

CHAPTER 1:  
EVOLUTION IN TANDEM: DEVELOPMENT  
AND RESEARCH IN AN ARTS EDUCATION PROGRAM

*Hollis Headrick and Greg McCaslin  
The Center for Arts Education*

*Terry Baker  
Education Development Center, Inc.*

**The New York City Annenberg  
Challenge for Arts Education**

THE CENTER FOR ARTS EDUCATION believes that the arts can make a significant contribution to school change and can improve student performance both in the arts and in the rest of the core curriculum. This belief became the basis for a theory of action that pairs schools with cultural institutions to develop customized approaches to arts education. The Annenberg Challenge supported such partnerships in eighty-two schools in New York City, involving 54,000 of the city's students.

ARTS EDUCATION  
IN NEW YORK CITY

Two distinct eras define arts education in New York City. The first era is pre-1975. During that time, the city made a financial and programmatic commitment to public arts education that it demonstrated in various ways. Foremost, it offered students across the system opportunities to acquire skills in the fine and applied arts. Students learned visual arts, music, theater, dance, and literary arts from licensed arts specialists working under licensed arts supervisors. The Board of Education had citywide curricula and standards in visual arts and music and some curricula in place for theater, dance, and technical/vocational

career studies related to the arts. Its Office for Arts and Cultural Affairs promoted thriving collaborations between public schools and the city's rich cultural community, generally in the form of artist residencies, class visits to museums, and student attendance at performances of various types.

In the mid-seventies, all that changed. Draconian cuts in the city's funding of public schools eroded a previously solid financial and programmatic commitment to arts education. Specialists in visual arts, music, dance, and theater were among the many thousands of teachers laid off. Teachers of the arts who had seniority in the system suddenly found themselves teaching subjects for which they had little or no training or license. Potential arts teachers had no opportunities to teach in their subject areas and either sought jobs elsewhere or turned to other specialties.

The lack of a systemwide means for delivering arts education also meant that schools made little attempt to link the scope and sequence of instruction or accountability mechanisms to instructional standards in the arts. A few pockets of arts instruction survived, but their quality and accessibility were uneven. Arts organizations helped as they could, and in some schools, practicing artists, many of whom had little or no teaching experience, became the primary providers of arts experiences for students.

*In the early 1990s, the Board of Education resolved that arts education is essential to the basic education of every child and endorsed restoration of arts education for all children.*

### **Renewed Commitment to Arts Education**

This state of affairs continued until the early 1990s. By that time, the city's cultural and educational leaders had positioned themselves for what was to become the beginning of a major renaissance in arts education. The president of the school board convened a citywide arts and culture advisory group, which commissioned *Crisis and Opportunity*, a report outlining the dire condition of arts education and its recommendations for changing it. Shortly after that, the chancellor of schools formed a second arts and culture advisory group through the Fund for New York City Public Education (since renamed New Visions). This second group produced the report *A Passion for Excellence*.

In response to these reports, the Board of Education resolved that arts education is essential to the basic education of every child and endorsed restoration of arts education for all children. The board's resolution authorized the chancellor to

- require a policy for arts education;
- provide all students the opportunity to participate in the arts;
- develop procedures to ensure that every school establish arts programs in keeping with standards of the Curriculum Frameworks;
- design an appropriate plan to assess student achievement in the arts and professional development needs;

- maximize opportunities for professional development;
- encourage collaborations among schools, cultural organizations, institutions of higher education, and appropriate community organizations to incorporate the resources of the city's artists, arts and cultural organizations, and institutions of higher education into public schools.

In addition to this action by the Board of Education, foundations and arts and cultural organizations stepped up on behalf of schools and arts education. The DeWitt Wallace–Reader's Digest Fund supported the School Partners Project through the Fund for New York City Public Education. This project became one precursor to the New York City Annenberg Challenge. In addition, an informal Arts Education Funders Group formed. This group, made up of public and private funders interested in arts and education in New York City, provided a forum for discussion on arts education. Its roster of guest speakers included the chancellor of schools and the commissioner of the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs, as well as nationally known practitioners. The chancellor's staff was given responsibility for preparing a list of opportunities for private-sector support of arts education in the public schools. One outcome of this list was support for an Arts Education Resource Center, the antecedent to the Center for Arts Education.

Other collaborations that took place included the New York City Arts in Education Roundtable, an affinity group made up of representatives of cultural organizations that provide services to the city's public schools, the Partnership for After-School Education (PASE), whose members represented community-based organizations, and the Arts and Related Industries Partnership (ARIP), which explored ways to link students with opportunities in the arts and related industries. Arts education was infused with new energy and commitment. When an advisor to Ambassador Annenberg suggested to the commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs that New York City establish an Annenberg Challenge for Arts Education, the community was ready.

## The Annenberg Proposal/CAE

The New York City Board of Education (BOE), the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), and the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA) took upon themselves the writing of a proposal to the Annenberg Foundation to restore arts education to the New York City public schools. Underwritten by the Aaron Diamond Foundation, a member of the Arts Education Funders Group, the proposal, “Institutionalizing Arts Education for New York City Public Schools: Educational Improvement and Reform Through the Arts, A Five-Year Plan for Implementation,” focused on multiyear grants for schools that brought together teachers, administrators, parents, arts and community organizations, individual artists, and universities.

The intent was to form partnerships to develop sustainable, comprehensive arts education programs. Partnerships would be formed according to a flexible formula joining site-specific needs with available resources at a site. This would allow schools to capitalize on relationships and resources including staff, cultural partners, and community groups. Effective programs were to be strengthened and placed in the context of a school’s comprehensive plan for arts in education. Additional programming was to be undertaken as needed. The Center for Arts Education (CAE) would direct the effort.

A press conference in March 1996 announced the New York City Annenberg Challenge for Arts Education. Several large leadership gifts kicked off fund-raising to meet requirements of the Challenge, and an Annenberg Advisory Council was formed, with the commissioner of cultural affairs named temporary chair.

Among the advisory council’s first acts was to hire an executive director for the Center for Arts Education and to move into the space in a high school formerly occupied by the Arts Education Resource Center, which had ceased operations. The number of staff hired for the Center quickly grew to four, eventually climbing to eleven three years later when the Center was fully operational.

Starting up any organization is a busy undertaking, and the Center was no exception. An immediate issue it had to address was its own governance. As specified in the plan, the chair of the Advisory Council,

the newly designated board chair, and the executive director formed a board of directors and began the process of board development. Members of the board included the chancellor and designee, the commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs and designee, the vice-president-at-large of the United Federation of Teachers and designee, representatives of the Arts in Education Roundtable, and leading members of the city’s philanthropic, cultural, and business communities.

The Center also needed to create a vision of excellent arts education that would communicate to the city’s policy-makers, the Center’s potential partners, and the public the core values that the Center would seek to exemplify and support. After much discussion and debate, the board came to consensus on five guiding principles for the Center’s work:

- school change through the arts
- arts as part of the core curriculum
- partnership and collaboration
- professional development
- evaluation and assessment

Another task was to contract with the Center for Children and Technology (CCT), a division of Education Development Center in Newton, Massachusetts, to conduct an umbrella evaluation and assessment of the entire partnership program. CCT was to become a major force in shaping the initiative and later reshaping it as midcourse corrections were made.

Meanwhile, the Board of Education showed its commitment to collaboration with the Center. It hired a special assistant for the arts who reported to the deputy chancellor for instruction and professional development. This individual served as the Board of Education’s liaison with the Center, attended the Center’s activities, and sat in on meetings of its board of directors and program committee.

## THE PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROGRAM

The request for proposals (RFP) for the first of three rounds of partnership grants to schools and cultural organizations was released in December 1997. It was drafted by the executive director, with feedback from the board of directors and advisory group. While the RFP did not prescribe specific practices, strategies, curricula, or outcomes for partnerships, it did challenge them to develop context-specific approaches to the five guiding principles. That is, it asked applicants to capitalize on their assets and deficits in developing their proposals, embodying the guiding principles in ways that honor, reflect, and enhance their unique circumstances. The Board of Education, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Department of Cultural Affairs helped disseminate the RFP and promote the initiative among educators, artists, and cultural organizations. Meanwhile, the Center offered extensive preapplication assistance to schools and cultural organizations as they prepared their partnership plans. In some cases, it helped match appropriate partners; in other cases, it advised proposal writers on technical matters.

Response to the RFP was overwhelming. The Center was deluged with over 400 partnership applications representing virtually all of the arts, from visual arts to performing arts to museum education. Over one-third of New York City's 1,100 public schools and programs applied, forcing the Center to hastily set up a system for managing this huge application load. The Board of Education and the UFT

*Response to the RFP was overwhelming.  
The Center was deluged with applications  
representing virtually all of the arts, from visual  
arts to performing arts to museum education.*

helped manage the intake process, but there was no time to design a programmatic database.

In April 1997, the Center awarded the first round of nineteen planning grants and eighteen implementation grants to thirty-seven schools. Support for these partnerships covered activities from January 1997 to June 2001. Many other partnerships that had applied for grants were disappointed or disenchanted with the results of the first-round process and selection. The Center refined its grants process on the basis of focus groups organized by CCT. Comments and recommendations from school staff, cultural organization representatives, and BOE, DCA, and UFT collaborators helped clarify the five guiding principles and funding criteria and made the grant review process fairer and more transparent. In the second round, the Center awarded twenty-four new partnership grants that supported activities from February 1998 through June 2001. In this round, many representatives from previously funded partnerships served as peer panelists. In a third and final round, twenty-one grants were awarded in 1999 to cover activities for two years, from July 1999 through June 2001. With this round, the scope of the initiative grew to a total of eighty-two schools, 135 cultural and community-based organizations, 54,000 students, and 2,000 teachers participating directly.

Partly in response to the overwhelming interest in the Annenberg arts initiative and the disappointment among schools that were not awarded planning grants in the first round of competition, the Board of Education, with support from the mayor, created Project ARTS (Arts Restoration Throughout the Schools). Project ARTS allocated the first systemwide per capita funds for the arts since the cutbacks of the mid-seventies. The mayor committed \$25 million a year for three years. Activities were phased in using a cohort model district by district.

Project ARTS required that community school districts identify an art liaison to oversee the restoration of arts. It also encouraged schools that scored high enough in the peer review process and came reasonably close to being funded by the Center to adapt their "Annenberg Arts" proposals as a framework for restoring arts to their school. Many schools did just this. This was one of the earliest contributions of the Annenberg Arts to the system as a whole.

## Implementation Issues

Several issues impeded implementation. For example, Center staff had to determine what the five guiding principles looked like in action. This involved close collaboration with the partnerships that were implementing the principles in schools and much discussion with other stakeholders, both local and national. Establishing and maintaining relationships among diverse players became a major undertaking. Sometimes this meant building bridges where previously there had been none; at other times, it meant mending fences to keep collaborations moving forward intact. Different stakeholders had different goals, priorities, values, levels of commitment, and expectations for the Center.

For example, some stakeholders viewed the goal as transforming education, reshaping schools, and redefining learning. Others wanted to restore arts instruction in a more traditional way by hiring more arts specialists. Some educators expected cultural organizations to offer professional development that would equip classroom teachers with the skills and confidence to integrate the arts into their instructional strategies and thereby ensure arts restoration beyond the grant period. Still other stakeholders wanted to become real partners with their schools, active in shaping school policy and practice, or in developing new financial resources for schools. Some stakeholders envisioned a school system that defined itself more by the range and diversity of student experiences and accomplishments than by performance on standardized tests.

One reason for such disparities was that key collaborators in the field had little time to develop a shared understanding of the initiative's guiding principles and what they meant for schools. The level of their understanding varied enormously, particularly among schools and cultural organizations that had little experience in integrating the arts into the school's program. The lack of time for partnerships to develop a shared vision also interfered with team building, as different visions pulled team members in different directions. This was compounded by district and citywide leaders' focus on literacy and high-stakes testing, which eclipsed and in some cases displaced the restoration of the arts, frustrating some school-based teams who had to compete for teachers'

*Establishing and maintaining relationships among diverse players became a major undertaking. Sometimes this meant building bridges; at other times, it meant mending fences.*

professional development time. And, of course, all of this occurred in an environment of constant turnover as principals, partnership contacts, cultural organization representatives, and district superintendents left one position for another, leaving Center staff to develop new relationships with their replacements.

Some of these issues resolved themselves over time as partners worked together to implement their plans. But others required significant adjustment. For example, the district required that teachers participate in professional development on literacy and test preparation. Finding time on top of that for professional development and partnership planning in the arts was difficult. Some schools found that they had proposed to do more than they could, or that they didn't have the space for it all. Similarly, the varying levels of skill and commitment among teaching artists and cultural organizations signaled the need to intensify professional development. Delays in payment of per session fees for planning and professional development undermined teachers' morale and dampened enthusiasm for change through the arts.

Staff from the Center dedicated significant time to visiting schools, meeting with new partnership members, and building leadership. They also supported

*The alignment and coordination between partnership activities and evaluation activities required constant attention, negotiation, and technical assistance.*

and encouraged periodic gatherings where representatives from schools and arts organizations could form loose networks. Peer-to-peer problem solving addressed logistics, communication, evaluation, and assessment. Center staff also convened regular meetings of representatives of the Board of Education, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Department of Cultural Affairs to review the initiative's progress.

Staff daily struggled with balancing the need to stay in the office with the need to be out seeing and working with the partnerships on the task of making the ambitious five-year plan operational. Each new round of grants brought in an enormous load of applications. While this response demonstrated the overwhelming interest on the part of schools and partnerships in restoring the arts to schools, managing the process was a daunting undertaking for staff.

Nor did the deluge stop once partnerships were funded. Project coordination was a constant challenge. Not unexpectedly, funded partnerships needed many kinds of help, including how to write proposals, how to design professional development and implementation plans, and how to assess their partnership's impact. Partnerships also had questions about the long-term effects and durability of the initiative,

especially when up against skepticism about its efficacy in the field at large.

Evaluation, too, raised issues for partnerships that had to be resolved. Partnerships did not always understand the purposes of evaluation, and the kinds of student assessment requested by the schools and the CAE program were new to many of the artists. Cultural organizations were accustomed to evaluation of their programs, but not of the impact of their programs on students. The program raised evaluation and assessment standards to new levels. Its two-level design called for participants to provide their own local evaluations to assess student learning in the school and to participate in a larger program evaluation conducted by an outside agency. To do this, however, it had to raise the capacities of adult participants to conduct and become better consumers of evaluation. The alignment and coordination between partnership activities and evaluation activities such as surveys, site visits, and interviews required constant attention, negotiation, and technical assistance.

### **Evaluation Strategy**

In the Center's early planning, the notions of comprehensive arts education and partnerships combined to form a theory of action. According to this theory of action, a number of elements work together to enhance students' mental, emotional, and social growth and contributions to society, eventually enriching economic, intellectual, and community welfare. These elements consist of the arts themselves, their associated skills, aesthetic contexts, integration into the education of the young, and the unique ways that effective teachers and teaching artists present them to students in the context of learning and understanding. Partnerships are the catalysts that bring these elements together and spur local school reform.

Five key research questions guided CCT's evaluation of the Center, the partnerships, and the arts education provided through the Annenberg Challenge:

- In what ways is the nature of arts learning qualitatively different when outside cultural resources partner with schools to design/deliver curriculum?
- How does the integration of the arts support school-change efforts?

- In what ways is student learning in non-arts subjects improved through the introduction of the arts? How is student learning in arts and non-arts subjects improved through partnerships?
- Do the arts provoke parent and community involvement in a school, and in what ways is this linked to school change?
- What is the impact and legacy of this sustained partnership of local cultural organizations, in terms of their capacity, understanding, and experience working with schools?

### **A Two-Pronged Effort**

The partnership program had a two-part evaluation strategy. First, the Center required local partnerships to conduct their own studies, using external evaluators or local partnership participants, to determine the impact of their partnership activities on the school and students. CCT reviewed these evaluations with an eye toward

- locally generated assessment plans
- student-achievement data
- student cognitive development data
- student attitude data
- student arts performance data
- technical assistance sessions on assessment for schools, artists, and arts organizations
- the variety of assessment techniques employed by local partnerships

These annual evaluations focused on local school programs, not citywide issues or “outcomes.” As such, they provided a great deal of information to schools and the Center about the structural and instructional content of the local school efforts, but they did not provide the kinds of information originally intended about student performance and program impact.

The second part of the evaluation strategy involved CCT’s evaluation of the entire partnership program. From the very beginning, a close collaboration between the Center and CCT was a design characteristic of the evaluation approach. Following

Robert Stake’s “responsive evaluation” approach (Stake 1975) and the “design research” approach of Allan Collins (1990, 1993) and other staff at CCT, the Center adopted an intense form of formative evaluation that would provide timely and ongoing assessment of the program as it was implemented. This would allow the program or implementation strategy to be adjusted, or “formed,” in process rather than waiting for final, or “summative,” judgments about effectiveness. The evaluators’ belief, and that of the theorists they followed, was that it made more sense to try to correct the course and work toward success than to simply make final judgments when it was too late to make corrections. But to do such work required a close collaboration built on trust.

Prior to beginning its evaluation, CCT reviewed program design documents, such as the five-year plan, the initial RFP, and the first round of planning and implementation grant applications. It also observed selection panels and readers in their deliberations. At the request of the Center, CCT hosted meetings and focus groups that informed program planning and allowed the assessment team to collect statements of attitude and opinions about the initiatives from leading arts educators, artists, and arts organization administrators. It administered a needs-assessment survey to grant recipients and observed planning-grant recipients as they devised activities. As evaluation plans developed, CCT reviewed the local evaluations and assimilated their results into a final program evaluation.

Center staff and the CCT evaluation team met each quarter to review and, wherever possible, align program implementation and research. Alignment and realignment, in particular, were constants in the

*The Center adopted an intense form of formative evaluation that would provide timely and ongoing assessment of the program as it was implemented.*

program, which had always been defined as evolving. The local programs asked for clarification of what the Center wanted in its evaluations. CCT worked with the Center staff to provide cross-site sharing sessions in which evaluators compared their products, CCT staff explained their reading of the local projects' reports, and local project staff and evaluators received technical support in methods and reporting. In addition, the research director at CCT began attending Annenberg Challenge cross-site gatherings with CAE representatives. From these meetings, they received useful information on how the theory of action model was supposed to work and began developing instruments to share with others through the Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

#### **From “Comprehensive” to “Contextual” Arts Education**

Initially, Center-funded partnerships were assessed to determine

- the extent to which they affected the whole school and every child;
- the extent to which they worked toward common school reform goals;
- the impact of their parent involvement and co-learning activities;
- the ways they provided for staff planning and professional development;
- their assessment process and the result thereof;
- their plans for expansion during and sustainability after the funding period.

*The adjustment from a program described as “comprehensive” to one described as “contextual,” a direct response to CCT researchers’ findings, required providing additional technical assistance and adjusting the evaluation design.*

As local partnerships began developing their programs, it became evident that their instructional designs fit no one pattern. The “comprehensive arts education” model was replaced by a more accurate depiction of the actual instructional practice, captured by the phrase “contextual arts education.” CCT adjusted some of its evaluation strategies to better ground them in actual practice. For example, CCT evaluators shifted from attempting to locate curriculum programs that were consistent across schools to accounting for individualistic instructional strategies. They shifted from studying “curriculum art” with clear and consistent scope and sequence to documenting what they came to call contextual arts education that varied from site to site, depending on the context defined by local resources, themes, topics, access to cultural organizations, and core curriculum alignments at each site.

The adjustment from a program described as “comprehensive” to one described as “contextual,” a direct response to CCT researchers’ findings, required providing additional technical assistance and adjusting the evaluation design. In making this shift, CCT had to reconsider its basic theory and methods of analysis. It had to determine “what counts” in contextual instruction, how to count it, and how it could be explained or transferred to other schools. If context is, by definition, idiosyncratic, what lessons can be drawn from contextual instruction that would have relevance to the general population or to other schools? These questions forced adjustments in CCT practices, and their answers are still being investigated. It had been relatively easy to justify a comprehensive or curriculum focus by thinking about its applicability to other sites and about the dissemination of effective practice to other schools or cultural organizations. Contextual programs, in the arts or other curriculum disciplines such as math or technology, require different ends and different justifications, and thus the analysis has to change as well. This ensured more accurate documentation and more trustworthy theory development than work from hypotheses that were fixed and generalizable.

The initial choice of a comprehensive and sequential curriculum model for the project echoed the wishes of many educators in the United States who have called for a standardized curriculum across



school districts. But the reality of education in the American context is, in Howard Gardner's terms, "highly dispersed." Gardner (1996, p. 104) reports: "'Context' has not been my favorite concept, but I have gained a new respect for its importance." Although he is referring to in-school curriculum arts, the contextual nature of the work is yet more complex when partnerships around arts in education programs are developed by schools and cultural organizations jointly. It has become increasingly important, as partnership programs have expanded with renewed funding, to account for context in the assessments of student learning and the evaluation of instructional programs.

The last quarter century has witnessed a sea change in basic conceptions of how learning occurs. Neurology, anthropology, and psychology provided new evidence on how the human brain works and how social and cultural contexts provide necessary linkages for thought and learning. Contextual understanding emerges from knowing and learning through shared activities and experiences and helps define knowing and learning as "synonymous with changes in the ways that an individual participates in social practices" (Cobb & Bowers 1999, p. 6). Such thinking is taking hold in the psychology and education research communities, stimulating new research and provoking new debates about learning and instruction.<sup>1</sup>

The ways in which contextual variables are incorporated into instructional design and evaluated by researchers have become the defining elements in measures of success. Measures of achievement, impact, or implementation that do not attend to complex sets of variables are incomplete. Just as it is important to design arts education around those characteristics of the arts and arts experiences that are necessary for their definition, so is it important to evaluate arts education programs according to contextual variables. If such programs "must create a new context," then research and evaluation efforts must attempt to document and account for the ways in which the new contexts are shaped by the programs. Such research

*The ways in which contextual variables are incorporated into instructional design and evaluated by researchers have become the defining elements in measures of success.*

should, as Winner and Hetland (2000, p. 6) say, "explore the ways in which the arts may change the entire atmosphere of a school. This way we can begin to understand how the arts affect the 'culture of learning' in a school. We can then develop rich, qualitative measures to evaluate whether the arts lead to deepened understanding of – and engagement in – non-arts areas." CCT's evaluation work aimed to create rich documentation of context variables in an arts education partnership and the ways that students, schools, and communities change in response to new combinations of variables (Baker 2001, p. 6).

The focus of evaluation was now on the extent to which

- a partnership provides adequate instructional time, content in the arts, participatory learning activities, and interdisciplinary studies;
- this instruction is attractive and engaging for students;
- students are learning by doing;
- students acquire a broad range of abilities and knowledge within the specific disciplines they study;
- instruction is developmentally appropriate;
- the program changes student attitudes toward art.

#### **A Focus on Leadership**

The following year (1998–1999), evaluators put the spotlight on school partnerships, with special emphasis on their leadership aspects. Given that the partnerships' approach to leadership was bottom-up with top-down support, evaluators considered local school leadership the most important level to examine. But they also examined shared leadership among the

1. Key studies and reports that identify points of connection or linkages in student learning and development learning and identify understanding as the ultimate outcome include Lave 1988, Gardner 1983, Collins et al. 1989, Pea & Kurland 1986, Caine & Caine 1994, and Resnick 1987.

initiative's main partner organizations, the Center, the Board of Education, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Department of Cultural Affairs, as well as each organization's independent leadership role.

Partnerships were assessed to determine

- whether or not the partnership formed its own local committee;
- who the members of the local partnership committees were;
- whether or not the committee held regular meetings;
- which partner organization played an "anchor" role;
- the content of year-end reports.

The Center itself was examined to determine the extent to which it

- built bridges between the educational system and external providers of arts education;
- held constituencies accountable to each other;
- channeled the efforts of the artistic community/ industries;
- resisted budget constraints and political shifts;
- initiated and supervised the proposal development process;
- provided pre- and post application technical assistance to applicants;
- oversaw review of proposals according to standards;
- provided assistance to schools/districts that had not worked with external partners;
- provided citywide professional development, leadership sessions, national model sessions, demonstrations, and presentations by educational and artistic leaders;
- facilitated selection of exemplary models and best practices.

## **Working with Partnerships**

Relationships between partnerships and the Center continued to develop and, in some cases, deepen. Good relationships were characterized by regular communication, active participation in Center-sponsored events, and response to the Center's requests for information and documentation. Partnerships in good standing with the Center took part in funder visits, presentations at Annenberg cross-site meetings, and panels at other professional gatherings. In some cases, representatives from partner organizations served as peer group facilitators, hosted visitors, and spoke at conferences.

Staff at the Center worked as closely with partnerships as seemed comfortable. In several cases Center staff participated in partnership planning meetings and became an active resource to the partnership by highlighting strategies that were effective in other contexts, by acting as a sounding board or by identifying potential resources, financial and otherwise. Center staff continued to visit partnerships to observe workshops, planning meetings, parent events, and other activities and to facilitate next steps when necessary. One of their main jobs was to maintain high expectations without being prescriptive as the partnerships put legs under their visions.

Classroom practices were varied, as the contextual approach suggests, so a single example or even set of examples of good practice does not convey the total impact of the partnership program. An example of a program from a participating high school is illustrative.

The program at this high school consisted of six different year-long "arts studios" co-taught by a teacher and a teaching artist. Students were placed by grade level in a studio of their choice. Each week throughout the year, they attended a two-hour art studio class designed to develop their arts skills in a given domain (acting, dance, visual arts, videography, design, poetry). This was one of the more intensive and sustained of the CAE partnership programs in terms of student contact hours with the arts and also in terms of professional development for teachers and artists.

## **Skills, Sequence, and Arts Integration**

At first glance, assessing the development of arts skills would seem to be the obvious approach for assessing project impact. Many of the students at this

school, however, particularly in the program's first two years, started with very little exposure to and experience with the arts. Assessing their development of arts skills with objective high school – level indicators would not necessarily be appropriate.

There is also the issue of arts integration. The project's initial goals of integrating the arts with non-arts areas were altered to "linking" the arts to the non-arts. In theater classes, for example, in the first year of the project, ninth- and tenth-graders wrote and performed plays around the idea of imperialism, the theme of the humanities curriculum for that year. In the second year of the project, the program was changed so that tenth-graders read and performed plays from the World War II period, the focus in their humanities courses, with an emphasis not on the play's content, but on the reading and performance of the play.

The content links were thus made more oblique but were intended to be mutually reinforcing. And, in fact, in the theater course where scenes from *The Diary of Anne Frank* were being rehearsed, a researcher observed the humanities teacher discussing with students the Nazi occupation of the Netherlands when students began to consider the stage sets for scenes from the play. Disagreement about the size of the stage attic space led to discussions about how and why Jews were hidden in the homes of the Dutch. In the exchange, the teaching artist who had been leading the class faded into the background as the humanities teacher led the discussion. After a while, when the students seemed satisfied with the conversation, the teaching artist took over again to move the rehearsal along.

At the same time as direct links to the curriculum faded, there was also no sequential development of arts skills across grade levels, or even within a grade. Teaching artists developed arts skills rubrics, but they were not seeking to move each student along a continuum of development. The overall program, which allowed students to change studio arts class each year or to stick with the same one, did not differentiate between novices and more experienced students and was not structured for the sequential development of essential skills. Instead, the program

*Changes in how students perceived and related to their community, and especially the cultural community and to the arts as a cultural force in society, were worth examining.*

was to a degree "product-oriented" (with a balancing emphasis on "process"), with periodic panels of outside practicing artists coming in to provide critical feedback to student performances or exhibitions. Through this and other project components, the program successfully connected a relatively isolated group of high schoolers – economically and socially – with the arts community. It built local community support for the school, including funding alliances.

The accomplishment of which the project administration spoke most highly was the extent to which the arts programs came to "matter" to the students in the school. "Students now see the arts as something that is their right," said one administrator. Teachers, too, were beginning to demand participation in the program, she reported. Art and "culture" became a central feature in the whole-school curriculum. Teachers were asking that the arts become part of their regular weekly planning meetings.

#### **Documenting the Impact of Partnerships**

What did all this mean for assessing impact? An objective assessment of arts skills alone might only prove successful for more naturally talented students, given the lack of a sequential approach to learning. An assessment of learning in non-arts areas, such as world history, would be difficult (and perhaps meaningless) to link to the arts. But the changes in how students perceived and related to their community, and especially the cultural community and to the arts as a cultural force in society, were worth examining. How the school changed through its new alliances with local community representatives was likewise

*Maintaining respect for practitioners' time and vision while pressing them for time to address critical research needs was a constant conflict and worry.*

interesting to examine. In this case, there was also substantial change on the part of the cultural organization, which came to understand the world of schools and classrooms in entirely new ways. Working with our theoretical framework of how context-rich partnership programs can change school culture, we documented the complex connections and relationships that contributed to these changes.

Maintaining respect for practitioners' time and vision while pressing them for time to address critical research needs was a constant conflict and worry. Simply by its existence, the project raised issues having to do with evaluation and assessment, documentation, managing change, intrapartnership communication, shared decision making, integrating arts curriculum with an eye to scope and sequence, and planning to sustain the partnership after the initial grant period.

The Center convened its first cross-site gathering in May 1998. Teams from sixty-one schools and 100 cultural organizations attended. The purpose of this meeting was to permit individuals participating in the initiative to meet each other, exchange ideas and experiences, and help Center staff prepare for future activities. Participants met by peer group within each borough – teachers met with other teachers, artists with artists, and parents with parents – to discuss successes and challenges. Center staff took notes for follow-up action. Feedback from this conference led

to further meetings among specialty groups. For example, a one-day conference for teaching artists and arts organization representatives, called Developing a Common Language, was held in June 1998 to highlight the need for artists and arts organizations to negotiate educational issues including standards, child development, school reform, school logistics, and so on. Educators were not invited to this conference in deference to their knowledge of these issues and their many end-of-the-school-year responsibilities. Another meeting drew local partnership evaluators to discuss their evaluation plans and challenges. Out of this meeting came Compelling Evidence, a one-day conference on evaluation tools and methods held in October 1998 with the research team from CCT.

Three more such cross-site gatherings were held, making give-and-take a major characteristic of the initiative's first phase and helping develop a sense of community across partnerships. A network began to take shape and extended to CCT. The Center held two gatherings for partnership representatives to review initiativewide formative evaluation findings with CCT's research director.

While these activities were full of useful findings for the initiative, there was clearly a need for additional data on the impact of the arts-infused curriculum on teaching and learning. To this end, CCT and the Center designed and piloted a practitioner action research project Student Learning in and through the Arts. This project, funded by the National Endowment for the Arts and General Electric Corporation, is still in progress. It funds teams of teaching artists and classroom teachers to refine student assessment in their classrooms, while CCT evaluators document their activities and coach them on the design of research strategies. Teaching artists and teachers meet together to plan, develop, test, refine, and assess fully integrated arts curricula in this project. CCT will continue to document these processes and results including

- diverse models of arts-integrated curriculum with embedded student assessments;
- documentation of the curriculum development process, illuminating how choices were made, how specific arts domain strengths were drawn upon, and how student learning was monitored;

- documentation of student learning in the relevant arts and non-arts domains;
- analysis of the curricula that illuminates connections to learning standards and other systemwide curricular frameworks.

This work expands on the work done by the CCT team and local evaluators. It adds to the quantity and quality of investigation in the crucial topic of student performance assessments in arts education, helping to establish validity and depth.

In another series of sessions, teachers and teaching artists came together to reflect on their practices in looking at student work. At another series, they learned about effective ways to use video for documentation and developed their own examples of video documentation.

### **Interagency Efforts**

Interagency efforts to foster arts education among such organizations as the New York City Board of Education, the Annenberg Challenge, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Empire State Partnership Program of the New York State Council on the Arts/New York State Education Department challenged Center staff to listen, learn, and lead. Throughout the implementation and evaluation of its own efforts, the Center collaborated with these other organizations to form and strengthen a collective focus on arts education. The Center mounted a major campaign to build support for arts education and to coordinate its efforts with intersecting and overlapping systems. Staff spoke at a staggering number of conferences and other events. At the request of the Open Society Institute, which was in the process of establishing the After-School Corporation, staff discussed arts in the after-school setting. The Center participated in the citywide Arts Education Week, sponsored by the Board of Education and community cultural leaders, and it went to the Empire State Partnership Summer Seminar, which focused on professional development and peer exchange.

In January 1999, the Center hosted its own large-scale public event. Promising Practices: The Arts and School Improvement was a conference highlighting practices developed by the partnerships. Peer shar-

ing sessions were organized according to the Center's five guiding principles (school change through the arts, arts as part of the core curriculum, partnership and collaboration, professional development, and evaluation and assessment). Partnerships proposed sessions and critiqued each other's session ideas in planning meetings facilitated by Center staff.

Attendance exceeded 500 at this meeting.

A major development in the Center's collaboration with other organizations was the design of a career development program in the arts. Designed to create opportunities for high school students and educators to participate in school-to-career activities in the arts and related industries, the program grew out of a study commissioned by the Center. The pilot Career Development Program got off the ground with the recruitment of a director and the development of an evaluation plan by CCT's research team. The Center recruited high schools, teachers, students, and job sites to participate in this pilot course of study and internships. It also convened a Career Development Advisory Group made up of representatives from labor, the school system, the for-profit and not-for-profit cultural communities, and higher education. With findings from the pilot program and practitioner feedback, the Center refined and expanded the Career Development Program.

More than 325 students and fifty work sites have participated in the program since it began in 1999. These students and educators have gained valuable experiences in the arts and arts-related industries and have explored their individual interests and learning about career opportunities. Most students in the program have attended college, and 80 percent of student interns have continued to pursue careers in the arts and arts-related industries, from fashion design to journalism. Several students have either been hired or have extended their internships as a result of their participation in the program in organizations such as Teachers & Writers Collaborative, ABC, Ballet Hispanico, Kenneth Cole Productions, International Center of Photography, and Nola Recording Studios. Relationships have been estab-

lished with two union work sites, providing student interns with technical training and access to the union trades, which can be difficult to access.

Other activities were designed to generate interest in the initiative as well. The United Federation of Teachers offered to highlight the work taking place by underwriting a publication on school improvement through the arts at Center-funded partnerships. Center staff identified a writer and a designer and created a preliminary outline for the publication, “Promising Practices: The Arts and School Improvement.”

The development of a Center Web site extended this sense of community even further.

## THE IMPACT OF THE CENTER’S ARTS PROGRAMS

Since its inception, the Center for Arts Education (CAE) has contended that adding the arts as content to the school program constitutes a significant school reform effort. According to CAE, arts instruction can improve student performance, both in the arts themselves and in the rest of the core curriculum; make a significant contribution to school change at several levels; foster parent and community involvement in the schools; and develop capacity in community organizations. Our findings supported this theory.

As described above in the sections Implementation Issues and Evaluation Strategy, measuring the arts education program’s impact called for new approaches to evaluation. These new approaches would need to provide feedback about student performance but they also needed to go beyond looking at traditional student-achievement data to consider the broader impact on students and schools and to provide timely feedback to the partnership. CAE used a two-level evaluation design. First, local partnerships conducted their own studies to evaluate the impact of the program on student learning and on the school, using external evaluators or local partnership participants. Second, local partnerships participated in the larger program evaluation conducted by CCT.

To varying degrees, the evaluation activities at both levels included analysis of quantitative data such as student achievement and staffing levels, along with data about perceptions, attitudes, new activities,

and changes in practice from surveys; observations during visits to classrooms, workshops, and meetings; interviews; and compilations of written reports from practitioners. The evaluation reports from the local sites were examined by the CCT team to compare results, methods, and data with CCT’s focus-school documentation data to compare results and to discover areas that were not covered in either effort. As a result, new evaluation responsibilities were assumed by the CCT team, especially in the area of student impact. In 2000 and again in 2001, CCT, working with the research office of the New York City Board of Education, identified standardized-test data in reading and math that was available for the third- and fifth-grade student populations at the time and conducted two separate analyses of those data to determine impact of the program on student learning in core curriculum areas. Documentation and description of practices were an important part of the evaluation, in addition to quantitative performance evaluation.

Although effective assessment models for arts programs are still in development, our evaluation yielded some clear positive results, which are summarized in this section.

### **School Change**

Arts education programs had a noticeable impact on Center schools at the level of curricula, staffing, instruction, and teacher professional development.

### **Curricula and School Staffing**

The CAE partnership had an important impact on student access to arts instruction in Center schools. The number of school arts staff doubled between 1996 and 2001. More students received sequential arts instruction in all arts areas (50 percent more than in 1995–1996, the year prior to the start of the partnership grant program, used as the baseline year from which change was measured). With the addition of the CAE Career Development Program, twice as many students in CAE partnership schools received career preparation as in 1995–1996.

Some schools reported the development of a “distributed leadership” model where teachers throughout the school took on responsibility for the programs. Some schools hired additional arts staff to

work with the teaching artists of the CAE partnerships program. Project coordinators judged those programs to be most successful in which certified arts teaching staff were integrated into the project. Prior experience with other arts programs before the CAE partnerships was highly correlated to the project coordinators' perception of effectiveness in assessing student progress, gaining higher student achievement, and delivering more skilled instruction.

Integration with the core curriculum, in areas such as social studies, history, English language arts, mathematics, and science, was the most frequently observed approach to arts instruction. The nature of arts integration varied from project to project and from classroom to classroom. It also varied with the capacity of teachers and teaching artists.

Some examples of arts skills instruction were seen throughout the program sites that followed this approach; the local evaluation reports contain some brief descriptions of teaching artists' practices. However, with the exception of the few certified arts teachers connected with the program, the evaluation team did not see classroom teachers concentrating on arts skills instruction, nor do the local evaluation reports feature such practices. More commonly, the teaching artists taught the arts skills required for the use of a particular art form in integrated instruction lessons rather than teaching arts skills developmentally or sequentially.

A long-term presence of teaching artists in the classroom seemed to be more effective than a short-term presence. The more time teaching artists spent teaching with their partner, the more they thought that working with the teacher benefited classroom practice (effect size 0.69) and that students were buying into the project (effect size 0.89), and the more cultural organization administrators thought that the role of the arts was enhanced in the school (effect size 1.08). This is a clear finding in favor of more intensive, prolonged arts residencies, proving them to be more effective in injecting the arts into the school.

Teachers and teaching artists did not often use the phrase "aesthetic education" to describe their instructional or curriculum approach in the CAE program – only one site specifically identified itself with the aesthetic education philosophy, though several others indicated that they emphasize aesthetics.

### **Instructional Practice**

Principals indicated in their interviews that changing teachers' instructional practice was their primary goal and expectation for the partnership program. The responses of teachers and teaching artists indicate that this expectation was met successfully.

Partnerships between teachers and artists changed the nature of instructional delivery. Teaching artists and arts organizations learned about the New York State Learning Standards and standardized-testing requirements and developed new ways to support the implementation of standards in classrooms in areas linked to state reading, math, and Regents' tests. Teachers co-taught with teaching artists. Some teachers actively co-designed and taught the integrated lessons, thus developing new abilities to collaborate and co-teach. Others played more passive roles in the classroom, as observers or sometimes as disciplinarians.

Teachers were exposed to a wide variety of community resources, from materials brought in by teaching artists, to work with agencies new to them, to new roles developed for parents. Teachers came to use new methods of evaluating student progress and learning. One common claim of teachers and administrators is that the arts programs allowed them to see students in a new light. Teachers incorporated arts activities into their instruction when the teaching artist was not present. Likewise, teachers used new classroom management techniques acquired from teaching artists.

Teaching artists reported that they experienced significant changes in their own practices – listening more carefully to the needs of teachers, looking for

*One common claim of teachers and administrators is that the arts programs allowed them to see students in a new light.*

*The process of co-planning and co-teaching was itself a source of professional development for both teachers and teaching artists.*

curricular connections, thinking about student learning and assessment, and learning more about developmentally appropriate instruction. The teaching artists came into the classroom as professional artists – experts in their fields – bringing passion and knowledge about their arts domains and introducing students and teachers to new role models and ways of being in the world.

#### **Professional Development**

Professional development offerings to teachers varied widely from project to project. On average, projects reported nine professional development sessions per year. New teachers were inducted into the culture of the school and practice of arts integration through professional development activities.

CAE offered an ongoing series of gatherings called Looking at Student Work. A total of forty-one partnership projects participated, sending fifty-four teaching artists, forty-three teachers, and evaluators to attend one of three groups of eight sessions where they discussed student art work and the kinds of learning they found in the student work. Student Learning in and through the Arts invited ten teams of artists and teachers to work with researchers to document their arts-integrated lessons. Although the project was designed simply to capture and describe in some detail the nature and effects of the arts integration lessons, it unfolded as a professional development project for teachers and artists.

Partnerships reported success in cosponsored professional development opportunities for teachers and teaching artists sharing their respective expertise in

areas such as classroom management and arts pedagogy. Successful teacher professional development emphasized direct interaction with the art form, helping to overcome barriers of teacher fear and inexperience. Teachers indicated that they had increased their knowledge about art forms through professional development focused on the art forms being taught in their schools. These sessions often were modeled on the types of classes the teaching artists would teach for the students. However, some teachers reported not having time to take advantage of professional development activities because they were required to participate in other district or BOE-mandated professional development in math and literacy.

District or BOE mandates for professional development in other areas often inhibited partnerships' abilities to focus on the arts in learning opportunities for teachers. Competing mandates from the districts forced schools to make choices about their limited professional development time. The amount of time that the programs could devote to the arts or arts integration or assessment was not large. The process of co-planning and co-teaching was itself a source of professional development for both teachers and teaching artists and has led to increased understanding on the part of cultural organizations of the demands placed on schools and increased exposure on the part of teachers to the means and modes of instruction in the arts.

#### **Student Learning**

The Education Development Center/Center for Children and Technology (EDC/CCT) team collected reports of student learning from the local site annual evaluation reports that were sometimes substantiated and sometimes not. That principals, teachers, and teaching artists were convinced of the power of the learning experiences that the arts provided is not in doubt. However, the systemic capacity for practitioners to frame questions and gather evidence and to analyze that evidence so that substantial statements can be made about student learning was extremely low.

Projects raised the question: "What are students learning?" But few partnerships developed the expertise to implement assessments that captured and usefully analyzed student learning. Many teachers and principals felt that standardized-test data



were not the best place to look for any substantiation of a powerful and engaging curriculum and student learning. Teachers and principals rely on many more indicators – such as student engagement, attendance, and behavior; the connections students draw between lessons; and the quality of student work produced in the classroom.

Many of the judgments that teachers and principals make, and the ways they reach them, remain undocumented. There was an increasing tendency from 1998 to 2001 for the local evaluation reports to cite student learning of arts skills (69 to 86 percent), learning non-arts content (31 to 66 percent), appreciation of the arts (23 to 37 percent), expanded creativity and imagination (23 to 42 percent) and achievement of standards (20 to 34 percent). During the same period, evaluation reports increasingly (15 to 24 percent) noted improvement in reading test scores, a finding that the EDC/CCT analysis of Board of Education reading test scores supports. Project evaluations provided rich information about the kinds of experiences provided for students, but gave a less vivid image of what students gained from these experiences.

EDC/CCT conducted an analysis of a stratified sample of New York City (NYC) standardized English Language Arts (ELA) test scores. Twenty-four Center-funded schools were identified as target schools for analysis. The following summaries compare target schools with other public schools in the same socioeconomic status (SES) category. The comparison is based on percentage of students meeting the fifth-grade NYC ELA requirement (reaching levels 3 and 4 in the exam):<sup>2</sup>

- The mean percent of students meeting the requirement in our target schools for 1999–2001 was 40.1. The mean percent of students meeting the requirement within similar NYC schools was 36.3. This was a total difference of 3.8 percent; that is, each of the target schools, on average, was located 3.8 percent above the general NYC school performance for 1999–2001. This difference is not strong enough to conclude that Center-funded schools distinguished themselves from the general NYC school performance.

- When breaking down the number by years, the mean difference in 1999 was 6.7 percent; in 2000, 3.3 percent, and in 2001, 1.5 percent. These findings are also not strong enough to draw conclusions and do not support our theory of accumulating impact, according to which we would have expected an upward trend from 1999 to 2001.
- Fourteen (58 percent) of the target schools were located above the NYC mean, and ten (42 percent) were located below it. While this information is positive, it still is not large enough to establish cause or to support our expectations.
- The twenty-four schools include seventeen schools from low SES groups (groups 7–12), and seven from high SES groups (1–6). Interestingly, six out of the seven (86 percent) high-SES schools are located above the NYC mean, while only eight out of the seventeen (47 percent) low-SES schools are located above the NYC mean. This finding may indicate that the CAE funding raises performance mostly for high-SES schools, and less so for low-SES schools.

Altogether, the partnership schools did not differ greatly from the expected mean of NYC schools. Though the trend is in a positive direction, when looking at the entire sample, the favorable trend is too weak for us to conclude that the CAE funding has affected student performance on standardized tests. However, when looking at high-SES schools alone, the improvement is evident.

In 2000–2001, we looked at long-term-funded schools and at fifth-grade scores that were not appropriate for the earlier study. The data we analyzed in 1999–2000 contained only the 1997–1998 school-year data (the most recent data available when we did the study in 1999–2000). These data were drawn from the school year after the arts partnerships had been funded for one or two years. In 2000–2001, we analyzed 1999–2001 data (after the arts partnerships has been funded for four or five years). There were many changes in the configuration of the pro-

2. Our findings do not derive from the study of data at the same schools. Therefore, our 2000–2001 findings neither support nor contradict the conclusions we drew from the 1999–2000 findings.

gram at the school level – participant population, grade level, curriculum, cultural organization affiliation – that prohibited seeing cumulative impact. Therefore, the results were more likely to show the cumulative impact only of those years of treatment and to differ from the data in our first analysis.

### **Parent Involvement, Community Partnerships, and Systemic Capacity**

A major aim of the CAE partnership program was to expand the involvement of parents and community in arts education. In addition to stimulating ties to parents and the community, the partnerships had a large impact on the capacity of local cultural organizations. The CAE partnership also made significant progress in capacity at the system level. These systemic changes were distributed through the various components of the program and show up in data on schools, cultural organizations, and the program itself.

#### **Parent and Community Involvement**

With the Department of Cultural Affairs, the Center offered grants of up to \$5,000 to 204 schools for a Parents as Arts Partners program to educate parents about the value of the arts in their children's education and encourage parent advocates. This project serves 22,000 parents annually. The CAE Career Development Program provided orientation, training, and fifteen-week internships for students from high schools at almost forty work sites.

CAE and EDC/CCT collaborated on the development and implementation of a research effort funded by the National Endowment for the Arts on Student Learning in and through the Arts, supporting teams

of teachers and teaching artists as they document, assess, and describe the student learning and achievement that occurs when an arts-integrated curriculum is taught. In partnership with the United Federation of Teachers, CAE produced *Promising Practices: The Arts and School Improvement* (Marrapodi 2000). CAE distributed 1,100 copies to public schools, district arts liaisons, local politicians, major contributors, and over 200 cultural organizations. The large demand called for a reprint of the publication.

CAE established and operates a gallery at 180 Maiden Lane in Lower Manhattan to present student art work from participating schools, with three rotating exhibitions managed by Center staff. CAE's advocacy and communications office, with sponsorship from PaineWebber Incorporated, produced a "4Rs" public awareness campaign to focus public attention on the arts as an essential component of a child's education. The campaign included mass-transit advertising, a full-time hotline service that received more than a thousand calls, information packets, and a special subsite on the CAE Web site. CAE staff and members of the evaluation team extended the program's influence by participating in the Learning Partnerships meetings of the Arts Education Partnership (a national arts education advocacy organization in Washington, D.C.) and in documentation efforts at the national level.

#### **Partnerships with Local Cultural Organizations**

CAE partnerships made important contributions to the capacity of local cultural organizations. Cultural organizations (COs) gained access to new funding sources. They hired new staff for arts partnerships programs and created new types of positions to support partnerships, such as project managers and coordinators. CO administrators said their organizations had changed the way they develop curriculum and programs.

COs began to work in arts disciplines that were new for them, adding, for example, dance, visual arts, and music to their historical repertoire. COs began to address education reform issues such as learning standards and student assessments, many for the first time in their institutional histories. COs changed their curricular focus even in projects outside the

*A major aim of the CAE partnership program was to expand the involvement of parents and community in arts education.*

scope of the Arts Partnership program. COs reported integrating their arts curriculum with core curriculum areas for the first time.

COs reported that they were forming new partnerships with schools outside the CAE partnerships program and using their curriculum and teaching methods developed in the CAE partnerships to work with those schools. CO administrators said they had changed the way they evaluated work of teaching artists and that they had changed the way they provided planning time to practitioners such as teachers and school administrators. Partnerships established structures for communication and planning to ensure that basic program obligations were met. The arts partnerships usually, but not always, overcame the service-delivery (or vendor) model that many teachers and teaching artists were accustomed to.

### **Systemic Capacity**

The CAE partnership program also developed significant capacity at the system level, including planning and managing activities across agencies and organizing professional development and technical assistance across the program.

CAE helped coordinate New York City arts education efforts and planning by creating bimonthly management update meetings of leaders from the Board of Education, the United Federation of Teachers, the Department of Cultural Affairs, and the Center for Arts Education. In cooperation with DCA, CAE participated in several policy and advocacy efforts with the mayor's office, influencing the creation with the Board of Education of Project ARTS for all public schools in New York City.

CAE conducted preapplication and technical assistance workshops for potential project sites and followed funding with Starting Smart sessions on issues and expectations regarding evaluation and assessment and budget and finance. CAE staff participated in and assisted the Empire State Partnerships Project in its summer seminar professional development series. CAE conducted twenty-four sessions, each consisting of eight three-hour workshops, on looking at student work in which teaching artists and teachers from forty-one partnership projects participated. Staff development workshops were provided by CAE for 147 members of local project teams

*Cultural organizations began to address education reform issues such as learning standards and student assessments, many for the first time in their institutional histories.*

and some guests on resource development and proposal writing. CAE partnerships participated in an intervisitation program for 111 participants, including teaching artists, teachers, school and cultural organization administrators, evaluation staff, and a team from the Minneapolis Arts for Academic Achievement program, who visited five local school projects.

CAE conducted four annual cross-site gatherings for 1,475 Center-funded project staff from both schools and cultural organizations to discuss partnership issues such as evaluation, curriculum, leadership, and sustainability. CAE designed and conducted a city-wide gathering focused on developing a common language for school and cultural organization personnel. CAE conducted a citywide convocation of evaluators and project staff to explore what constitutes and how to collect "compelling evidence." In collaboration with Project ARTS and the Council of Supervisors and Administrators, CAE sponsored a school leadership conference for principals and district personnel on sustaining change and conducted a second Institute on Using Cultural Institutions as Instructional Resources in August 2001. CAE and the partnership schools and organizations strengthened their

links with citywide support efforts such as the Arts Education Roundtable and shared their work through Roundtable workshop sessions.

In collaboration with the EDC/CCT evaluation team, CAE supported a series of four three-hour meetings in an evaluators' exchange series for independent partnership project evaluators. CAE and the EDC/CCT evaluation team conducted an Implications for Action session for all project personnel to review the evaluation report and to explore ways that evaluation can be a tool for program development.

## THE FUTURE

CAE and CCT are now embarking on a new cycle of program development and implementation. Building on the research and evaluation that guided its initial five years, CAE will concentrate on disseminating and demonstrating its promising strategies, practices, and programs.

CCT will also continue to evaluate the impact of arts infusion on school and classroom cultures, the working nature of partnerships, and the leadership and management issues involved. In addition, it is planning small, tightly focused research studies of the impact of a controlled set of crucial variables. The purpose of these studies is to draw out knowledge that is embedded in instructional practice. By keeping the studies small, researchers expect to more nearly approximate real learning conditions and settings, making the results more useful to teachers and teaching artists.

For example, CCT will continue to research systemic, reliable, and valid means for measuring the effects of arts learning on students' cognitive, social, and personal development. Researchers will develop a set of assessment instruments designed to measure arts learning, academic achievement through the arts, and cognitive and social development through the arts.

## References

- Baker, Terry L. 2001. "Contextual Arts Education Assessment: Counting in Context." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.
- Caine, Renata, and Geoffrey Caine. 1994. *Making Connections: Teaching and the Human Brain*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Cobb, Paul, and Janet Bowers. 1999. "Cognitive and Situated Learning Perspectives in Theory and Practice," *Educational Researcher* 28: 2 (March).
- Collins, Allan. 1990. *Toward a Design Science of Education*. Technical Report no. 1, Center for Technology in Education. New York: Bank Street College of Education.
- Collins, Allan. 1993. *Design Issues for Learning Environments*. Technical Report no. 27, Center for Technology in Education. New York: Bank Street College of Education.
- Collins, Allan, John Seely Brown, and Susan E. Newman, 1989. "Cognitive Apprenticeship: Teaching the Craft of Reading, Writing, and Mathematics." In *Cognition and Instruction: Issues and Agendas*, edited by L. B. Resnick. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gardner, Howard. 1996. "Rejoinder to Steers." In *Evaluating and Assessing the Visual Arts in Education*, edited by Doug Boughton, Elliot W. Eisner, and Johan Lightvoet. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, Howard. 1983. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lave, Jean. 1988. *Cognition in Practice: Mind, Mathematics and Culture in Everyday Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marrapodi, Maryann. 2000. *Promising Practices: The Arts and School Improvement*. New York: Oxford Lithograph. Available at <[www.cae-nyc.org](http://www.cae-nyc.org)>.
- Pea, Roy, and D.M. Kurland. 1986. "On the Cognitive Effects of Learning Computer Programming." In *Mirrors of Mind*, edited by R. D. Pea and K. Sheingold. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Resnick, Lauren. 1987. *Education and Learning to Think*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Stake, Robert. 1975. *Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Winner, Ellen, and Lois Hetland. 2000. "The Arts in Education: Evaluating the Evidence for a Causal Link," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 34:3-4 (Fall/Winter).