Grantmakers in the Arts
2004 Conference

DANCING WITH DIFFERENT PARTNERS

Proceedings from the Conference
October 17–20, 2004
Renaissance Cleveland Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

DANCING WITH SCHOOLS II: THE ANALYSIS

There is growing recognition that arts education is beneficial for children and can play a role in school reform efforts. But what about arts education makes the most difference for children? Should we simply be teaching the various disciplines or should the arts be integrated with other academic subjects? What role should community arts organizations play? What level of exposure makes a difference? We will hear from researchers who have recently completed work that answers some of these questions.

Sessions Organizer: Deena Epstein, *senior program officer*
The George Gund Foundation.

A conversation with: Rob Horowitz, *associate director,*
Center for Arts Education Research at Teachers College, Columbia University
Nick Rabkin, *director, Chicago Center for Arts Policy*
(Guest appearance by Naomi Shihab Nye)

October 19, 2003, 2:30 p.m.

EPSTEIN: Welcome everyone to Dancing with Schools II. Naomi provided the perfect setup for us at lunch. If we ever had any doubt about the need for arts education and what arts education can do, you provided us the answer. I thank you so much.

We've hijacked Naomi for the few minutes before she has to leave to be part of this session because we think she can add something to it.

This afternoon we're very fortunate to have two researchers with us. They're not going to be too academic, folks. We're going to do this as informally as we can, a conversational format.

Nick Rabkin, who is immediately to my left, is the executive director of the Chicago Center for Arts Policy at Columbia College in Chicago, which does research and advances policy ideas designed to democratize the arts and understand how the arts contribute to community vitality and the practice of democracy.

We're going to put a little plug for his new book, *Putting the Arts in the Picture.* Is it available here at the conference?

RABKIN: No. It'll be back from the printer in a few days, but if you give me your card, you'll get a complimentary copy.

EPSTEIN: Oh, what an offer!

Many of you knew Nick from his days in the MacArthur Foundation, and he also, once upon a time, was executive director of Chicago's Organic Theater Company, so he has a grounding in the arts.

Rob Horowitz is associate director of the Center for Arts Education Research at Teachers College, Columbia University. He has been involved with two of the major compilations of research that have come out in recent years, "Champions of Change" and "Critical Links." He's been very involved in both of those and does a lot of research around arts education partnerships.

And he is a guitarist! So we have two people with grounding in the arts as well.

Each person is going to talk about the research they've been doing and why. Then we have a series of questions that I'm going to pose to each of them, and we'll ask the audience to jump in as they see fit.

Okay, take it away, Nick.

RABKIN: The first thing I would say is that the people I've learned the most from as I've thought about and worked in the world of arts education, have been practitioners like Naomi, who go into schools and who have discovered the capacity to transform them as places for learning through the arts.

Having said that, I have probably revealed more than I want to reveal about the fact that I'm not really a researcher. What I have done a lot of is read other people's research and try to be a bridge between the world of research and the world of policy and practice.

I think that's an important role to play, and I hope my book helps to play it. I'll explain more about the book as we get into the conversation.

HOROWITZ: I've had one of these circuitous career paths. Maybe some of you share this, I don't know. But I am a guitarist, yes. I was a teacher in an inner city, alternative high school in New York City for five years, helped run that school. I got involved as a consultant developing arts partnerships in New York City and around the country.

I then became a researcher and evaluator, although I suppose I was doing that all along. I am particularly fascinated with the issue of arts education partnerships, which are somewhat unique in the research environment, because they bring together these different areas, public schools, arts organizations. It's a fascinating area to work in.

My thinking has been shaped by my work in various ways, but nothing has shaped it more than working on "Champions of Change." I'm particularly tickled to be on a panel with Nick, the program officer on that project. Jane Polin is here, who's also with the GE Fund. We worked on that, it was a pressure cooker of a project, and we learned a lot from it, and it really influenced the way I think about this field. I'll try to introduce some of that into the comments.

EPSTEIN: The first question is, what are the structures and conditions that best support arts education partnerships? What makes it work? And, Naomi, feel free to jump in.

HOROWITZ: We're interested in everyone participating in this too, so we'll throw it back to you in a minute.

There are certain conditions that are going to make partnerships work better, and there are certain funding conditions that are going to make it better. I was able to work on a study for the Arts Education Partnership looking at six large-scale initiatives and evaluations of them. So the six were CAPE in Chicago, New York City Center of Arts Education, A+ in North Carolina, ABC in South Carolina, and the Getty Annenberg.

There are certain commonalities about what the evaluators found across these projects. One thing that they all articulated is that long-term funding and long-term support is better than one-shot funding. One of the strengths of those initiatives was that there was a long-term commitment from the communities and from funders to see the project through. Arts partnerships take some time to get going, and there's a power that grows as they work together.

Part of that also was the power of the network, being able to work together. Because these initiatives were across schools, one of the successes they had was being able to bring schools together.

They also supported long-term professional development for schoolteachers. So the assumption is not that you parachute in artists or you parachute in funding, but there's investment in long-term growth for those teachers.

Another strength was real administrative support in schools, an attempt to reach all the stakeholders of a partnership. In many of them an attempt to work with arts specialists, to bring them onboard to break down the barriers that sometimes art specialists feel that they're in. They often don't interact with the rest of schools and the rest of the people in school. Supporting other kinds of collaboration. One of the findings that seems to come through in all of those studies is that there's more collaboration and that there's more of a chance for different people within those schools to work together.

What seems to be most successful is when some of the funding is directed towards that, getting to people to break down barriers and work together.

RABKIN: I'd like to make two quick points that reinforce for the most part exactly what Rob was saying.

The first of them is that it's a rare circumstance when a single funder has got enough money to support all the things that Rob was talking about. If you have the expectations that your grantees are going to create partnerships, you'd better become partners with other funders and your grantees as well.

This is very complex, very difficult work to do. It requires a pooled intelligence in order to do it well.

The second point is a somewhat different point than those that Rob was making. This is a question I'd like to invite Naomi to talk about too – it has to do with the school as an environment for learning.

Many of you, I'm sure, have walked into lots of schools, and they don't look like the classroom that Naomi described in Winnipeg.

If you look at the cover of that brochure for my new book, you didn't see a whit of art on the walls. That's why we called the book *Putting the Arts in the Picture*.

Most schools are not real environments for learning. They're, in fact, in many respects, environments that discourage learning. They discourage kids' curiosity and inquisitiveness. They discourage kids from creating things that express their understanding or their questions.

Partnerships work better in places that have those environments where kids are invited to do authentic intellectual work. To try to answer real questions that are their own questions.

Since most schools don't do that, part of the work of the artist in these partnerships is to help change the school. Successful partnerships are partnerships where the artists and arts organizations understand themselves as agents for change in the school, not just as people who are bringing the art into the school.

NYE: That's right. Absolutely. I completely agree with everything both of you have said. It's so true and so accurate, every way you've described it.

One thing that is often important to think about for the artist going in is how to create an atmosphere, a very portable atmosphere that travels with the artist or operates out of certain classrooms, and might become contagious to other aspects of the school. So that you're starting to pull in people who aren't even the core group of whoever's doing the artistic project, but involving as many people as possible.

The more years I worked in it, it seemed very important to get someone in the school, and it does not have to be always the teachers who are directly involved with you, someone in the school really believing in and feeling like a profound participant, whether it's a counselor or the vice principal, or someone there who is committed and devoted so that you always know that that person is going to try to keep the energy going in the future.

The schools where teachers and administration agree to allow the teachers to participate in some in-service kind of way or doing work of their own or having a creative experience of their own, always work better.

Whenever the schools realize that that's another layer of artistic experience, and it's not always that easy to sell that idea in a school, because they have so much going on. Just to allow you to be with their children is a big gift they're giving you. But for them themselves to get involved, sometimes they don't want to do that. You have to convince them. Let them see the contagion of that experience.

I used to talk to artists about trying to carry a portable environment with you, whatever it is, something simple, whether it's a cloth you drape across the table and a piece of music that you like to play, just to make an atmosphere that switches out of that amazing cover of your book, an atmosphere that starts leading into another direction. It doesn't have to be involved or expensive.

RABKIN: Is it okay if I turn the tables on you guys?

NYE: Yes.

RABKIN: Does what Naomi describe sound like what the artists and arts organizations you send into the schools do routinely? Does it?

NYE: At its best.

RABKIN: At its best. How often is it at its best? That's an important question for funders to ask themselves. How do we set standards in this work to be sure that it's <u>always</u> at its best? What are the obstacles to artists? What are the obstacles within arts organizations that inhibit artists from taking that approach?

NYE: Seeing the artist almost as a consultant, someone who is coming to nourish and add to what's already there, even if there doesn't feel as if there's very much there in terms of creative work, is very important instead of having a competitive atmosphere with people who are there.

Some artists imagine when you go to a school everybody's sold on the project, they love you so much before you get there, they're so happy you're coming. That's very rare.

If there are just one or two people in the school who lean with an optimistic glance your direction, you should feel lucky! It's up to you to let them see how great it is and how much it does for the kids. Then it becomes your responsibility.

HOROWITZ: That's such an important point. In a lot of schools I've worked in that had successful partnerships, there's one person there who's the hero.

NYE: One person who's the hero of it.

HOROWITZ: Who makes it happen. But there's something troubling too about that because that person might retire or transfer. Often what we see is the committed principal or teacher moving on.

There's no easy answer because it does take someone who's going to go beyond the minimum. This is a challenge, and there's no easy answer to this. Building multiple constituencies within schools is so critical because those people will leave, and they will move on. They may not all be heroes, but there are messages from the principal, from the district, from funders, from everybody, that the education and the quality education is important.

NYE: As you work, creating that sense of visibility, where so many people see what's happened. Many people who didn't participate, you hope that they're going to start calling for this, if the champion of it in the school goes away.

Wait a minute, my child's in fourth grade this year, how come they're not doing any creative writing? Where's the writing workshop? Why aren't we having a poetry show? Why is no one ever reading?

Other people in the community will be asking for it as if it was a given. That was always the hope that it would suddenly start seeming like so much a natural part of daily life and school life, that it's not dependent on one person, either the artist or the person in the school, but just part of what happens in an educational atmosphere.

EPSTEIN: Are there readiness factors that we should be looking at as funders?

HOROWITZ: Yes. There was an interesting issue that came up with this with the New York City Annenberg when it was started. There was a fairly large pot of money coming into the system when this initiative, run by the Center for Arts Education, came in. One of the concerns arts organizations had was, did they have sufficient capacity to do the things that were going to be required? Whole school professional development, whole school programming, school reform, a whole bunch of things on the plate.

The arts organizations really weren't set to do it. That's part of the answer. As part of an initiative there has to be a way to build capacity with the organizations so they can be the agents of change.

The organizations have to also change as well. We've seen that in New York where organizations finally took on professional development of artists and teachers more than they had done in the past.

Building that inner capacity of being able to handle those kinds of changes is really important.

AUDIENCE: You're talking about the readiness of the cultural organizations. We actually, after two rounds of funding, developed a readiness quiz that was available on our website and at all pre-application workshops. It was like a Cosmo quiz, should I get a summer share? Should I cut my hair? *[Laughter]*

That allowed the folks at the schools to do a self-inventory that was private, never shared, nothing evaluative.

It's dumb things like, are you comfortable having other people in your room? Is your principal comfortable with you leaving the building? We found that that was as helpful as anything for the schools to self-select.

You can find the quiz on our website. Just Google us, Center for Arts Education.

EPSTEIN: Did you do one for the arts organizations as well?

?: We didn't. We talked about doing one, but, as Rob said, they had so much at stake at the beginning, that they very quickly as a community came together and identified in a very fluid way what they needed and how to pull it off.

RABKIN: Say goodbye to Naomi.

AUDIENCE: Do you want to give us your email address before you leave?

NYE: It's nshihab@aol.com. I'll send you anything I can.

AUDIENCE: Last question. Any comments on in-class versus after-school programs?

NYE: Both are good, and, in fact, now I know a lot more writers who are working in after-school programs than I did many years ago. I always worked during school. But I think they both can work in different ways.

When it was during school, it was more involuntary. You're all in this, like it or not. After school it's more selective. Who wants to come, or who needs to come, or who's directed to come. But I think they both have strengths.

AUDIENCE: And do you do one over the other?

NYE: I'll do anything. Thank you for listening to me. Bye bye.

RABKIN: I'll do anything. An awful lot of artists will say that to you.

I don't want to discourage anybody by telling this story. I'm sure that in this crowd a lot of people would raise their hands if I asked, do you listen to Ira Glass's radio program. Some of you may have heard his program this weekend.

It was about a school in Chicago in a low-income neighborhood that had been on an upward trajectory ten years ago during the heyday of school reform in Chicago. And Ira covered it for NPR just before "This American Life." He went back to that school now ten years after, and the place is falling apart. This absolutely inspiring teacher, who would have scored very high on the readiness quiz, was interviewed and is about to quit.

It's the overarching environment of schools today. It is poisonous! It's toxic. So it's difficult to do this stuff. It's <u>very</u> difficult to do this stuff. But that's the water you swim in.

I tell you this story not because I want to discourage you, but because this work is heroic. Naomi is a hero, and people like her are heroes. It is so important to make sure that people like Naomi continue to go into schools.

I want to say one quick word about the after-school/in-school. There's a lot more after-school money right now than there is in-school money. But there's something to be said for in-school, which is, it's all kids. It's not self-selected. It's egalitarian. Teachers and artists will need to learn how to work with kids whose initial inclinations may not be that they could be artists, that they can do this work.

It's challenging work, and we may talk more about Larry Scripp and the New England Conservatory's charter school in Boston, which is a music-based K-6 school. It's interesting to hear Larry talk about music teachers. They're not used to having to teach all children. There not used to having behavior problems in their classes. They don't like it initially. But it's a challenge I think we have got to accept.

AUDIENCE: It's so important with funding issues, to look at the overall structure of the project. One thing that also is important is this idea of investing in quality rather than quantity. I know there's a breadth versus depth issue in funding, and it's a very critical issue, and as a researcher I wish I had better answers. In other words, how much is enough?

The research suggests there's a tipping point of some kind. If there's enough funding, wonderful things happen, you lower that, not enough. We as researchers have not done enough to really provide that information which is so critical.

It's very important to fund the quality of the educational process as opposed to counting the numbers who've been served.

It's not easily done, but it's a very critical concept. All the things that we're going to talk about today take that depth of instruction. There really is a tipping point to get to where those effects can happen.

RABKIN: There is research that supports that point.

AUDIENCE: What is it?

RABKIN: Evaluation of The Arts for Academic Achievement in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In particular, the evaluators found that when they asked teachers, how much did you use the arts in your classroom, they found they could quantify how many more months the advancement in different subjects kids got as the numbers increased from classroom to classroom.

There are strong correlations between the intensity and volume of engagement with the arts in the classrooms and student achievement.

AUDIENCE: We're working on that in an ICARE in the evaluation where we're trying really hard. I'm working with ICARE here in Cleveland to evaluate their program. One thing we're looking at is trying to scale and measure the amount of quality program participation and compare it with outcomes.

RABKIN: Like Rob, I've spent a lot of time mulling over research on six, I think they're probably the same six, significant projects that had serious evaluation components over time, not just a snapshot, but over time.

One of the very best programs and one of the best evaluations was the one done in Minneapolis. The program is called "The Arts for Academic Achievement." The evaluators were all from the University of Minnesota, and the head of the team was a woman named Deb Ingram. It's available on the Internet, as Greg's stuff is, as well.

EPSTEIN: Was this actual arts teachers in the building, or people coming in from the community?

RABKIN: Good question. It's a nice segue into what are the different models for partnerships and what are the different pedagogical approaches that these partnerships use?

The Arts for Academic Achievement and CAPE, which were two of the partnerships that we looked at, use outside artists. They bring them into the building. Some others don't. A+ Schools, Jeannie Butler, who was here a short time ago and left, has been associated for a long time with A+ Schools. They don't bring any artists into the buildings. They train teachers to do the work at summer institutes and other professional development…

You guys in New York bring artists into buildings, and T-TAC did rather less of that. It was a lot more teacher training.

I couldn't tell from the evaluation what the Arts in Basic Curriculum in South Carolina brings.

HOROWITZ: I'll also make one more quick comment about this issue of structures. This is a little self-serving. There's a lot of advantage to bringing in evaluators early in the process. That was another point that was made by these six projects. Sometimes projects feel they don't want to bring in an evaluator yet because they're not ready, they don't want to be looked at.

I do think that initiatives really benefit from another perspective. Sometimes I feel like I'm the only grownup who sees what's going on. The kids know, because they're in the classroom, and they see the artists and they see everything else going on. But it's really worth having someone in, who's not part of the schools, part of the arts organizations, to take a good look and give formative evaluations.

RABKIN: I disagree only in one sense with Rob, and it's this: It's not that these projects derive great benefit from outside evaluation, I think that they do. But I also think that they would derive the greatest benefit from evaluation designs that engage the practitioners, the artists and the teachers, in the effort to answer the questions.

These are complex, intellectual endeavors that they're involved in, and most of the people who are in them, like Rob says, don't really know what they're doing. My own sense is there are very few people around with the kind of sensitivities that Rob brings into these classrooms that he's working in.

There are few education researchers out there who really have an understanding of the arts that's more than skin deep. Without the participation of the artists and teachers, the evaluation almost always loses some sense of the real work that's going on.

HOROWITZ: There's a philosophy promoted in the arts by Suzanne Callahan and some others that she calls "participatory evaluation" in a sense very similar to that. The providers, the practitioners themselves are involved in establishing the protocols. They're learning along the way.

RABKIN: It enriches the network of the partnership too, because then as a group, among schools, among arts organizations, there are shared questions that they're exploring. It mirrors what we're asking kids to do in classrooms. Careful attention over sustained periods of time to serious questions. That's what education should be about. It's real professional development for the entire network.

EPSTEIN: Any other questions before we leave this issue?

AUDIENCE: Where do you get these members?

?: It's a good question. I think our field is growing a lot. There's a collective group of us who are developing expertise and trying to share that. But I also think we need more of a forum to do it.

A lot of the information we've talked about is readily available on the Web, but in terms of researchers and evaluators working on this, that's something we need to do. Funding has not necessarily been directed towards improving evaluation, which may be fine. It's directed towards programming and initiatives for children's learning and for school reform. We need to take a look at the field itself and learn how to do this work better.

RABKIN: I'm putting on my old funder's hat, and suggesting that you begin by talking to the people who have done it and do it reasonably well. The likelihood of their having the time and opportunity to work with you in your city is pretty low, to be candid. But they could consult with education researchers who are local. They can pass along some of their experience and their wisdom.

I would strongly recommend that you really scour the education research communities. Most of us come from cities where there are education schools and where people do education research, but by and large they've not done education research on arts education.

Now there's a benefit to that. When Jane and I were working on "Champions of Change," we thought it was terribly important to engage researchers who <u>weren't</u> involved in the arts. Because they have a certain kind of legitimacy in the world of education research and policy, that somebody who's understood as an advocate for arts education historically, doesn't have. But they need to understand the dynamic.

AUDIENCE: So there's a tension between what you said earlier about the importance of a researcher bringing a certain sensitivity, or we might lose the essence of what is really happening, and what you just said now.

RABKIN: That's right. There is a tension. You have to find a balance.

HOROWITZ: Sometimes people look to evaluators out of the arts, because they'll be more objective. I think what often happens is they may not know what they don't know, and they end up back in the same place having to get that expertise.

That's an interesting point you're making, but it's also troubling that it's coming from an arts world, that the idea that we can't be objective or look at questions. It's a circular process. One of the things we benefit from is having advisory groups from multiple areas.

RABKIN: The sad truth is there are very few researchers in the world of education who do research on arts education. There hasn't been money to do it, so there's been little in the way of incentive for people to break into the field. There's a small community of people like Rob who've done it, and most people ignore it.

AUDIENCE: Is it our job as grantmakers to have evaluation within our own organizations, or are we passing that on to those who are seeking funds to evaluate? How much do we have to put into our budgets as well as the grantees' budgets, to do this kind of evaluation?

RABKIN: How did you do it in Cleveland?

AUDIENCE: We didn't do anything for a long time, and then with ICARE, we had some conversations, and they wanted to do that kind of research, and we pulled together the original ICARE funders. We brought Rob in to talk to the funders and educate them as to what kind of evaluation was needed and what we could be looking for, given the kind of data and information we had. Then those funders all kicked in, and that's how we're involved in this project.

RABKIN: You paid for the evaluation separate from your grants.

AUDIENCE: Right, separately.

HOROWITZ: That's a very important question. That's a really good example. I find an evaluation is going to be more successful the more broad based support there is, and the better understanding. Being able to work with Deena and to talk about what we're going to try to accomplish, at the outset, is very critical.

On the other hand, I sometimes am asked to work on projects where it's clear that there's a lot of ambiguity and unclear expectations within an organization, from an Ed Director to an Executive Director to funders to the community. People have all kinds of expectations or hopes about what an evaluation can do, and those things just don't work.

AUDIENCE: The evaluation was not in place when the program started?

AUDIENCE: There have been a couple of not very successful evaluations. The program started in 1996, there had been several years of planning before that. Two times along the way we had some attempts at evaluation.

The first evaluation was looking at the process and how the program ran, and was that the best way to be running it. Did we get at all into was happening in the classroom and with the arts organizations?

The second evaluation was done by someone locally, and was very misconceived. It was someone who didn't have the capability and it was less than successful.

We pretended it didn't exist. We don't want to talk about it. ICARE went through some changes in administration, and it finally reached a point where we were stable. We had some questions as to whether this was the way to keep doing it, or is there another way to do it more effectively? That was the point at which we began the conversations, convened the original funders, and now we're waiting with baited breath.

AUDIENCE: I can respond to that from CAPE perspective in Chicago. We've been in from the ground floor on that one. The first evaluation group we had from NCREL, it was like throwing money away. We were trying to get outcomes, and they were giving us process, and it just didn't seem to be a fit. After two years that was the end of that. Then James came in and did much better work.

RABKIN: There are some distinctions that are probably worth noting here. I completely agree with Cassie about the NCREL work being pretty lame.

In all fairness, it takes a while for the work to develop, and I don't think that NCREL understood the work well enough to see the developmental science. This was very early in CAPE's life, and the work didn't look like it looks now. It didn't even look like it looked by the time James got there. It took a year. I see two people from CAPE here, and neither of them were there during this year. The first year that artists walk into the schools and they start to plan this work with teachers, it's chaos! People are asking themselves, what are we trying to do? Why are we trying to do it? Why am I working with you? It takes a while for it to start to click.

NCREL saw that, and they were trying to say nice things, and it all came out sounding like mush.

AUDIENCE: In terms of the CAPE process and what we've been doing, we have to give the artists and teachers a space to experiment with for a year or a year and a half before they get their feet on the ground enough to participate in an evaluation or research methodology. That's a tough thing for funders to swallow sometimes because you want results within a period of time, and it just doesn't happen that way.

RABKIN: So do the schools. So resist the temptation. Try to build structures into your grantmaking strategies so that you don't expect results in a single school year. Because you're not going to get them. But a few years down the line.

AUDIENCE: I have a question going back to the secondary research. Is there any merit to piggybacking with some of the experiential learning or other after-school research that's being done? I don't know if after-school has good arts research, but it might have good, just, experiential learning.

HOROWITZ: There's some other good work being done, and I think that's important to work off of some of the other research.

Some of the work mentioned in "Champions of Change" was by Shirley Brice Heath. We tracked some programs outside of the school, after-school or community organizations. I think that's worth looking at and I think it's worth building on. It's a challenge.

What's interesting about that is that it's a challenge to aggregate a lot of information and apply it to arts partnerships, because there are so many different kinds of settings. We need to borrow and learn from that example. Also, sometimes people get trapped in thinking how it might apply to all settings that we're working in.

RABKIN: One point I'd make about the relationship between after-school and in-school work is that in the schools where this stuff really takes root, the distinction between in-school and after-school becomes much more seamless. In-school begins to look more like after-school. After-school begins to take on intellectual challenges that are different from the sort of recreational orientation that after-school programs often pursue.

It's an interesting way to think, I think, about schools. This is a bit arcane perhaps, but those of you who know Shirley Brice Heath know that Shirley hates schools, especially high schools. She thinks that they're bad places for teenagers and they screw 'em up.

Having two children, one just through high school and one in the middle of it – a good high school too – there's something to Shirley's theory. If my kids had gone to a bad high school, I'd probably subscribe to it 100 percent.

Better schools seem to have the capacity to be flexible in ways that after-school programs are. That's the stuff I want to learn from after-school as much as anything else. What are they doing in after-school that we can import into schools to make them places where the kids have better experiences.

AUDIENCE: Let me just weigh in with a couple of things. There is some extraordinary after-school work being done at Wisconsin and at Harvard that we all need to become more familiar with, because there are common issues there.

One of the key concerns in this conversation is there's a huge difference between program evaluation and research. I know people are coming from many different places in this conversation, but there are touchstones, documents that are being referenced right now, which you may want to become familiar with.

You want to become familiar with the documents available from the Arts Education Partnership, www.aep-arts.org. Greg, you're being bashful, so www.cae-nyc.org is the Center for Arts Education.

There's a new document out from the Arts Education Partnership that was done with AERA that Rob was very involved with, about the kinds of questions we should be asking. Having been involved with many different forms of evaluation and research, one of the key things you want to do is look at the research question, the program evaluation, and for what, or for whom?

The most important piece of a program evaluation is to improve the quality of the work that you're trying to do. At what stage do you decide to do it and who do you decide to involve. One of the things we have responsibility around right now is developing a group of graduate students who get as excited about this work as we do, because this will become an important strand of their careers.

Some of the success of the work in New York was because the playing field was raised by the work that was done at CAPE. A lot of programs are starting with a lot less false starts now because we are, as a field, learning from each other. But there's still a lot to be done.

Ohio has been an extraordinary place for this work. The work that's been led by the Goode and Cleveland Foundations here, work being done in Cincinnati and other places. The Ohio Arts Council has also provided extraordinary leadership in moving knowledge around.

There are wonderful research questions around this, which we're happy to make into heroes as well. For those who are less familiar, I would encourage looking at some of the existing work.

Just a couple of comments, and I, unfortunately, have to run out the door too.

AUDIENCE: For those of who want to think about this, one of the things we did with young audiences is we sat down with Dick Deasy from the Arts Education Partnership, who is an incredible resource. We talked to him about our dilemma and our issues. He was able to help us frame what we were looking for and offer us the names of several folks that he thought could be helpful to us, one of whom was Rob.

We didn't have to start from scratch; we didn't have to reinvent that. He is out there. And the partnership really is a resource that you can use. It was very helpful to us.

AUDIENCE: Can I just ask, Jane, which were those great after-school projects you mentioned from Wisconsin.

JANE: This is work that Terry Peterson, former special counselor to Secretary Riley, has been very involved with from the Mott Foundation. There is important after-school research being done by researchers at the University of Wisconsin and also with the Harvard Family Research Center.

I also would highly recommend research that's being posted regularly on the Benton Foundation's "Connect for Kids" website. Also "What Works for Kids," which comes out of Rhode Island, and it's related to the Annenberg work.

EPSTEIN: We've talked about structures and conditions. Now I'd like to move down to the next question.

RABKIN: As we deliberated about this session, we talked a bit about how important it is for people to have an idea what arts integration is because it's a term that comes up and is, as far as I can tell, not deeply understood.

One way to help you understand it is to contrast it to the conventions of arts education, and most of you know the conventions. We've got Art On The Cart, where the art teacher goes around from classroom to classroom. Like Naomi said, she's the hobo in one school. It's pretty weak stuff. The current data shows that the average elementary school kid in America gets forty-five minutes of art and music a week. It's not very much. There's outreach and enrichment, and I mention that partly because I think a lot of the work that, in these six programs that Rob and I have reviewed, began as outreach and enrichment work. It began in the sixties. It's a movement that began in the sixties as the arts were cut from the curriculum in schools across the country because of financial and, frankly, ideological perspectives.

Arts organizations tried to make up the difference by doing enrichment programs and bringing the arts into schools or bringing kids to museums and performances. They were designed as enrichment, they weren't sequential, they weren't developmental. They were usually about what the arts organization did, it was their outreach program about their work.

In the fifties, there was something called "creative expression." It was an extreme expression of progressive education. There have always been camps within the world of arts education that, on the one hand, thought the arts had something to do with real intellectual development, and on the other hand, thought that their real importance had to do with the development of the whole child, particularly with the child's emotional and social development. It had little to do with cognition.

Creative expression became the whipping boy for school reform in the late fifties and sixties, and it was one of the reasons that the arts were blown out of the schools during those years.

Fast forward a little bit to the eighties. Some of you are old enough, as I am, to remember the Getty stepping into the picture and saying, the school reformers who say that the arts are not serious intellectual pursuits have got something right. We've got to make them serious.

They developed this approach that they called discipline-based art education. It's focused, because Getty's a visual arts organization, on visual arts. But the principles of DBAE, as it came to be known, were very persuasive and powerful, and they influenced arts education across the board in all different disciplines.

For example, ABC, the program in South Carolina, I think pretty much just adapted the principles of discipline-based arts education for multiple disciplines. And T-TAC, another one that Getty and Annenberg did together, despite all of their talk about being about whole-school reform, was essentially grounded in discipline-based arts education.

Arts integration grew out of some sort of amalgam of all that. I'll say a few words about it, Rob will probably want to. And I'm sure there are people out in the audience who want to talk about it to.

Here's my quickie definition of arts integration. It makes the arts an interdisciplinary partner with other subjects. Students get rigorous instruction, both in the arts and thoughtful integrated curriculum in other subjects, that brings the arts into those subjects and makes structural connections between the arts and those subjects.

I'm going to quickly give you an idea of what I mean by structural connections. There are easy, simple ways to bring the arts into other subjects. Things like dance movements that help kids remember letter forms.

…is an important concept in the visual arts. There are important concepts in history too. The history of slavery told from the point of view of the slaveholder or the slave or the slave trader, they're different. The haystack painted in the morning is different from the haystack painted in the afternoon.

When kids learn those two things together, they learn both more deeply. That's what arts integration can do at its best.

HOROWITZ: I agree. I'm going to keep this brief so we can go on and hear from you. This term "arts integration" is a term widely used and little understood and poorly defined. I encounter that professionally through the work of trying to evaluate the research. That becomes really apparent because if I'm evaluating a program and I want to know the program components, and if one of them is described as arts integration, I have to know what it is so I can try to measure it.

You can't measure something that's not well defined. It's defined in practice. In other words, just because it's on a proposal, or it's part of an initiative or it's required that you can go integrate, that's the intention. But what really has to be looked at is what actually happens in the classroom between the artist, the teacher, the others.

We find there's very mixed definitions about what the term means, and wide variations in practice. Anyone who's been involved in the nitty-gritty of putting together arts partnerships knows that certain teachers may subscribe to the idea but do very little. Some teachers wish they could, but they don't have time. Some teachers don't care. Some teachers care passionately and do it really well. There's this variation. We need to better understand what happens in practice. That's based on the work of CAPE and others, so there's some growing evidence of what it is when it works well. There's still variation, though, amongst practitioners, of what that is.

There was a document put out by the professional arts education groups, NENC and NADA. They're the service groups for the arts specialist teachers. They collaborated with the dance and theater people to put out their criteria for what arts integration is in interdisciplinary practice, which was a pretty big step for them.

That's their attempt to define it. That's available on the Web, but unfortunately, I don't know exactly the site.

The various projects we've been referring to on their websites are various models of arts integration. For instance, the Minnesota people have put up a six-level system of various levels for arts integration. All of this is ways to think about it, food for thought. I get very concerned about it as a term, as an evaluator. Often what we're talking about is good teaching versus poor teaching.

Good teachers make connections between subjects, its just part of instruction. It's just part of the learning process. We can't compare bad general teaching versus good arts integration or vice versa. It's all in the implementation. It's all in how it's done, and that's what makes it good.

Part of the subtext of this as a researcher, that comes up for me, and maybe you can respond, is that I think we've had a false dichotomy out there about whether arts should be taught for their own sake, as a discipline, or taught as instrumental to learning other subjects.

Some of the arts integration folks start with the idea that arts are used for other subjects. It's a false dichotomy because it sets up opposing forces that badly meet together. It's a battle waged by some practitioners, some researchers and some others. The public really doesn't care or doesn't understand why these people would be fighting.

Arts integration has to do with deep learning in the arts and in other subjects. It can't be just the arts simply as a tool, as a mechanism. It has to be learning within the art form and learning in other areas.

The idea of arts for art's sake, we don't go to school to learn any subject for its own sake, we apply it in new contexts. On the other hand, arts are a discipline to be learned that takes sequential long-term study.

Somehow that idea gets lost amongst practitioners.

RABKIN: One of the best people at articulating how the dichotomy that Rob described can be bridged, is Larry Scripp who's the research director of the New England Conservatory. He has played a very big role in their charter school. I brought along a note from something I heard Larry talk about. The story's in our book.

He talks about a teacher meeting with a first grade student's parents, and explaining number awareness, which is something that kids have to learn in first grade. But number awareness taught with music can combine five or six aspects of math as well. A teacher then can say to a parent of a first grader, "Your first grader knows, through musical notation, that seven is larger than three, but also that seven is higher than three on the scale. It also lasts longer than three. That the seventh beat comes after the third beat."

So through music, number means all these things at once! Because your student understands these math concepts, she's also a better musician. That's the bridge in the dichotomy.

AUDIENCE: Would you comment on whether you think children need to be taught the elements of the arts disciplines before integration can happen?

AUDIENCE: The answer is no, right? It's simultaneous.

RABKIN: You bet. You bet! If you can learn anything one way, you can learn it another way too. Everything we know about learning in general says that learning happens best when it happens as the result of an individual's personal investment and exploration of a question.

David Perkins, who some of you may be aware of, is to me, one of the intellectual heroes in this field. I don't know if Rob agrees. He was for a long time the co-director with Howard Gardner of Project Zero at Harvard, and has made even bigger contributions to thinking about this. Perkins has a wonderful book about schools that I highly recommend called *Smart Schools.*

The main point Perkins makes in the book is that the way we think about learning is that kids gain knowledge first and then use the knowledge to think about other stuff. He says that's an inversion of the real process. Kids need to think about stuff. That's how they get knowledge.

So ask a kid to write a poem, and then they're going to start to wonder, "How can I make it better?" Then the rules begin to matter.

AUDIENCE: Isn't that part of the dichotomy between specialists and the visiting artists? Because the specialists think they're there to do the teaching of the elements.

HOROWITZ: It doesn't have to be. That might be part of why it's a false dichotomy. In that it may not be the question, the question you pose. It's an interesting question, and I think the answer is a more or less constructivist-based approach that you learn something from doing.

There are things to learn within the art forms. A good arts teacher is not necessarily just teaching elements, but they're doing these things as well.

There are reasons that are systemic that this has been set up as opposing forces. We need to do all we can to break that down, to bring specialists in.

In my work teaching, I teach research methods, but I have new specialists coming to the program. There's a far greater openness to working in various kinds of partnerships and teaching in all kinds of multi-dimensional integrated needs. Yet they're very steeped in music and visual art, with really expert knowledge.

Part of what's happened very often in situations is that the specialists have not been good at articulating what they do, being able to work across lines, and not necessarily being politically able to defend their position. They're beleaguered and angry, often.

With private initiatives we need to do all we can to bridge that gap. Having specialists with that content knowledge in schools is really important.

Another benefit to specialists, which we often don't talk about, is that there's someone in the school building who nurtures a kid over five years, who's the one who sees them grow up, who can articulate to an arts organization or a principal or other colleagues, that when the child comes into kindergarten what are they going to really know in five years, what do they understand?

It's a burden that arts organization can't really take on easily. That's very important.

AUDIENCE: I was going to get into the issue of standards. In Ohio, the elements are one slice of what's being taught in the art form. Visiting artists, unless they're doing private music instruction, they're not going to teach kids how to be a trumpet player probably.

However, they may do a lot about context of music, music history, about aesthetic response, about reflecting, so it can really all work together. It comes out of DBAE really. If you don't have a lot of instruments, visiting artists don't have trumpets for all twenty-five of your kids. They might do drumming, but I think the standards, in a way, makes it easier to see a fit between some of the art specialists and art music specialists and outside, external providers.

AUDIENCE: I'd like to offer up an alternative for us to think about. I'm the executive director of ArtsTeach, which was formerly Cultural Education Collective of Charlotte, North Carolina. For seven years, we did whole schools, and during summer institutes.

What we found is the sustainability was not there. We'd let the school go, and all of a sudden there would be failure, and we'd have to bring them back in and let them be a part of the summer institute.

So we did something novel. We went to the superintendent and said, look at your balanced score card, tell us where your greatest need is. What can we do to partner with you? They were very clear that they were struggling with fourth grade reading.

We centered our professional development with fourth grade teachers in the summer, and we asked all the administrators to send a fourth grade teacher with their arts teacher to partner together to be in-service.

It was hugely successful. We surveyed them before, they absolutely had no clue about arts integration. At the end of the in-service, they were very, very positive. But out of that, each of them created a lesson plan that was arts-infused.

We had a national board certified team of juries that took a look at it. It is going up on Learning Village, which is our Web instructional tool that IBM has given us. The classroom teachers now, because it's aligned to Open Court, which is our reading adoption, will be able to pull down a lesson plan at any given week that's arts-infused. Now, how do we know it's happening? Because we're, number one, monitoring the button, and number two, they have to pre-test and post-test and send them to us. So we know for a fact they've used the lesson.

In January, we're going to give them an opportunity, if they continue to use these lesson plans, to have an artist or an organization come in to spend a week with them to take one of the lessons during January, February, March, or April, and make it deeper. That's how we're getting the arts and organizations to work with them and collaborate.

We've been back to the schools. I just met with an associate superintendent last week and he said, "We're successful with the reading component. Now what would you like for us to do?" The response was, writing. We have a writing test on the fourth grade, the seventh grade and the tenth grade. Writing is an absolute failure.

What we do know is that the artists and organizations work <u>beautifully</u> with writing. That's more or less their forté. So we're in the business now of creating what our in-service will be like this summer.

It's an alternative way to look at how you can impact schools and partner with schools and answer those questions that they have so that it's seamless.

EPSTEIN: Talk about effective processes and practices in arts partnership and in the classroom, the actual nitty-gritty on the ground. What do we know about that from the research?

RABKIN: We'll probably have some exchange on this, and I'll take up where you left off.

The research says that school systems, more often than not, cripple reform rather than enable reform. Which is not to say you don't want to do exactly as you've done, try to make the system work for you and try to figure out creative strategies to do that. But, by and large, progress has to be made on a school-by-school basis, and the greatest successes are individual sites that are supported or at least not screwed up by systems. Site-based change is a fundamental principle. Second, is that the people who come into the schools, the artists and arts organizations, need to understand themselves as reform initiatives, not just as an arts education initiative.

They have to understand that the arts are competing for scarce resources and for time, which is probably the scarcest of resources in the school today. And if the arts can't contribute to the broader goals of reform, we lose these competitions.

I want to say one more word. That has to do with the arts specialists question. I want to return to that briefly.

I think the CAPE folks in the room will back this up, and I hope Greg will too from New York, there are places that have found the key to the problem of the arts specialists in the class, in the school. In those places, arts specialists become leaders, as opposed to sort of the marginalized weirdo in the school pushing the cart around.

There's a wonderful school that serves kids from Cabrini Green in Chicago, a pretty notorious housing project, with an art teacher who has become, without question, one of the most important individuals in that school. He has bound that school together, and he has gotten kids to make art projects that are at such a high level that the Museum of Contemporary Art has borrowed them to exhibit them.

They're serious art projects. And this is apropos of the question before about the fundamentals of art-making. Believe me, these kids didn't study the fundamentals of art-making, but they've made fabulous art, compelling art, because they've asked tough aesthetic questions at the same time that they've asked tough questions that matter to them in their own lived experience.

The exhibit that they brought to the MCA was an installation piece of materials that they found around the school. This is a school that's served mostly black kids since the forties, entirely black kids probably since the fifties. It was largely depopulated, so there are lots of empty classrooms that were filled with junk.

The kids went through the junk, and they made these installations from the junk. The junk included things like log books of students in the school in the thirties, place of birth: Sicily, Palermo. They were all Italian kids! And these black kids said, "Wait! White kids used to go to this school?" They couldn't believe it! That didn't enter their frame of reality.

The school's going to be rebuilt by the Board of Ed, and they wondered, it was being rebuilt as Cabrini Green was coming down, and the kids were wondering, are white kids going to come to this school now? That became part of the exhibit, those kinds of questions, their questions.

One of the things you see with effective practices are real questions in kids' own lives that get converted through the arts into curriculum.

HOROWITZ: One thing that comes up a lot in the research about what makes classroom instruction good in an arts education partnership is the issue of collaboration, about the different people who are there to teach the arts, working together. We're touching on this over and over again in various ways.

It's one of the centerpieces, and there's a lot you can do in funding to bring people together. There's often artists, classroom teachers, art specialists, and whatever can be done to have them not divide up into separate constituencies, to fight with each over a shrinking arts pot, that's the danger. A lot of people feel they have their backs to the wall, specialists, classroom teachers, artists who are trying to make a living at this and may do other things.

The funding itself can be directed in a way that helps create the conditions for success for them to work together. That's really critical.

That collaboration manifests itself through planning time, reflection, being able to collaborate for instruction. One of the things we look at in our evaluations is, if there's planning meetings set up between an artist and a teacher, how is that time used? Is it used for logistics and scheduling, or is it used to talk about teaching and learning?

Since partnerships are so hard to do in the field, very often they're about logistics. It takes time. It's not that simple for artists to match their schedules and what they're going to do with classroom teachers. It's a lot of conversation and a lot of back and forth, and things canceled or changed on different sides.

They have to do the scheduling. They have to do the logistics. But what we hope is that that's somehow handled structurally, and that if they get together they're talking about curriculum. What are we really going to do over this ten-week residency? What do we really want kids to learn? How are we really going to work together effectively?

That's usually in the initiative design. That's supposed to happen. Part of what we can do, funding and directing and helping run these things, is to make sure that those discussions try to have the structural things in place, the logistics scheduling happens because there's support, and we get artists and teachers and arts specialists talking about kids learning, and what they are going to do differently.

Usually when you ask teachers about that, how they've done it, they often say, "Well, we don't have time." That's the most common complaint I hear from teachers. They don't have time to do these things. They have competing curricula, they have testing that they're preparing for, all these other kinds of things.

That brings us to our first question, which is, is this administrative support so important to get to?

AUDIENCE: I wanted to go just a little bit deeper with the idea of the relationship between the teacher and the artist. Over the course of CAPE's twelve-year history, we have artists and teachers that have been working together for that long. They've developed relationships that are not just collaborative in terms of, they teach together or they plan together, but they are what we sometimes call "critical friends."

They're really able to push each other to the next level, and it's not just, can we get together on Tuesday at three o'clock to talk about this? It's how are you becoming a better teacher by me working with you and vice versa? That's really important. That wasn't created in just a year. That was over a long period of time.

HOROWITZ: That reminds me of the Maslow hierarchy of needs or whatever it is, I forget exactly. You have to be fed and have a shelter before you can go and do things that are more fulfilling. In a way that's true, you have to do the logistics, the scheduling, get that support, all those things in place so that you can do that. Then they can have those kind of conversations, which are so critical.

RABKIN: Critical friends, I like the metaphor of the sand in the oyster too. I think that artists play that role in the schools. You're the sand, they're they oyster. Their instincts, their habits of mind, the way that they work, the sort of inherent sloppiness of art making, cuts against the grain of school where everything's supposed to be neat, where there's one answer to every question and so forth.

But without that grain of sand in the oyster, you don't get the pearl! So artists have to be adapted to an environment where they're swimming against the tide frequently. They will find allies, believe me.

You all know this from your own experience: great teachers are also artists. This sounds like hokey pop psychology, I'm sorry I'm about to say it, but it's true – within the school culture it's important for great teachers to find their inner artist.

AUDIENCE: A lot of the standards today are making sure that parents are involved, and in my experience doing some consulting in Alaska, I've gone with a team to look at Head Start programs, and I've gone with very diverse teams of people from across the nation.

I was selected to be a part of the finance review, but I had a chance to go and help record some of the sessions with the other consultants. I observed national-level consultants taking a look at an Alaskan Native community where the program brought all of the really high, shiny kids and families, and the majority of kids and families were very, very poverty-stricken families, but there were no files, no parents, no representation of the majority of the kids.

So when we were there they brought their best faces forward. I caught on really fast, naturally, I'm Native. That was my experience on an evaluation team. The evaluator was directing all the questions, one man was answering every question.

I finally spoke up. I said, "What do you think?" and pointed at another parent on the board, after half an hour of just one-on-one discourse between the reviewer and the chairman. It was really upsetting to me as an evaluator. Of course, I wasn't even supposed to be evaluating the parent-student portion, but it was my observation.

RABKIN: It makes me mindful of my earlier point about how kids' own lived experiences, among other things, their families, become part of curriculum in high-quality arts integration classrooms.

The history of that school opened up all sorts of questions for those kids, and it brought their parents into the school. These are parents who didn't get a very good education themselves, who are poor, many of them don't work, and there are big problems in these families. It's difficult for those parents to feel that they can be real resources to their children in the context of education. They don't trust themselves to be resources for their own kid's education.

But once the curriculum begins to be about their own experiences, that changes, it shifts. Parents begin to feel like they can play a role in their kid's education. They can be a real resource to their children. It's a terribly important thing to see develop.

LINDA: When we were on the other subject of the artist being so important to the schools, and getting the buy-in from the teachers, the principals, and I'm speaking as a funder in San Francisco, it's hard when you face the annual shuffle of the principals. You've got something good going, and it's cool and okay. You're planning your grants for next year, where things are going to be and how it's going to be, and you all agree.

Even the principals don't know where they're going to go. They just take out a deck of cards and throw them on the floor. I don't know how they figure out what they're going to do when it's not the same.

AUDIENCE: The pieces have moved.

LINDA: It's really sad, and everybody's mostly worried about the test scores, and they're like, oh, the hell with the arts! I've got to save my job, and I'm getting switched over here because those kids are doing badly, and that's my mandate. If you can fit it in here somewhere, well, that's cool.

It's just an ongoing thing. It's not a new thing.

AUDIENCE: I think that's Nick's comment about this is the water we're swimming in.

LINDA: Yeah. It's true. You have to adapt, but it's hard.

AUDIENCE: This speaks to something we've grappled with. We made an enormous investment with help from the Annenberg and a large collection of private and public funders. We found that within two years over a third of the principals were gone, and Jane even helped us with money from GE to do a principals' institute.

We've learned, and there's some research on this, that the reality in schools is that unless there is a distributed leadership in place and that you support that regularly through your convenings and through the kinds of questions you ask in your application process, that as appealing as it is to say, they used to say you get a teacher. You get a classroom. You get a principal. You get a school. You get a superintendent. You get a district.

Well, the most mobile people go up the vertical chain. The most destabilizing things that happen in education, as I think Nick has alluded to earlier, are as a consequence of senior management installing the latest silver bullet.

We've come to rely on a distributive leadership approach that requires from the onset that they describe a group of people who have come together around whatever it is they're proposing as their partnership. During the course of that partnership, if there are changes in either of two key roles: the project contact, who is our chief liaison; or the principal, there's a required visit with us. We make it clear that we'll come to them onsite if that's more convenient, or that they have to come to us.

The other thing on the subject of parents is that we realized early on with help from our Department of Cultural Affairs, that we might need to focus resources specifically at the engagement of parents. Not only as potential advocates if you bring them along so that they recognize, and we're less in jeopardy of losing it all because of a void where there might be popular support, but also because in our city they hold so many traditions closely and practice them in informal and community settings, that this allows the school to tap those traditions and mix them with the work of the more formally self-describing cultural community.

The distributive leadership model suited that as well. At any given point looking at our partnerships, the leadership may emanate from a parent, a key teacher, often an art specialist, a principal, or a couple of classroom teachers, it may be the cultural organization, and it changes sometimes during the life of a partnership.

One of the things that stymied us when we tried to do research on integration is that the folks we found most engaged and, therefore, the folks we identified that we wanted to track through the research, were so fluid that we thought we'd target them at the school where they had cultivated their partnership, but they kept moving around!

Now we're looking at how do we support leadership as embodied by different folk that self-identify differently. The distributed leadership model has helped us in taking a fact and working with it in a way that allows some continuity for us.

AUDIENCE: Right. And if it comes from within, it lessens the struggle of here we are, come and get it!

AUDIENCE: It's still true to the context.

AUDIENCE: I came in late, so forgive me if you've already touched on this. I wondered if there's been discussion about the controversy about focusing so much time on the testing and the skill level because of the achievement gap, versus all the research that poor kids and kids of color who are reflected in that achievement gap, are often the kids that excel the most as a result of the involvement in the arts. Has that come up?

RABKIN: It hadn't specifically and directly.

EPSTEIN: We are just getting to the thing about what do we know about the effects of outcomes, so that's a great segue.

HOROWITZ: I could start off with that. It's a big subject, and I know we're coming to the end of the session, and I want to make sure that whatever we say there's some chance to answer.

I want to say something about test scores with that. It may not be an exact answer. I've often said that we can get too fixated on the test scores. Probably the most promising results in arts education partnerships and some of the most exciting, are in those areas that the tests find hard to measure, just by the nature of the tests and what the tests do, which are often lower order skills-based in disciplines that are not the arts.

It's a challenge as a researcher to find the right outcomes. What we're going to find is that the arts support learning and cognitive skills, thinking skills, and skills of creativity, expression, elaborative thinking, of working detailed social skills, kids working together in a whole range of areas, and areas of personal development like self-confidence.

That was a big part of the work that we did with Champions for Change. That's what I meant at the beginning, that that framed my thinking. I still think that it's really important.

If an arts partnership initiative affects test scores, there has to be a credible reason for a researcher to make those kinds of connections. That might be because the arts change the school, and the school works together in new ways, and the teaching improves, so it might be a secondary effect. Or the instruction is geared directly with what's on the test. Very often we find it's not set up that way at all and that people are looking for quick fixes from test scores.

RABKIN: I submitted to the temptation to look at the test score question in the doing of the book. In large measure because as much as we may understand what's wrong with the tests, there's nothing else in place that we can offer up as quantified evidence of kids' achievement and transformation through the arts.

I don't think there's anything that can replace Naomi Shihab Nye getting up in front of an audience and reading that poem about the wink! That says much more than fourth graders in X school advanced by three months more than fourth graders in Y school. But that's the data that we've got available.

I looked at it pretty carefully across the six programs that had serious long-term evaluation. It's interesting what we came up with, and I don't make big claims for this, but I do make some claims for it.

There are six programs. In two of them their evaluators argue that there are real correlations between the test scores and the application of the program. Four of them didn't find a relationship between the test scores and the programs.

The two that found relationships were CAPE and the Arts for Academic Achievement. Those are the two, I would argue, that are the programs that are most self-consciously and consistently organized around the problem of integration and the challenge of achieving transfer between the arts and other subjects. That happened in some of the other programs, but it wasn't a singular mission of those programs.

There is at least a hypothesis that can be drawn that says programs that deliberately try to do this, work hard and make it their point, have a greater chance of success than programs that don't.

Having said that, I want to say that this is an article of faith, I can't say that the data shows this because it doesn't. If kids learn more deeply and learn better in school, and at least five of the six programs made a pretty compelling case that there were significant improvements in school climate and culture, which is almost always a correlate to improved student achievement.

Over time you'll see improvements in the test scores. The test scores will follow all this other stuff, almost of necessity. If kids are improving in all those other domains that Rob mentioned, the test scores are bound to follow.

HOROWITZ: That would be the best argument. That would be a compelling argument.

Here's what I see as a problem about some of that. We know that if kids have more arts they're going to score higher, because those correlations are established. For instance, the SAT studies have shown if kids have more arts, they have higher SAT scores. But that doesn't mean they caused the higher SAT scores. That's been the research problem.

The study you might be referring to is the Catterall one, where it's much more in-depth funded than Champions of Change, looking at arts and learning. James Catterall makes a very convincing case that it goes beyond correlation. He tries to rule out all the rival hypotheses, so he's claiming that this shows that the arts are the likely cause. It's not definitive, but I think he really worked at that.

What we need to do as researchers is go beyond that. We need to articulate what it is about that teaching process and the learning process to make that connection. Having done a lot of work in schools and seeing a lot of residencies canceled, we're told not to come because we're drilling for tests. We're going to close down our partnership for one month, so don't come now.

I've never seen yet a principal say, we're giving the test in one month, so we're going to increase the arts this month. There's some kind of disconnect about what the real belief is in the field that they find really works, and they commit themselves to drilling, which cuts back the presence of arts.

Another way to put that is, the more emphasis on the tests in schools, often the less emphasis on the arts. If there's a causation one way, arts to tests, I think there's a bigger causation the other way. Stronger presence for tests, less arts.

AUDIENCE: I agree.

EPSTEIN: Well, our time is up. That went fast. I thank you gentlemen, and I thank you folks for presenting it.

RABKIN: Let me repeat my offer, give me your business card, I'll give you a book.

END