they have increased time for ELA and/or math at the elementary and middle school levels since 2001-02. ... [and] have decreased time in social studies, science, and art and music.

- **Greater emphasis on tested content and skills.** Since 2001-02, most districts have changed their ELA and math curricula to put greater emphasis on the content and skills covered on the state tests used for NCLB.

Recommendations

- **Encourage states to give adequate emphasis to art and music.** States should review their curriculum guidelines to ensure that they encourage adequate attention to and time for art and music, and should consider including measures of knowledge and skills in art and music among the multiple measures used for NCLB accountability.

2

Parsad, Basmat, and Maura Spiegelman. 2012. *Arts Education: In Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1999–2000 and 2009–10*.

A Closer Look at Visual Arts Education

This section presents findings that are based on data collected from school principals and visual arts specialists in elementary and secondary schools.

Elementary Schools and Teachers

In 2009–10 and 1999–2000, elementary school principals reported on the prevalence and characteristics of visual arts education programs. School principals in the 2009–10 study were also asked whether the school or district provided opportunities for professional development activities in visual arts during the 12 months preceding the study. Both studies collected information from elementary visual arts specialists about their professional development activities, teaching responsibilities, the integration of visual arts and other subject areas, and the use of formal assessments of students' progress and achievements.

Indicator 13: Availability of Visual Arts Education

Most public elementary schools offered instruction that was designated specifically for visual arts; 83 percent offered visual arts instruction in 2009–10 and 87 percent offered the subject in 1999–2000 (figure 14). In both years, the percentage of elementary schools that offered visual arts instruction differed by poverty concentration. In 2009–10, for example, visual arts was offered by 80 percent of schools with the highest poverty concentration and 92 percent of schools with the lowest poverty concentration.

Figure 14

Percent of public elementary schools reporting instruction designated specifically for visual arts, by percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: School years 1999–2000 and 2009–10

NOTE: More detailed data are provided in supplemental tables 1 and 128 at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubinfo.asp?pubid=2012014>. The 1999–2000 data presented in this figure may differ from previously published information because missing data from the 1999–2000 surveys were imputed for analysis in this report.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "Elementary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 2009," FRSS 100, 2009–10; and "Elementary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 1999," FRSS 67E, 1999–2000.

28 Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools

Indicator 14: Characteristics of Visual Arts Education

Elementary schools that offered visual arts were also asked about the frequency of instruction, the primary space used for instruction, district curriculum guides, and the availability of arts instructors employed to teach visual arts.

Table 13

Among public elementary schools that offered instruction in visual arts, percent reporting selected program characteristics for visual arts, by percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: School years 1999–2000 and 2009–10

School characteristic	Instruction was available at least once a week		Instruction was offered throughout the entire school year		Dedicated rooms with special equipment were the primary space for instruction		Arts specialists were employed to teach visual arts		Had district curriculum guide that teachers were expected to follow	
	1999–2000 ¹	2009–10 ²	1999–2000 ¹	2009–10 ²	1999–2000 ¹	2009–10 ²	1999–2000 ¹	2009–10 ²	1999–2000 ¹	2009–10 ²
All public elementary schools	85	85	88	87	56	68	72	84	78	83
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch										
0 to 25 percent	88	90	91	92	70	76	80	89	86	87
26 to 50 percent	85	88	85	87	53	75	71	87	79	82
51 to 75 percent	83	78	85	88	48	63	63	78	72	80
76 percent or more	81	84	88	83	41	59	67	81	70	83

¹Percents are based on the 87 percent of public elementary schools that reported instruction designated specifically for visual arts during regular school hours in the 1999–2000 school year.

²Percents are based on the 83 percent of public elementary schools that reported instruction designated specifically for visual arts during regular school hours in the 2009–10 school year.

NOTE: More detailed data are provided in supplemental tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134 at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2012014>. The 1999–2000 data presented in this table may differ from previously published information because missing data from the 1999–2000 surveys were imputed for analysis in this report. Arts specialists are education professionals with a teaching certificate in an arts discipline—such as music, visual arts, dance, or drama/theatre—who provide separate instruction in that discipline.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, “Elementary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 2009,” FRSS 100, 2009–10; and “Elementary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 1999,” FRSS 67E, 1999–2000.

Secondary Schools and Teachers

Secondary schools were asked about the prevalence of visual arts instruction in the 2008–09 school year (i.e., the year prior to the study) and the number and types of 2008–09 staff members who provided instruction in the subject.¹² As with elementary schools, secondary schools were also asked about the characteristics of their visual arts programs in 2009–10 and whether the school or district provided professional development in visual arts during the 12 months preceding the study.

Indicator 19: Availability of Visual Arts Education

Most secondary school principals reported that visual arts education was available at their school; 89 percent of schools offered instruction in visual arts during the regular day in 2008–09, and 93 percent offered the subject in 1999–2000 (figure 17).

The percentage of secondary schools that offered visual arts in 2008–09 differed by poverty concentration at the school, with 80 percent of schools with the highest poverty concentration offering visual arts compared with 91 percent and 95 percent of schools with the two lowest categories of poverty concentration.

Figure 17

Percent of public secondary schools reporting instruction in visual arts, by percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: School years 1999–2000 and 2008–09

NOTE: The 2009–10 survey asked whether visual arts was taught during regular school hours in the previous school year while the 1999–2000 survey asked whether visual arts was taught during regular school hours in the current school year. More detailed data are provided in supplemental tables 70 and 154 at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2012014>. The 1999–2000 data presented in this figure may differ from previously published information because missing data from the 1999–2000 surveys were imputed for analysis in this report.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, “Secondary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 2009,” FRSS 101, 2009–10; and “Secondary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 1999,” FRSS 67S, 1999–2000.

¹²The secondary school survey asked about arts course offerings and arts instructors for the previous school year since the survey was mailed in early fall 2009, when some schools might not have been able to provide this information for the current school year.

34 Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools

Indicator 20: Characteristics of Visual Arts Education

Table 17

Among public secondary schools that offered visual arts instruction, number of visual arts instructors reported by schools and percent that were arts specialists in 2008–09, percent of schools reporting the number of courses offered in 2008–09, and percent reporting district curriculum guides and dedicated rooms for instruction in 2009–10, by percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch

School characteristic	Number and percent of visual arts instructors reported by schools ¹		Percent of secondary schools reporting selected characteristics of visual arts program		
	Number of visual arts instructors	Percent of visual arts instructors who were arts specialists	Schools offered 5 or more courses ¹	Had district curriculum guide that teachers were expected to follow ²	Dedicated rooms with special equipment were the primary space for instruction ²
All public secondary schools	49,700	94	40	83	92
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch					
0 to 25 percent	17,400	94	56	87	97
26 to 50 percent	16,300	96	37	84	95
51 to 75 percent	11,200	92	36	79	89
76 percent or more	4,800	93	22	78	85

¹Percents are based on the 89 percent of public secondary schools that offered visual arts during regular school hours in 2008–09 because the 2009–10 survey asked about course offerings and visual arts instructors in the previous school year. Schools were instructed to count different sections of the same course as one course.

²Percents are based on the 97 percent of public secondary schools that offered visual arts during regular school hours in 2009–10 because the 2009–10 survey asked about curriculum guides and the primary space used for visual arts instruction in the current school year.

NOTE: More detailed data are provided in supplemental tables 71, 73, 75, and 76 at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2012014>. Arts specialists are education professionals with a teaching certificate in an arts discipline—such as music, visual arts, dance, or drama/theatre—who provide separate instruction in that discipline. The percent of schools offering the arts subject in 2009–10 school year was inferred from the “not applicable” response to questions about curriculum guides and space used for instruction in the current school year.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, “Secondary School Arts Education Survey: Fall 2009,” FRSS 101, 2009–10.

Penn, Kal. 2017. "Why the White House's Arts and Humanities Committee Decided to Resign All at Once Under Trump."

<https://www.vanityfair.com/hollywood/2017/08/white-house-arts-humanities-committee-resignation-trump>

VANITY FAIR HWD

THE FINAL WORD

Why the White

House's Arts & Humanities Committee Decided to Resign All at Once Under Trump

Kal Penn explains the committee's fiery response: "None of this behavior is presidential."

BY YOHANA DESTA

AUGUST 18, 2017

Update (4:55 p.m.): The White House has responded to the committee's decision to resign, stating that "earlier this month it was decided that President Trump will not renew the Executive Order for the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities (PCAH), which expires later this year," according to a statement released to the *New York Times*. The statement continues, noting that the committee "has done good work in the past" but is currently "not a responsible way to spend American tax dollars."

Kal Penn responded to the statement on Twitter, writing: "Lol @realDonaldTrump you can't break up with us after we broke up with you LMFAO."

The original article continues below.

On Friday morning, the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities made the startling decision to resign from **Donald Trump's** committee all at once. In a joint statement, all of its members—including author **Jhumpa Lahiri**, artist **Chuck Close**, actor **Kal Penn**, and more—explained in very specific terms why they no longer felt comfortable serving the president in the wake of his inflammatory remarks about the Charlottesville tragedy.

"Speaking truth to power is never easy, Mr. President . . . art is about inclusion. The humanities include a vibrant free press. You have attacked both," the letter reads. "You released a budget which eliminates arts and culture agencies. You have threatened nuclear war while gutting diplomacy funding. . . . Your words and actions push us all further away from the freedoms we are guaranteed."

The committee, devised in 1982 under the Ronald Reagan administration, was initially created to advise the White House on cultural issues. However, that mission has become extraordinarily difficult under the Trump administration, Penn tells *Vanity Fair*. Now that the group members have resigned, they will focus on protecting programs that were initially created by the committee—such as Turnaround Arts, an initiative that provides arts education to schools across the country, in partnership with the Kennedy Center, as well as Americans for the Arts, which provides arts funding to numerous schools. In addition, members will also continue to uphold the cultural exchange program with Cuba that began in 2016.

***Vanity Fair:* This is a really extraordinary measure, ... Why now?**

Kal Penn: ... our terms don't automatically expire with the changing administration—that our roles are nonpartisan. We're there to serve the existing programs that were created in terms of arts education and cultural diplomacy. And that would still be an opportunity to serve the American people.

It became clear that the government became inoperative under this particular presidency. A lot of the work and the agencies have been frozen. There's a big waste of taxpayer dollars. We had hope, ...

It's one thing to say you want to serve the programs you were appointed to serve, regardless of politics, but after a certain point . . . we just don't want our names attached to this in any way.

What was it like, trying to actually interact with this presidency in these last few months?

We found it incredibly difficult, and it seems that was on purpose. We had not, at least as far as I know, heard from the White House directly, ... There was no support and no interaction with the White House.

It's surprising that there was no effort made on behalf of the First Lady's office or anyone in the White House to reach out to the President's Committee at some point, but in a way, it's also not surprising. You look at the president's fiscal 2018 budget: under the National Endowment for the Arts, there's zero dollars. Under the National Endowment for the Humanities, there's zero dollars. You can have someone like **Ivanka Trump** talk all she wants about the importance of

programs for young people, but when she is a senior adviser and her administration's budget has zero dollars next to those things, it's not surprising that the First Lady isn't reaching out.

© 2020 Condé Nast. All rights reserved.

Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development. 2020.
 “Educational Improvement Tax Credit Program (EITC).”

dc.ed.pa.gov/programs/educational-improvement-tax-credit-program-eitc/

Pennsylvania
 WORK SMART. LIVE HAPPY.
 Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development

About Us Library

Why PA Business Programs & Funding

EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT TAX CREDIT PROGRAM (EITC)

Overview

Tax credits to eligible businesses contributing to a Scholarship Organization, an Educational Improvement Organization, and/or a Pre-Kindergarten Scholarship Organization.

Uses

Tax credits may be applied against the tax liability of a business for the tax year in which the contribution was made.

Funding

Tax credits equal to 75 percent of its contribution up to a maximum of \$750,000 per taxable year. Can be increased to 90 percent of the contribution, if business agrees to provide same amount for two consecutive tax years. For contributions to Pre-Kindergarten Scholarship Organizations, a business may receive a tax credit equal to 100 percent of the first \$10,000 contributed and up to 90 percent of the remaining amount contributed up to a maximum credit of \$200,000 annually.

How to Apply

Organizations

Applicants interested in applying as an Educational Improvement Organization, Scholarship Organization or Pre-K Organization can apply at DCED Center for Business Financing, Tax Credit Division, 4th Floor, Commonwealth Keystone Building, 400 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120: 717.787.7120 or RA-EITC@pa.gov. Do not use the Single Application. The application process is listed below.

President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. 2011. *Reinvesting in Arts Education: Winning America's Future Through Creative Schools.*

A remarkably consistent picture of the value of the arts in a comprehensive PreK–grade 12 education emerges from a review of two decades of theory and policy recommendations about arts education. Over the past decade, the National Governors Association, the Education Commission of the States, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the SCANS Commission (Department of Labor), and the Council of Chief State School Officers⁸ — professional groups with a broad education interest — have begun promoting the value of arts education using the same arguments as traditional arts advocates such as the National Endowment for the Arts, the Arts Education Partnership, the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, and Americans for the Arts. Last year's U.S. Conference of Mayors, which represents the mayors of over 1200 cities nationwide, urged school districts to use federal and state resources to provide direct instruction in the arts and integrate the arts with other core subjects.⁹

While there is support for the intrinsic value of developing cultural literacy and teaching

⁸ See Appendix D, the bibliography, for references to reports from major task forces and national groups. Perhaps the strongest evidence of broad education policy support for the place of arts education in the K-12 public education system is represented in standards for the arts adopted by 48 states and arts requirements for high school graduation in place in 40 states (Education Commission of the States; NASAA).

⁹ USCM 2010 Resolutions section on Arts Education.

artistic skills and techniques, leadership groups typically emphasize instrumental outcomes derived from high quality arts education in one or more of the following categories:

- Student **achievement**, typically as represented by reading and mathematics performance on high stakes tests, including **transfer of skills** learning from the arts to learning in other academic areas—for example, the spatial-temporal reasoning skills developed by music instruction;
- Student **motivation and engagement**, including improved attendance, persistence, focused attention, heightened educational aspirations, and intellectual risk taking;
- Development of **habits of mind** including problem solving, critical and **creative thinking**, dealing with ambiguity and complexity, integration of multiple skill sets, and working with others; and
- Development of **social competencies**, including collaboration and team work skills, social tolerance, and self-confidence.

Each category of outcomes is composed of many distinct behaviors that have been described with a variety of labels and supported by findings from research studies and evaluations. Below we highlight examples of landmark research findings and more recent evaluations related to the outcomes associated with arts education; refer to Appendix A for examples of the well-known studies and compilations of research that have been frequently cited as support for arts education.

Evidence for arts integration. The documented benefits of arts integration have also been accumulating over the past decade, although only recently have researchers begun to understand why arts integration may hold unique potential as an educational reform model. While the term arts integration takes on different meanings to different people, it can be loosely defined as teaching “through” and “with” the arts, creating relationships between different arts disciplines and other classroom skills and subjects (Burnaford, 2007). In recent years, it has formed the basis for several successful school reform initiatives, and has generated a lot of enthusiasm from classroom teachers, school administrators and policy researchers for its ability to produce results. Studies have now documented significant links between arts integration models and academic and social outcomes for students, efficacy for teachers, and school-wide improvements in culture and climate. Arts integration is efficient, addressing a number of outcomes at the same time. Most important, the greatest gains in schools with arts integration are often seen school-wide and also with the most hard-to-reach and economically disadvantaged students.

Earlier studies about the benefits of arts integration (Fiske, 1999) reported that arts integration approaches were successful in producing better attendance and fewer discipline problems, increased graduation rates, and improved test scores; motivating students who were difficult to reach otherwise; and providing challenges to more academically successful students. Studies from Minnesota (Ingram and Reidel, 2003; DeMoss and Morris, 2006) demonstrated particular benefits from arts integration for economically disadvantaged students and English learners in the form of reading achievement gains—not surprising given the similarities between effective language instruction techniques and visual arts and theater skills.

Reinvesting in Arts Education 19

School-wide achievement gains have been observed when arts integration has been applied as a school reform and improvement strategy. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan has noted his positive experience with arts in the Chicago Public Schools, a centerpiece of which is the Chicago Arts Partnership in Education (CAPE).¹³ The 19 Chicago elementary schools operating the CAPE arts integration model showed consistently higher average scores on the district’s reading and mathematics assessments over a six year period when compared to all district elementary schools (Catterall and Waldorf, 1999). Moreover, in the CAPE schools there were associated positive changes in school climate, e.g., leadership, focus on instruction, teacher collegueship, and participation in decision making.

CAPE researchers also began tackling questions about how arts integration supports student engagement in learning (DeMoss and Morris, 2002). Compared to traditional instructional experiences, arts-integrated units consistently engaged students in complex analytical cognitive activity, including those students who struggle with academic tasks. Students who were learning through arts-integrated units expressed no feelings of boredom or discouragement with the learning methods and showed interest in independent learning. After working through the non-arts units, students often self-described as discouraged; after arts-integrated units students demonstrated increased interest in the subject matter.

Probably the most extensive and systematic study of the benefits of arts integration is associated with North Carolina’s network of A+ Schools (which now have been established also in Oklahoma and Arkansas). A+ Schools are a comprehensive education reform model that is based on using arts-integrated instruction, incorporating Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences, recent brain research findings, and dance, drama, music, visual art, and creative writing. More than twelve years of research about the A+ Schools in North Carolina tracked consistent gains in student achievement, the schools’ engagement of parents and community, and other measures of learning and success. Most notably, the A+ Schools with higher proportions of disadvantaged and minority students performed as well on statewide

¹³ While we highlight here CAPE because of its associated research, there are other notable programs in Chicago that bring arts into the public schools. One good example is Project AIM, the Center for Community Arts Partnership’s arts

integration project which brings teaching artists into classrooms to work with students and teachers. Another major provider is the 50 year old Urban Gateways program, which has focused a number of its programs on arts integration with promising results.

20 Reinvesting in Arts Education

reading and mathematics assessments as students from more advantaged schools. This is doubly impressive considering that while other schools have focused on basic skills in response to high stakes testing, the A+ Schools have been able to achieve reading and mathematics gains on statewide accountability tests without narrowing the curriculum (Corbitt, McKenney, Noblit, and Wilson, 2001).

An evaluation of Oklahoma's A+ Schools underscores the school-wide value of arts integration. The study found significant differences in students' attitudes (more likely to find school challenging, interesting, and enjoyable) in schools where the A+ model was embedded in school policy and daily instructional practice—in contrast to schools where arts integration was treated as an add-on. The Oklahoma state report card's Academic Performance Index data show statistically significant advantages for A+ students compared to state and district averages; this is true even though, as in North Carolina, the Oklahoma A+ schools typically serve higher percentages of minority and economically disadvantaged students (Barry, 2010).

Last year, a Montgomery County, Maryland study with a rigorous evaluation design provided a more fine-grained look at the results of arts integration; the study compared three arts integration-focused schools (AIMS) to three control schools over a three year period. During that time AIMS schools substantially reduced the achievement gap between high-poverty minority students and other students. The AIMS school with the highest percentage of minority and low-income students reduced the reading gap by 14 percentage points and the math gap by 26 percentage points over a three year period. In the comparison schools, the number of proficient students actually decreased by 4.5% over the same time period (RealVisions, 2007). The AIMS schools with the lowest number of proficient students in reading and mathematics at the outset of the study experienced a 23% increase in the number scoring proficient over a three year period.

The Montgomery County evaluation also closely tracked the experiences of classroom teachers as they learned how to integrate the arts. Almost all teachers (79%) agreed that they had “totally changed their teaching” and (94%) that they had gained “additional ways of teaching critical thinking skills.” Montgomery County's arts integration results prompted the Maryland State Department of Education to

Reinvesting in Arts Education 21

invest in tracking arts integration and developing assessments of arts learning (ExCLAIMS, 2010).¹⁴

¹⁴ While delivering impressive outcomes for students, arts integration also shows great promise as a method to involve and engage a community in arts education. In Dallas, Big Thought has demonstrated how arts integration can be the catalyst for linking schools, community partners, families, and funders around a learning system coordinated in and out of school. As a result, the Dallas school district has been able to provide visual art and music for every elementary student in the district every week while also increasing out-of-school arts opportunities for thousands of students.

Raber, Jesse. 2017. "The Arts in Public Schools: An Intellectual History."

<http://www.processhistory.org/raber-arts-public-schools/>

Process: a blog for american history

HOME ABOUT SUBMISSIONS

YOU ARE AT: Home » Research » [The Arts in the Public Schools: An Intellectual History](#)

The Arts in the Public Schools: An Intellectual History

BY JESSE RABER ON MARCH 28, 2017 RESEARCH

This image appears in Leon Winslow's *The Integrated School Art Program* (1949). It is captioned, "Students of the High School Art-Curriculum Class in Architecture Engaged in Planning New Building Facilities for the School Art Department."

ABOUT

Process is the blog of the [Organization of American Historians](#), *The Journal of American History*, and *The American Historian*, dedicated to exploring the process of doing history and the multifaceted ways of engaging with the U.S. past.

Advocates for public schools have always needed to explain how they serve the public good, and these explanations have evolved within larger discourses of national identity. In this context, the public schools' arts curriculum poses significant questions about America's self-concept. Do the arts serve the public good (or are they, say, just a luxury)? And conversely: if the arts epitomize our best and freest selves, is any public good that excludes them really good at all?

The public school curriculum is difficult to study because it is largely written by local teachers and administrators, and thus varies widely. These local actors, though, often look to national educational thinkers for guidance. What follows is a thumbnail intellectual history of the arts within the national curriculum discourse, moving chronologically but organized by different conceptions of the public good.

When Horace Mann launched the public school movement in the 1830s and 1840s, he argued that public education would make the people better workers, and that drawing, which he wanted to include in the curriculum, had commercial applications. But Mann also believed, more idealistically, that the public schools promoted a self-governing society of self-governing individuals. Mann defined the self-governing person, according to the faculty psychology of the era, as one whose mental powers were all strongly developed, with the higher rational faculties controlling the lower emotional and physical ones. Art's role within the pedagogy of faculty psychology, known as "mental discipline," was ambiguous. For Mann, art was uniquely able to engage all levels of the faculty hierarchy at once; singing, for instance, exercised the physical

faculties by improving lung power, the emotional faculties by its “affinity with peace, hope, [and]affection,” and the rational faculties via the “mathematical relations” among tones. By contrast, the 1893 Committee of Ten omitted the arts from the first national high school curriculum guidelines because they lacked the mental-disciplinary value of academic subjects.

After the Civil War, as the U.S. grew into a society of large bureaucratic organizations, the self-governing individual was supplanted, as an educational ideal, by the coordinated society and the individual as realized through community. William Torrey Harris, a Hegelian philosopher, superintendent of the St. Louis schools (1867-1880), and US Commissioner of Education (1889-1906), argued that in order to achieve true “self-activity” and discover her “higher ideal nature,” the student’s “brittle individualism” must be subordinated to the “established law” of civilization. Harris’s curriculum initiated students into the collective wisdom of the past, and in literature he favored classics that revealed the grandeur of human potential. In art, he argued that the aesthetic principles of repetition, symmetry, and harmony mirror the stages of the individual’s induction into civilization. At the same time, like Mann, he also asserted the commercial value of art.

Progressive Era educators debated the extent to which social coordination should account for individual preferences. Harris, while extolling “self-activity,” saw “punctuality, regularity, attention, and silence” as the real basis of “successful combination with fellows in an industrial civilization”; his “self-activity” did not mean self-assertion. As a corrective to Harris, and to mental discipline, the American Herbartians (named after the German philosopher Johann Herbart) propounded the “Doctrine of Interest,” the idea that learning requires giving one’s attention freely to the material. Defining “interesting” lessons as those that seamlessly built upon one’s prior knowledge, they pressed for an integrated curriculum in which all lessons were carefully linked. “Just as the individual states yielded some of their particular rights for the sake of the higher unity, the central government,” argued the Herbartian Frank McMurry, this curriculum would show the importance of everything’s being part of a larger whole. Several Herbartians proposed that literature should be the center of the curriculum, arguing that texts like *Robinson Crusoe* or *Hiawatha* could serve as a base camp for students’ explorations of history, geography, and other subjects.

John Dewey accused the Herbartians of trying to stage-manage an inauthentic kind of student engagement, but their influence was largely eclipsed by a group whose technocratic version of coordination did not even pay lip service to individual self-activity: the social efficiency educators. Thinkers like Massachusetts education commissioner David Snedden argued that “it is for sociology to answer endless questions as to what is ‘the good community life,’” for politicians to

children.

faithfully execute sociologists’ ideas, and for citizens merely to select “efficient and honest” officials for the job. Snedden saw no place for art in public schools, though other social efficiency educators, like the University of Chicago professor Franklin Bobbitt, praised art as the spoonful of sugar that helped students digest data. Bobbitt favored works that gave students vicarious access to faraway facts, such as a novel about Laplanders that could help students learn anthropology.

Franz Cizek's child art pieces (something made by a child under his supervision). Although he helped them create works whose technical difficulties would normally be beyond them, he tried to preserve what he saw as the unique artistic sensibility of young

The corporate philanthropies that shaped Southern black schooling, especially the General Education Board, adopted the business-friendly philosophy of social efficiency. Working both within and against the constraints they imposed, Booker T. Washington developed a pedagogy in which literature and art were permissible only if they were directly related to vocational training for low-status work. W.E.B. Du Bois famously objected, calling for an aesthetic education that would develop black youths' critical social consciousness, but Washington largely prevailed in the public schools.

Between the world wars, new approaches to arts education emphasized experimentation rather than order. Social reconstructionism, which focused on cooperatively reforming society, arose in the change-hungry 1930s. In a social reconstructionist art program, students made art that improved their social environment, by designing landscapes, decorating shop windows, and creating labels for local products. Another approach, dating from the 1920s, was expressivist. Drawing on pop Freudianism and the Greenwich Village artworld, it emphasized the externalization of private, inner feelings. The rationale for this approach was largely therapeutic, but it also had an anti-totalitarian politics. Franz Cizek and Viktor Lowenfeld, its two leading proponents, were both Viennese emigrants who saw expressivist art education as an inoculation against fascism.

With the launch of Sputnik I in 1957, as the US appeared to be falling behind in the space race, calls mounted to overhaul the public schools in the interests of economic and military competition with the Soviet Union, downplaying social and psychological goals in favor of academic essentials. Cold Warriors considered replacing the "comprehensive" high school, which offers liberal education to all students, with a European style dual-track system giving intense academic training to an elite and vocational training to the majority. Harvard president James B. Conant, however, made a forceful argument for widespread arts education as a Cold War resource. Conant believed in a fusion of specialized education, which created wealth and knowledge, with general (i.e., liberal) education, which ensured that society worked toward common goals based on a common culture. Associating specialism with competition and general education with cooperation, he called for a meritocratic workplace within a solidaristic society. Conant saw artists as another species of competitive specialist, vying to create "warranted interpretation[s] of man's emotional experiences," with the winners becoming part of the canon of general education, where "minds most deeply and essentially meet" to forge "imaginative understanding of things in common." All American students, he argued, should study works that unite them to a shared past and a shared future.

Conant's call for a common culture left open the question of just what this culture was. Educators sympathetic with 1960s social movements sought curricula that openly challenged institutional oppression, but met strong resistance from the conservative movement, which responded with activist takeovers of local boards of education. Left-wing educators regrouped around multiculturalism, which affirmed the dignity of minorities without explicitly criticizing the status quo. Meanwhile, corporate philanthropists at the Getty Foundation championed a new approach called discipline based arts education (DBAE), which sidestepped the culture wars by defining art education as teaching the standards of technical competence upheld by the professional artworld. This emphasis on technical skills was shared by the accountability movement, whose rise was signaled by the 1983 federal commission report "A Nation at Risk." "A Nation at Risk,"

though, recalled the Sputnik era in calling for a return to essential academic skills; it did not recommend any study of art at all. Today's Common Core standards, an outgrowth of the accountability movement, initially did not cover visual arts, and their literature standards focus on reading and writing skills rather than the contents or aesthetic qualities of the texts. Promoters of the standards explain that they are only a baseline on which schools should build, but critics charge that, since keeping up with accountability measures has become the sole focus of many poorer schools, if poor children are to receive any art education at all it must be codified in the standards.

Jesse Raber teaches English at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago. His current book project examines the influence of educational reformers on novelists in the Progressive Era.

Rodin Museum. 2020. "The History of the Rodin Museum."

<http://www.rodinmuseum.org/492-518.html>

Rodin Museum

[Planning Your Visit](#) • [The Collection](#) • [Calendar & Events](#) • [Get Involved](#)

The History of the Rodin Museum

In the 1920s, the City of Philadelphia was in the midst of creating the Benjamin Franklin Parkway as a great civic space. The Free Library of Philadelphia opened its central Logan Square location in 1927, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art's main building opened the following year. Nestled between these two destinations, the Rodin Museum opened in November 1929.

A unique ensemble of Beaux-Arts architecture and a formal French garden, the Museum was designed by French architect Paul Cret (1876–1945) and French landscape designer Jacques Gréber (1882–1962). Its founder, entrepreneur and philanthropist Jules E. Mastbaum, gave the Museum to his native city as a gift. It was immediately embraced and celebrated, drawing over 390,000 visitors in its first year.

Today, the Rodin Museum is one of the defining icons of Philadelphia, housing one of the most comprehensive public collections of Rodin's work outside Paris.

Since 1929, [the Philadelphia Museum of Art](#) has administered the Rodin Museum and its collection.

© 2017 Rodin Museum All rights reserved.

Administered by Philadelphia Museum of Art

School District of Philadelphia. 2006. *Core Curriculum: Visual Arts K-12.*

T H E S C H O O L D I S T R I C T O F P H I L A D E L P H I A

GRADE 4: VISUAL ARTS	
PENNSYLVANIA STATE STANDARD:	
9.3 Historical and Cultural Contexts	
PA Standard Statements	VISUAL ARTS INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL
	RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES/MULTICULTURAL CONNECTIONS
<p>A. Recognize critical processes used in the examination of works in the arts and humanities: compare and contrast, analyze, interpret, form and test hypotheses, evaluate/form judgments.</p> <p>B. Know that works in the arts can be described by using the arts' elements, principles and concepts.</p> <p>C. Know classification skills with materials and processes used to create works in the arts.</p> <p>D. Explain meanings in the arts and humanities through individual works and the works of others using a fundamental vocabulary of critical response.</p> <p>E. Recognize and identify types of critical analysis in the arts and humanities: contextual criticism, formal criticism, intuitive criticism.</p> <p>F. Know how to recognize and identify similar and different characteristics among works in the arts.</p> <p>G. Know and demonstrate what a critic's position or opinion is related to works in the arts and humanities.</p>	<p>INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will look at and discuss a variety of works of art and artifacts that exemplify art makers from diverse cultures and historical periods Students will describe and identify, orally and in writing, using appropriate art vocabulary, elements, media, technique and objects in works of art and artifacts Students will understand and reflect on different responses to the same work of art Students will recognize that reflection is important for understanding and improving their own art work Students will understand that students can have similar and different descriptions of the same work of art Students will respect, appreciate and value the responses and opinions of others. Students will understand and value their own artwork and that of their peers and others through participation in classroom, school, and citywide competitions Students will understand that art/artifacts are created for a variety of reasons.(beauty, personal expression, functional, emotional release, documentation of an event) Students will compare works of art with similar subject matter, symbols and ideas Students will develop, use and retain an art vocabulary <p>INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading aloud, show picture books

PA Standard Statements	VISUAL ARTS INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL
	RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES/MULTICULTURAL CONNECTIONS
GRADE 4: VISUAL ARTS	
<p>A. Know how to respond to a philosophical statement about works of art and humanities.</p> <p>B. Know how to communicate an informed individual opinion about the meaning of works in the arts.</p> <p>C. Recognize that the environment of the observer influences individual aesthetic responses to works in the arts.</p> <p>D. Recognize that choices made by artists regarding subject matter and themes communicate ideas through works in the arts and humanities.</p>	<p>INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL</p> <p>PENNSYLVANIA STATE STANDARD:</p> <p>9.4 Aesthetic Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will look at and discuss a variety of works of art and artifacts that exemplify art makers from diverse cultures and historical periods Students will know that personal preference is not the primary criterion for evaluating art and artifacts Students will make conscious choices concerning art works using their knowledge of art and appropriate art vocabulary Students will know about the artists: e.g., basic background and details such as name, home nation or place, and unique traits such as media, subject matter and style Students will identify works of art of similar style or technique, e.g., art by one artist or art from one movement Students will identify visual clues in works of art that influence the meaning in an art work Students will compare similarities in elements, media, technique and objects in several works of art and artifacts Students will verbalize associations and references in observing art, e.g., "This sounds like " " Reminds me of "

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

GRADE 5: VISUAL ARTS

PENNSYLVANIA STATE STANDARD:

9.3 Critical Response

PA Standard
Statements

VISUAL ARTS INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES/MULTICULTURAL CONNECTIONS

A. Recognize critical processes used in the examination of works in the arts and humanities: compare and contrast, analyze, interpret, form and test hypotheses, evaluate/form judgments.

B. Know that works in the arts can be described by using the arts' elements, principles and concepts.

C. Know classification skills with materials and processes used to create works in the arts.

D. Explain meanings in the arts and humanities through individual works and the works of others using a fundamental vocabulary of critical response.

E. Recognize and identify types of critical analysis in the arts and humanities: Contextual criticism, Formal criticism, Intuitive criticism.

F. Know how to recognize and identify similar and different characteristics among works in the arts.

G. Know and demonstrate what a critic's position or opinion is related to works in the arts and

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

- Observe and discuss a variety of works of art and artifacts that exemplify art makers from diverse cultures and historical periods
- Know and use the critical process of the examination of works in the arts: Compare and contrast, Analyze; Interpret; Form and test hypotheses; Evaluate/form judgments
- Analyze and interpret specific characteristics of works in the arts
- Identify and classify styles, forms, types and genre within art forms
- Evaluate works in the arts using appropriate critical vocabulary
- Interpret and use various types of critical analysis in the arts: Contextual, Formal, Intuitive
- Apply the process of criticism to identify characteristics among works in the arts
- Compare and contrast critical positions about selected works in the arts
- Understand that students can have similar/different descriptions of the same works of art
- Understand and reflect on different responses to the same work of art
- Respect, appreciate and value the responses and opinions of others
- Recognize that reflection is important for understanding and improving one's own artwork
- Understand and value one's own artworks, and that of one's peers and others, through participation in the classroom, school, and citywide exhibitions

PA Standard
Statements

VISUAL ARTS INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES/MULTICULTURAL CONNECTIONS

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

GRADE 6: VISUAL ARTS

process of examination of works in the arts and humanities.

B. Analyze and interpret specific works of art.

C. Identify and classify styles, forms, types and genre within art.

D. Evaluate works using a complex vocabulary of critical response.

E. Interpret and use various types of critical analysis in the arts and humanities.

F. Apply the process of criticism to identify characteristics among works of art.

G. Compare and contrast positions or opinions about selected works of art.

- Recognize what an art critic does and identify how a critique can increase one's perception and appreciation for a work of art

9.3 Critical Response

- Identify the four steps of art criticism:
 1. Describe the elements and expressive features found within the work
 2. Analyze the artist's use of the principles of art
 3. Interpret the meaning or message implied or communicated. Form and test hypotheses concerning observations
 4. Evaluate and form judgments about the reason for the success of the work
- Use art criticism to compare and contrast, analyze, interpret, form and test hypotheses, evaluate/form judgments about artwork
- Classify styles, form, types and genre of artwork as being:
 1. representational, stylized, or abstract
 2. figurative, objective, or non-objective
 3. expressive, functional, and/or documentary
- Identify three types of critical analysis: contextual criticism, formal criticism, and intuitive criticism.
- Share student's critical reviews and discuss facts as well as similarities and differences of opinion

School District of Philadelphia. 2020a. "Fast Facts."

School District of Philadelphia. 2020b. “District Performance Office, School Information—District Enrollment & Demographics: SY 2019-2020.”

← → ↻ https://www.philasd.org/performance/programsservices/open-data/school-information/#district_enrollment

[Our District](#) ▾ [Schools](#) ▾ [Families](#) [Students](#) [Employees](#) [Directory](#) ▾ [Careers](#)

District Performance Office

215-400-4070

[Home](#) [About](#) ▾ [Programs/Services](#) ▾ [News](#) [Forms](#) [Contact](#)

School Information

Click below to expand the table to view a description of the data and download a data set for a specific school year. You can also download a [Zip](#) file that contains all available years for a specific School Information category.

The public release of this data supports our goals to promote greater transparency and community engagement. Before accessing these data, please review the [Terms and Conditions](#).

+ School Lists

+ School Enrollment & Demographics

– District Enrollment & Demographics

Click below for files that provide District-wide enrollment numbers as of Oct 1st, sorted by grade. Student subgroups include All Students, Gender, Ethnicity, and ELL, IEP, and CEP status. Note: SY 2019-2020 includes District, Alternative, Charter and Non Public Special Education enrollment numbers. All data prior to SY 2019-2020 only include District schools.

Last Refreshed: Dec 2019 | **Next Update:** Nov 2020

School Year	File Type	File Size
SY 2019-2020	CSV	13 KB
SY 2018-2019	Excel XLSX	12 KB
SY 2017-2018	Excel XLSX	24 KB
SY 2016-2017	Excel XLSX	25 KB
All Available Years	Zip file	58 KB

SY 2019-2020, All Grade Levels

Sector-- SubSector	Student Enroll- ment	EL PCT	IEP PCT	Ameri- can Indian PCT	Asian PCT	Black African Ameri- can PCT	His- panic PCT	Multi Race PCT	Pacific Islan- der PCT	White PCT	CEP Econom- ically Disadvan- taged Rate
Alternative- -Contracted	2,431	3.29	11.07	0.12	0.78	67.46	23.45	2.96	0	5.18	76.74
Alternative- -District Run	776	5.03	22.94	0.26	1.55	75.9	11.73	2.32	0.13	8.12	43.09
Charter-- Cyber	7,677										
Charter-- Non-Phila	1,867										
Charter-- Phila	67,699		19.32	0.19	3.42	59.55	18.31	5.3	0.06	13.16	
District	124,184	13.18	15.31	0.2	9.32	47.49	22.83	5.52	0.1	14.53	100
Non Public Special Education-- I.U. 26	59										
Non Public Special Education-- Non Public	1,085										

SY 2019-2020, 4th Grade

Sector--SubSector	Student Enrollment	EL PCT	IEP PCT
District	10,473	16.09	16.81

School District of Philadelphia. 2020c. “Prekindergarten Services.”

Prekindergarten Services

Information Regarding Preschool Services and Application

School District of Philadelphia Prekindergarten (Pre-K) Services

The School District of Philadelphia directly provides free, full-day preschool services to more than 9,500 children (ages 3-5) in partnership with Pre-K Counts, Head Start Partners and PHL PreK. It is important that you start the process of enrolling your child as soon as you know you will want preschool services. Entering children must be three years old by September 1, and five year olds after September 1. Children who are five before September 1 must apply to [Kindergarten](#).

Bright Futures & Prekindergarten Head Start Preschool Programs

Joy Diljohn, Executive Director

Bright Futures Prekindergarten is available to families with three and four year old children who meet the income requirements set by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Prekindergarten Head Start provides early childhood services to three and four year old children whose families meet the income requirements set by the Federal Head Start program.

For more information about the Bright Futures or Head Start programs, click the choose a location link, and then [click this link to fill out the Contact Form](#).

Pre-K Counts, Community Childcare Centers & Partner Locations

Michelle Linder-Coates, Executive Director

Pre-K Counts Partnerships — The School District of Philadelphia partners with 50 community agencies at 64 center locations through Pennsylvania's new Pre-K Counts program. Children in the program receive high quality early childhood services aligned with Pennsylvania's state standards.

Head Start Partnerships — The School District partners with 25 community child care organizations to provide educational, health, and nutritional Head Start services to three and four year old in 39 centers. The District and the partners work together to ensure that all children receive high quality programs so that they arrive at school ready to learn. The program is state funded and free to eligible families.

For more information about the Pre-K Counts, Community Childhood Centers & Partner Locations, click the choose a location link and then [click this link to fill out the Contact Form](#).

School District of Philadelphia. 2020d. “Office of Multilingual Curriculum & Programs.”

Frequently Asked Questions

If you don't find your answer here, please contact us.

What is an EL?

An EL is a student who is an English Learner. They were previously known as “English Language Learners” or “ELLs”. “Emergent Bilingual” is another term for an EL.

What is ESOL?

English to Speakers of Other Languages is a program designed to help students for whom English is not a first language excel.

How many ELs are currently enrolled in the School District of Philadelphia?

More than 14,000 students receive ESOL services. These students have more than 100 languages among them and represent more than 130 countries.

Last modified: October 1, 2018

© The School District of Philadelphia
440 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA 19130
call us at 215-400-4000

Scialabba, George. 2020. "Creativity Is Intelligence Having Fun."

<https://quoteinvestigator.com/2017/03/02/fun/>

Creativity Is Intelligence Having Fun

Albert Einstein? George Scialabba? Joey Reiman? John C. Maxwell? Anonymous?

Dear Quote Investigator: An invigorating comment about creativity is often credited to the universally recognized scientific genius Albert Einstein: Creativity is intelligence having fun.

Are these really the words of Einstein?

Quote Investigator: There is no substantive evidence that Einstein who died in 1955 made this remark. The most comprehensive reference about the physicist's pronouncements is the 2010 book "The Ultimate Quotable Einstein" from Princeton University Press, and the expression is absent.¹

QI hypothesizes that the saying evolved from the concluding sentence of a March 1984 article titled "Mindplay" in "Harvard Magazine", an alumni publication. Emphasis added to excerpts by **QI**:²

Perhaps imagination is only intelligence having fun.

The article author was George Scialabba who graduated from the prestigious university with the class of 1969. Later he joined the staff and began writing essays and book reviews for a wide variety of periodicals.

After publication the expression was disseminated and streamlined; in addition, the word "imagination" was replaced by "creativity" as shown in the chronologically ordered selected citations below.

Great thanks to researcher Barry Popik for his pioneering work on this topic.

In conclusion, George Scialabba should be credited with the words he wrote in 1984. The saying was modified over time. Joey Reiman's book included a version with "creativity" instead of "imagination", and he may deserve credit for the change. Alternatively, it may have already been circulating. The ascription to Albert Einstein remains unsupported.

(Great thanks to Rand Hartsell for accessing "Harvard Magazine". Many thanks to Danny for accessing the book "Resource of Creative and Inventive Activities". In addition, special thanks to previous researchers Barry Popik and Jay Dillon.)

Notes:

1. 2010, The Ultimate Quotable Einstein, Edited by Alice Calaprice, (No page number because statement is absent), Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. (Verified with hardcopy)
2. 1984 March-April, Harvard Magazine, Volume 86, Number 4, The Browser: Mindplay by George Scialabba, (Book Review of Howard Gardner's "Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences"), Start Page 16, Quote Page 19, Published by Harvard Magazine Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts. (Verified with scans; thanks to the library system of University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign)

Posted on March 2, 2017. Author quote research. Categories: Albert Einstein. Tags: Albert Einstein, George Scialabba, Joey Reiman, John C. Maxwell.

Silverstein, Lynne B. and Sean Layne. 2020a. "Defining Arts Integration."

<https://www.kennedy-center.org/education/resources-for-educators/classroom-resources/articles-and-how-tos/articles/collections/arts-integration-resources/what-is-arts-integration/>

Education / Resources for Educators / Articles & How-To's / Arts Integration Resources

What is Arts Integration?

Explore the Kennedy Center's comprehensive definition

Arts Integration is an **approach to **teaching****
In which students construct and demonstrate **understanding**
Through an **art form.**
Students engage in a **creative process**
Which **connects an art form and another subject area**
and meets **evolving objectives in both.**

The Birth of the Definition

The Kennedy Center's Changing Education Through the Arts (CETA) program was in its initial years when it became clear that there was a wide variation in the quality of arts integration teachers were providing in classrooms. Some instruction was on target while others were not. Many heated discussions followed about what the program considered to be "on target." ...

Thus, the Kennedy Center began an effort to further clarify the key ideas that formed the foundation for its work in arts integration and to draft a comprehensive definition that would provide a foundation for a shared understanding among all program participants.

The effort began with extensive research about how other organizations and programs were defining arts integration. Although many provided excellent descriptions, none totally fit CETA's vision. After months of research and endless conversations and debates, several key ideas were identified ...

Although the program strived for a shorter definition, it was decided that length was an invaluable attribute for helping others understand CETA's perspective on arts integration. As the definition was crafted, the inclusion of every word was debated. ...

Further, the discussions about the nature of arts integration led the Kennedy Center to clarify the variety of ways the arts are taught in schools.

The Arts in Schools: Three Variations

The arts find their way in to ... classrooms every day ... The variations can be distilled into three main categories.

- Arts as Curriculum
- Arts-Enhanced Curriculum
- Arts-Integrated Curriculum

All three variations are important, needed, and valid. All benefit from being supported by arts experiences—where students attend performances and exhibits by professional artists to engage in authentic experiences that deepen and broaden their arts understandings.

While the three variations naturally link and support each other, there are reasons why teachers and schools target one or more approaches. Understanding the differences in the approaches can help teachers and schools make informed choices about the programs they offer.

Art as Curriculum

If a school has a music, art, drama, or dance teacher, their approach is most likely and primarily Arts as Curriculum. Students develop knowledge and skills in a particular art form. Often referred to as "arts learning" or "art for art's sake," the programs are guided by national, state, or local standards for each of the art forms. For example, in visual arts, students learn the content, processes, and techniques for two- or

three-dimensional work. They learn how the visual arts developed and changed throughout history, and engage in creating and analyzing works created in a variety of media.

Arts-Enhanced Curriculum

When the arts are used as a device or strategy to support other curriculum areas, but no objectives in the art form are explicit, then the approach is called Arts-Enhanced Curriculum. For example, students sing the ABCs as a means to other ends—remembering the letters and sequence of the alphabet. However, students are not usually expected to learn about melody, song structure, or develop specific singing skills.

Arts-Enhanced Curriculum acts as a “hook” to engage students in learning content. Additionally, teachers need little or no training in the art form. Arts-Enhanced Curriculum is often mistaken for Arts-Integrated Curriculum or a distinction is not made between the two.

Arts-Integrated Curriculum

In Arts-Integrated Curriculum, the arts become the approach to teaching and the vehicle for learning. Students meet dual learning objectives when they engage in the creative process to explore connections between an art form and another subject area to gain greater understanding in both. For example, students meet objectives in theater (characterization, stage composition, action, expression) and in social studies. The experience is mutually reinforcing—creating a dramatization provides an authentic context for students to learn more about the social studies content and as students delve deeper into the social studies content their growing understandings impact their dramatizations. For Arts-Integrated Curriculum to result in deep student understanding in both the art form and the other curriculum area, it requires that teachers engage in professional development to learn about arts standards and how to connect the arts to the curriculum ...

Conclusion

... Without making a distinction, opportunities can be missed, programs can lack clarity, or the arts can seem like something too unwieldy to incorporate. Making a distinction among the approaches can help narrow or focus objectives as well as help educators select the most appropriate approach based on their objectives. Ultimately, students are best served when all three variations—Arts as Curriculum, Arts-Enhanced Curriculum, and Arts-Integrated Curriculum—are part of their education.

Historical Context

Our ideas about teaching have shifted over the last century and this shift has had implications for arts integration. This 6 1/2 minute video, *Public Education in the United States, Setting a Context for Arts Integration*, examines some of the thinking that has led to these changes.

Public Education in the United States, Setting a Context for Arts Integration, 6:30

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=25i3RJ9gvIs&feature=emb_logo

Inside the Definition

The definition includes terms that have deep connections to the arts and education. The following sections examine each key term. For ease of printing this article, [download a printer-friendly PDF](#)

WRITERS

Lynne B. Silverstein

Sean Layne

EDITORS & PRODUCERS

Amy Duma

Kenny Neal

UPDATED

January 14, 2020

SOURCES

- Jacqueline Grennon Brooks and Martin G. Brooks, *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivist Classrooms* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1999), 4.
- Lauren M. Stevenson and Richard Deasy, *Third Space: When Learning Matters* (Washington DC: Arts Education Partnership, 2005), 37.
- Dennie Palmer Wolf, “Building and Evaluating ‘Freedom Machines’: When is Arts Education a Setting for Equitable Learning?” in *Contours of Inclusion: Frameworks and Tools for Evaluating Arts in Education*, ed. Don Glass (Washington, DC: *VSAarts*, 2008), 5-6.

Copyright 1990-2020. All rights reserved.

Silverstein, Lynne B. and Sean Layne. 2020b. “Why Arts Integration? Two Big Reasons.”

<https://www.kennedy-center.org/education/resources-for-educators/classroom-resources/articles-and-how-tos/articles/collections/arts-integration-resources/why-arts-integration-two-big-reasons/>

Why Arts Integration? Two Big Reasons

Why are educators interested in arts integration?

While the concept of arts integration is not new, there is an increased interest and a growing number of programs and schools focusing on arts integration. Why are educators showing this interest? ...

1. Arts integration practices are aligned with how students learn.
2. Arts integration energizes teachers by providing increased professional satisfaction.

Reason 1: Arts integration practices are aligned with how students learn

Ongoing research about how humans learn supports constructivist theories of learning¹. These theories reflect the characteristics of effective learning which include learning that is active and experiential, reflective, social, evolving, and focused on problem-solving. Arts integration provides learning experiences that reflect all these characteristics.

When students learn through arts integration, they are engaged in **experiences** in which they **actively build and demonstrate their understanding** of both the art form and the other curriculum area. ... Students become active learners as they build on, extend, or challenge their prior understandings.

Reflection, an inherent part of the creative process, is integral to arts integration practice. Within the creative process, students create, **reflect**, assess, and revise their dance, drama, song, poem, or film based on an established criteria. ... This reflection transforms these experiences into learning². These verbal or written reflections offer insights for teachers and students. ...

By its very nature, arts integration engages students in **social and collaborative learning**. ... Teams of students work together to consider how they can demonstrate what they know and understand. ...

Arts integration engages students in the creative process where learning is dynamic and evolving. The creative process involves students in revisiting ideas and revising their work. ...

Arts integration places students into the role of **problem solvers**. The arts demonstrate that many questions have more than one right answer. The creative process requires that students create their own solutions to problems, make choices, and evaluate the results of those choices ...

... Because arts integration aligns with how students learn best, students find it personally meaningful and are drawn to it. For example, at-risk high school students report that their involvement with the arts is often the reason they come to school and stay in school³.

Reason 2: Arts integration energizes teachers by providing increased professional satisfaction

Not only is arts integration engaging and motivating for students, teachers find that it also energizes them and their teaching. Teachers that have been relying primarily on textbooks and worksheets as instructional strategies report that they feel increasingly discouraged by the drudgery of teaching and the lack of student engagement⁴. Many become bored or disenfranchised, and even leave the profession.

Teachers participating in arts integration programs say that arts integration puts them back in touch with what originally excited them about teaching. They want classrooms full of engaged, curious, and responsive students. They want to do what is best for student learning. They want to be excited about going into the classroom every day.

Arts integration can change the entire classroom culture. When every student is participating, engaged in purposeful conversation with their peers, and focused on making sense of the content in both the art form and the other subject area, the room fills with focused energy. Arts integration's alignment with the education of the whole child results in a similar alignment with the concept of the "whole teacher"—the energized professional that makes learning engaging and challenging for students, and who enjoys tapping into his/her own creativity for teaching. Teachers regain a sense of efficacy when they see the positive impact of arts integration on their students' learning.

"In the context of school cultures that frequently dismiss teachers as part of the problem, this approach [arts integration] affirms that teachers are part of the solution. When teachers are given the authority and

responsibility to reflect on their work and make it better, their morale and their practice improves. Arts integration becomes an invitation to personal growth and learning that changes their identity as teachers...” —Nick Rabkin and Robin Redmond⁵

In *Third Space: When Learning Matters*, the authors comment on the impact of arts integration on teacher satisfaction and renewal:

*“Indeed, teachers in the case study schools said they derive delight and professional renewal and satisfaction from incorporating the arts into their teaching. They enjoy teaching more, primarily because of the responsiveness of their students, and the new level of collaboration with other teachers in the school.”*⁶

Additionally, the impact of arts integration on school culture has been documented in two evaluation reports about the Kennedy Center’s Changing Education Through the Arts (CETA) program.

*“Teachers and leaders...remarked that arts integration had come to define the way things are done at their school, made the entire atmosphere of their school more positive and cohesive, and helped make their school more child-centered...”*⁷

*“Repeatedly teachers and leaders reported that their school’s arts integration program had strengthened staff collegiality and collaboration.”*⁸

*“Teachers claim they are approaching curriculum differently, taking more risks, open to serendipity in the lessons, excited by the changes and the possibilities, and motivated by the professionalization of their work made by continuing education.”*⁹

To conclude, in the past, and even somewhat today, the arts have been seen as something extra, and something fun to do if students needed a break from “real learning.” We now know that arts integration aligns with current best practices for teaching and learning, and that it offers a powerful way to help teachers return to the joy of teaching.

WRITERS

Lynne B. Silverstein
Sean Layne

EDITORS & PRODUCERS

Amy Duma
Kenny Neal

UPDATED

January 14, 2020

WORKS CITED

1. Jacqueline Grennon and Martin G. Brooks. *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivist Classrooms*, revised ed. (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1999), 23-31.
2. SEDL, “Action + Reflection = Learning.” SEDL Technology Assistance Program, Vol. 3, Issue 2, Winter 2000, 1.
3. Richard J. Deasy, “Don’t Axe the Arts!” National Association of Elementary School Principals, Volume 82, Number 3 (January/February 2003) in *Critical Evidence: How the Arts Benefit Student Achievement*, (Washington, DC: National Assembly of State Arts Agencies and The Arts Education Partnership, 2006) 14.
4. Based on ongoing, informal discussions with teachers and teaching artists in the Kennedy Center’s *Changing Education Through the Arts* (CETA) program.
5. Nick Rabkin and Robin Redmond, *Putting the Arts in the Picture: Reframing Education in the 21st Century*, (Chicago: Columbia College Chicago, 2004), 144.
6. Lauren M. Stevenson and Richard J. Deasy, *Third Space: When Learning Matters* (Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership, 2005), 74.
7. Drs. Bennett Lentzner, Linda Whitesitt and Elda Franklin, Nancy Wolcott ed., *Montgomery County (MD) Arts Integration Model Schools Program Evaluation Report*, (Montgomery County Public Schools & Arts Education in Maryland Schools Alliance, 2007), 19.
8. Ibid.
9. Ann Cale Kruger, *The Kennedy Center and Schools: Changing Education through the Arts – Evaluation Report*, (The Kennedy Center, September 2002), 3.

Simon, Nina. 2012. “The Art of the Steal: Access & Controversy at the Barnes Foundation.”
<https://museumtwo.blogspot.com/2012/01/art-of-steal-access-controversy-at.html>

POSTED BY NINA SIMON

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 04, 2012

The Art of the Steal: Access & Controversy at the Barnes Foundation

Last week, I finally watched [The Art of the Steal](#), an arresting documentary on the controversy around the evolution of the Barnes Foundation from a suburban educational art facility to a major urban art museum (to open in May 2012). The documentary raises basic questions about donor intent, legal execution of eccentric peoples' wills, and, most interesting to me, the definition of access to a collection.

A quick background on the Barnes Foundation. It was founded in 1922 by Albert Barnes, a wealthy scientist who collected what is now considered an incomparable collection of Impressionist and Modernist art. Renoir, Cezanne, Matisse, Picasso--Barnes collected it before it was popular in the U.S., and he collected the best of the best. With the help of educational philosopher John Dewey, Barnes founded the Barnes Foundation as an educational facility in Merion, PA, near Philadelphia. Unlike most art collections, Barnes' art was neither exclusively private nor a public museum. It was primarily used as a teaching collection for youth and adult students. The Barnes Foundation allowed a limited number of public visitors two days a week, but visitors were second-class citizens compared to the students.

Barnes protected his vision for the collection in his will. The art could not be sold, reproduced, loaned, or traveled. The school was to continue. There were slight concessions to public visitation, leading to capped attendance of about 60,000 per year. However, over the past thirty years, Philadelphia leaders clamored for the art to move to the city and be made more accessible to visitors (projections suggest the new facility will welcome 250,000 per year). The film documents the incremental subversion of Barnes' will and the eventual development of a new, highly public home for the collection in Philadelphia--exactly what Barnes despised and sought to avoid.

The [documentary](#) is shrill at times, with several Barnes Foundation stalwarts ominously repeating the word "conspiracy." There are cringe-worthy art critics who decry Barnes' rivals as "people who know nothing about art." But the fundamental story is fascinating and really challenged some of my basic ideas about museums. Despite my focus on populism and access, I am sympathetic to Barnes and his followers, who feel strongly that a serious injustice has been done.

The civic and cultural leaders who successfully challenged the original intent of Barnes' will had two basic arguments for the transformation of the collection:

1. **The Barnes Foundation was struggling financially.** A move to a more accessible venue in the center of Philadelphia would increase attendance dramatically, thus bolstering finances.
2. **The Barnes collection is an incredible cultural artifact that more people should be able to access.** Demand exceeded availability for public hours in the Merion location, and that demand constituted a valid public concern, one that foundations and politicians felt necessary to address.

I think both these arguments are bullshit. Let's look at each one closely.

First, let's talk money. The strangest thing about the documentary was the insistence by all parties--those who supported the move to Philadelphia and those who wanted to preserve the Barnes in Merion--that increased attendance would solve institutional financial crises. I kept scratching my head and thinking, what kind of art museum makes big money on attendance? Most art museums get a maximum of 10% of their income from admissions. ...

What's healthier for the financial viability of the Barnes Foundation--focusing on being a school, or focusing on being a museum? I don't see how a four-fold increase in public attendance--saddled with the significant costs of operating a large urban museum--will ensure stability.

Second, let's talk about access. If a donor designates a particular use of his or her property, how closely does that have to be followed? If a large body of civic and cultural leaders feel that the designation is no longer culturally relevant, does that matter? If someone owns something unique (and bars its reproduction or transfer), how much "public good" does that collection have to confer before the owner's wishes are challenged? And on a more practical museum management level, are there multiple ways to validly define access to a collection?

I don't feel qualified to answer the first three questions. But I do feel confident in my answer to the last one: **yes**. There are many ways a collection can be accessible or inaccessible (check out the UCL report [Collections for People](#) for a rigorous review of this). There are some collections that are entirely private. Others are accessible seasonally to a handful of visitors. There are publicly-owned collections that are only accessible by appointment or through digitization efforts. There are objects you can see, and objects you can't.

The Barnes Foundation was inaccessible to visitors who wanted to come to the facility, pay an admission fee, and view the art in the galleries. At the same time, it was deeply accessible to a cadre of teachers, students, and artists who spent prolonged periods with the work.

The controversial reconfiguration of the Barnes Foundation suggests that the first kind of access is more important than the second. That attendance trumps depth of experience. That center city trumps suburb. That granting access to 60,000 people per year is not sufficient to appropriately meet the demand to view the collection. That that demand has a moral public value. ...

The Barnes Foundation was not founded as a museum. It was founded as a school that used a privately-held art collection as its curriculum. I don't see why museum standards of access should be applied to such an institution just because it would be politically convenient to do so.

And that, I think, leads to the real reason governors, mayors, and heads of Philadelphia-based charities pushed to move the Barnes Foundation to the city. The Barnes collection is an extraordinary cultural jewel, and Philadelphia wants that jewel in its crown. It doesn't really matter if the collection is accessed by 60,000 people or 250,000 people, whether those people have a deep experience or not, and whether their admissions tickets will improve the institution's financial health. What matters is that Philadelphia can tout the Barnes collection and its wonders in its tourism and marketing materials for the city.

In some ways, this is a good thing. It implies that civic leaders do understand the incredible value of cultural institutions as identity-builders and tourism-attractors. But I don't think that justifies such a blatant disregard for donor intent, trumpeted with a one-note, "more attendance = better" horn. What do you think?

Smithsonian. 2020. "About the Smithsonian."

<https://www.si.edu/about>

Smithsonian Visit What's On Explore & Learn Get Involved Support About

About the Smithsonian

The Smithsonian Institution is the world's largest museum, education, and research complex, with 19 museums and the National Zoo—shaping the future by preserving our heritage, discovering new knowledge, and sharing our resources with the world.

The Institution was founded in 1846 with funds from the Englishman James Smithson (1765–1829) according to his wishes “under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge.” We continue to honor this mission and invite you to join us in our quest.

The Art of Education University. 2020. “Historical Perspectives in Art Education.”

uploads.nyc3.digitaloceanspaces.com/2015/06/Historical-Perspectives-in-Art-Education.pdf

Historical Perspectives in Art Education

Adapted from *Brief History of Art Education in the United States* by W.G. Whitford and [The History of Art Education Timeline](#).

Tishman, Shari and Patricia Palmer. 2006. *Artful Thinking: Stronger thinking and learning through the power of art.*

Project Zero

Harvard Graduate School of Education

124 Mount Auburn Street

Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

*Stronger thinking and learning through
the power of art.*

Final Report submitted to Traverse City Area Public Schools
by the President and Fellow of Harvard College
on behalf of Shari Tishman, *Principal Investigator* Patricia Palmer, *Project Manager*
November, 2006

INTRODUCTION

In October of 2003, Traverse City Area Public Schools (TCAPS), in Traverse City, Michigan, received an Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination grant from the U.S. Department of Education to develop a program called “Building Connections.” One of the key stated goals of the program is:

Integrating the arts into the core elementary school curriculum as a means for improving reading, writing, and general academic achievement.

Toward this goal, TCAPS invited Project Zero at the Harvard Graduate School of Education to develop an arts-infused curriculum in which the arts are used as entry points for students to develop deeper thinking and learning skills. Accordingly, Project Zero proposed to develop *The Artful Thinking Program* – a program to be used in the regular classroom that helps deepen student learning by teaching high- level thinking dispositions in and through the arts.

Artful Thinking is one component of a larger TCAPS grant from the U.S. Department of Education to develop a model approach for integrating art into regular classroom instruction. The purpose of the Artful Thinking Program is to help teachers regularly use works of visual art and music in their curriculum in ways that strengthen student thinking and learning.

The Artful Thinking program is designed to be used by the regular classroom teacher, not necessarily arts specialists. It currently targets grades K-9 and will eventually be used in all grades. The program focuses on experiencing and appreciating art, rather than making art. (Other components of the overarching DOE grant focus on art- making.) There are two broad goals of the program: (1) To help teachers create rich connections between works of art and curricular topics; and (2) to help teachers use art as a force for developing students’ thinking dispositions.

Project Zero was awarded a subcontract from TCAPS for a 2 year and 4 month period (September, 2004 – December, 2006) to develop the program, renewable yearly, pending continued TCAPS funding from the DOE. Year One of the Artful Thinking project was September, 2004 – August, 2005. Year Two covered a 10 month period, September 2005 – June 2006. The final period of the project was July, 2006 – October, 2006.

Artful Thinking Final Report, November 2006 **4**

The goal of the Artful Thinking program is to help students develop thinking dispositions that support thoughtful learning—in the arts, and across school subjects.

Works of art are good things to think about. This simple premise underlies Artful Thinking, a program that helps teachers regularly use works of art in their curriculum in ways that strengthen student thinking and learning. Used by classroom teachers across all grade levels, as well as art specialists, the program focuses on looking at and interpreting art, rather than making art. Its goals are twofold: To help teachers create rich connections between works of art and topics they are teaching; and to use the power of art as a force for developing students' thinking dispositions.

THINKING DISPOSITIONS

Most educators believe that it's important to teach students to think. Traditionally, efforts to teach thinking have been ability-centric: They foreground the teaching of thinking skills – reasoning skills, problem solving skills and the like – with the assumption that developing the requisite skills is all that's needed to insure the desired behavior. Thinking skills are certainly important. But if we want students to use their skills frequently, if we want them to transfer their skills to diverse and novel contexts, if we want them to feel committed to certain patterns of intellectual behavior in certain circumstances (for example, to feel committed to exploring works of art from multiple perspectives, say, or committed to taking the time to form thoughtful interpretations about works of art), then simply teaching thinking skills may not be enough. As an alternative, the Artful Thinking program takes a dispositional approach to teaching thinking. In a moment we describe how Artful Thinking takes a dispositional approach. But first a few words about the idea of dispositions and its presence in the psychological and educational research.

The general idea of dispositions is that people behave in a more or less informed and appropriate way guided not only by knowledge and skills but by predilections or tendencies. For instance, everyday language includes many words that mark tendencies in intellectual, social, and moral conduct. We speak of people as more or less open-minded, reasonable, thoughtful, skeptical, curious, friendly, responsible, generous, honest, and so on. Such attributions address what people are inclined to do within the range of their knowledge and capabilities. Closed-minded people could ponder different perspectives if they chose. People who lack curiosity could identify more puzzles and ask more questions. People who jump to conclusions or settle for first impressions could take the time to be more thoughtful.

A number of psychologists have included attention to dispositions in their analyses of thinking and intelligence. For example, dispositions play a central role in Baron's (1985) model of rationality. Baron distinguishes between dispositions and cognitive capacities. Capacity factors like short-term memory determine what in principle a person can do. Dispositional factors, in contrast, determine what a person does do within capacity limits. Perkins (1995) in an analysis of psychometric versus other conceptions of

intelligence discussed how positive dispositions are needed to overcome broad negative dispositional tendencies in thinking that veer toward hasty, narrow, indiscriminating, and disorganized thinking.

Artful Thinking Final Report, November 2006 7

Various programs of research have documented the presence of thinking dispositions and their influence on intellectual performance. For example, Cacioppo and Petty (1982) introduced the dispositional trait need for cognition. This refers to people's readiness to invest in cognitively demanding activities and enjoyment in such activities. Need for cognition has proven to be a stable individual trait largely independent of psychometric intelligence and showing significant positive correlations with school performance, thoughtful examination of arguments, and related matters (Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, & Jarvis, 1996).

Langer (1989), in a program of research extending over many years, has documented a very general disposition toward 'mindlessness' – the shallow processing of ideas and information in everyday circumstances that can lead to maladaptive albeit superficially efficient responses. Some people are systematically more mindful, and sometimes remarkably simple manipulations can boost mindfulness well beyond their obvious scope. For instance, giving elderly people plants to care for has been shown to improve their attitudes and patterns of activity in a number of ways, even to the point of extending somewhat their life spans.

Several researchers have developed ways to distinguish cognitive skills from thinking dispositions as predictors of intellectual performance (Stanovich & West, 1997; Perkins, Tishman, Richhart, Doni, and Andrade, 2000; Facione, 1995), and several philosophers and psychologist have argued for the importance of a dispositional conception of rationality or intelligence (Baron 1985; Ryle 1949; Dewey, 1933; Dai & Sternberg 2004).

Arts educators and art education programs have also recently embraced the notion of dispositions. For example, Studio Habits of Mind (Hetland, L., Winner, E., Veenema, S., & Sheridan, K., in press). takes a dispositional approach to the analysis and design of studio arts instruction. Art Works for School takes a dispositional approach to teaching thinking in and through visual art and theater (Grotzer, Howick, Tishman and Wise, 2002). Lambert (2006) argues for the importance of thinking dispositions as an outcome of arts education.

The Artful Thinking Palette

There are many thinking dispositions worth cultivating – curiosity, open-mindedness, reasonableness, to name just a few. Artful Thinking focuses on a set of six thinking dispositions that have special power for exploring works of art and other complex topics in the curriculum. They are: *questioning & investigating, observing & describing, reasoning, exploring viewpoints, comparing & connecting, and*

Artful Thinking Final Report, November 2006 8

finding complexity. These dispositions have been chosen for two

reasons. The first is that each of the six represent forms of thinking that are powerful in terms of exploring and appreciating works of art. The second is that each of the six represent forms of thinking that are powerful in terms of building understanding in other disciplines.

Each of these dispositions has specific intellectual behaviors associated with it. Reasoning involves constructing arguments and seeking evidence; exploring viewpoints involves looking at things from different points of view; finding complexity involves uncovering multiple dimensions and layers; comparing and connecting involves exploring juxtapositions and seeking connections; questioning & investigating involves posing questions and finding avenues of inquiry; observing and describing involves close looking and re-presenting. As a set, the six dispositions are synergistic: Observing naturally leads to

reasoning, which connects to questioning, which in turn links to connection-making, and so on. Artful Thinking uses the image of an artist's palette to express this synergy. A full-page version of the Artful Thinking palette can be found in Appendix A.

Thinking dispositions and thinking routines

Dispositions are formed when people routinely engage in specific patterns of behavior. Accordingly, in the Artful Thinking program, thinking dispositions are developed through the use of *thinking routines* – short, easy-to-learn procedures that help students enact thinking-dispositional behavior in and across the six areas of the palette. For example, these three discussion questions – *What do you see? What do you think about that? What does it make*

you wonder? – comprise a thinking routine that connects to two dispositions on the palette – observing & describing, and questioning & investigating. Other thinking routines encourage exploring multiple viewpoints, forming careful interpretations, finding complexity, and so on. Thinking routines are designed to be used flexibly and frequently. Students can use them solo or in small or large group settings, they can be used across subject

matters, and they can be used with a wide range of topics and works of art. Above all, they are designed to deepen students' thinking about the topic at hand, whether it is a painting, an historical event, or a mathematical operation. Please see Chapter 3: Instructional Components for more on Thinking Routines.

Artful Thinking Final Report, November 2006 **9**

Artful Thinking and making thinking visible

Too often, students are exposed only to the final, finished products of thought – the finished novel or painting, the established scientific theory, the official historical account. They rarely see the patterns of thinking that lead to these finished products, yet it is precisely these habits of mind that students need to develop. A key part of *Artful Thinking* involves making students' thinking visible by documenting

their unfolding thought processes as they use thinking routines. Making thinking visible in the classroom provides students with vivid models of what the process of good thinking looks like and shows them how their participation matters.

Artful Thinking Final Report, November 2006 **10**

Toledo Museum of Art. 2020. "Visual Literacy: Why Visual Literacy?"

<https://www.toledomuseum.org/education/visual-literacy/why-visual-literacy>

Why Visual Literacy?

We've all heard the old adage "A picture is worth a thousand words." Learning to read those pictures gives us advantages in both work

and life.

As infants, we learn to read images months before we become verbal and years before we attempt to become fluent in written language. Have you ever seen a toddler who can communicate through sign language before learning to speak? From a young age, a great deal of educational emphasis is placed on teaching children how to identify and read words and understand their meanings. So too do we need to learn to identify, read, and understand images – to become literate in visual language – in order to communicate successfully in our increasingly image-saturated culture.

Visual Literacy and the Toledo Museum of Art

At the Toledo Museum of Art, visual literacy is defined as being able to read, comprehend, and write **visual language**.

Although we are immersed in visual language, few of us stop to consider exactly how it works or how we might master it. Art museums, the repositories of the greatest examples of visual communication in human history, are specially equipped to help people learn how to unlock the meanings of images. At the Toledo Museum of Art, this process is called **The Art of Seeing™**.

What is Visual Literacy?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=039niAzuapc&feature=em_logo

© 2020 Toledo Museum of Art. All rights reserved.

U.S. Department of Education. 2009. No Child Left Behind: A Toolkit for Teachers.

https://www2.ed.gov/teachers/nclbguide/toolkit_pg10.html

ARCHIVED INFORMATION

U.S. Department of Education [ABOUT](#)
[ED](#) OFFICES

No Child Left Behind: A Toolkit for Teachers

Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements

Which subjects are considered the core academic subjects?

No Child Left Behind defines "core academic subjects" to include English, reading or language arts, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history and geography.

Last Modified: 08/13/2009

Upper Darby School District. 2020. "Comprehensive Plan 2018-2021."

Curriculum & Instruction

Upper Darby School District Comprehensive Plan

Upper Darby SD
 District Level Plan
 07/01/2018 – 06/30/2021

5

Educational Community

Located just west of the City of Philadelphia, Upper Darby School District serves an 8.3 square mile area of 82,795 (2010) residents in Upper Darby Township, Clifton Heights Borough and Millbourne Borough. One of the most densely populated and urbanized townships in Pennsylvania (110,397.7 /square mile), Upper Darby is typical of what have become known as "inner ring suburbs." Upper Darby public schools have experienced a significant increase in enrollment over the past 22 years, resulting in the largest student population in the County. Specifically, enrollment has grown to over 12,099 students as of 2016 up from 7,523 in 1985. Many of the district's 14 schools are quite large (there are over 3,600 students at the High School) and the Board of School Directors is working hard to alleviate overcrowding through innovative solutions including leasing recently closed parochial schools in the area.

Upper Darby schools serve an increasingly diverse population: 31.76% of students are White, 46.6% are African American, 14.4% are Asian/Pacific Islander, 5.62% are Hispanic and 1% are other. In 2016, there are 899 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students speaking over 53 different languages. Over 555 students also meet the state criteria for immigrant status. In addition, the district annually educates more than 380 students who have refugee status and/or limited formal schooling. In the past seven years, the percentage of students who meet the low-income status set by the Federal Free/Reduced Lunch Program has risen from 23% to over 60%.