



EDUCATION

- CHILD POLICY
- CIVIL JUSTICE
- EDUCATION
- ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
- HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE
- INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
- NATIONAL SECURITY
- POPULATION AND AGING
- PUBLIC SAFETY
- SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
- SUBSTANCE ABUSE
- TERRORISM AND HOMELAND SECURITY
- TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

This PDF document was made available from www.rand.org as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

Support RAND

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore [RAND Education](#)

View [document details](#)

Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents.

This product is part of the RAND Corporation monograph series. RAND monographs present major research findings that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors. All RAND monographs undergo rigorous peer review to ensure high standards for research quality and objectivity.

Arts Education Partnerships

Lessons Learned from
One School District's Experience

Melissa K. Rowe

Laura Werber Castaneda

Tessa Kaganoff

Abby Robyn



EDUCATION



Prepared for the
California Arts Council
Demonstration Grant Program

The research described in this report was conducted by RAND Education for the California Arts Council Demonstration Grant Program.

ISBN: 0-8330-3650-5

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

RAND® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2004 RAND Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from RAND.

Published 2004 by the RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050
201 North Craig Street, Suite 202, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-1516
RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org/>

To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact
Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;
Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: order@rand.org

Preface

Arts education in the nation's public schools is facing some tough challenges despite receiving strong public support and despite the growing evidence of its wide-ranging benefits. One of the strategies adopted by schools to address the issues surrounding arts education is to tap the expertise of local community arts organizations. In 1999, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) approved a ten-year, multi-million-dollar program to implement a substantive, sequential curriculum in arts education for all students in kindergarten through grade 12. A core component of the plan is to build partnerships with community arts organizations to develop and provide programs to enhance the study of the arts in support of the district's educational goals.

The RAND Corporation received funding from the California Arts Council Demonstration Grant Program to examine the partnerships between local arts organizations and elementary schools in the early stages of LAUSD's ten-year program. The purpose of the study is to examine the range of partnerships in operation and to identify the common partnership challenges and facilitators. We conducted in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, including principals, teachers, local district arts advisors, and directors of arts organizations. This monograph report presents our findings from these interviews and provides recommendations for improving partnerships between arts organizations and schools.

This report should be of interest to educators, policymakers, artists, cultural and community leaders, and those involved in or sup-

portive of the implementation of substantive arts education for students in the nation's public schools.

This research was carried out under the auspices of RAND Education. Inquiries regarding RAND Education may be directed to Dominic Brewer, Director RAND Education, at education@rand.org. Inquiries regarding this report may be directed to Melissa Rowe at Melissa_Rowe@rand.org.

The RAND Corporation Quality Assurance Process

Peer review is an integral part of all RAND research projects. Prior to publication, this document, as with all documents in the RAND monograph series, was subject to a quality assurance process to ensure that the research meets several standards, including the following: The problem is well formulated; the research approach is well designed and well executed; the data and assumptions are sound; the findings are useful and advance knowledge; the implications and recommendations follow logically from the findings and are explained thoroughly; the documentation is accurate, understandable, cogent, and temperate in tone; the research demonstrates understanding of related previous studies; and the research is relevant, objective, independent, and balanced. Peer review is conducted by research professionals who were not members of the project team.

RAND routinely reviews and refines its quality assurance process and also conducts periodic external and internal reviews of the quality of its body of work. For additional details regarding the RAND quality assurance process, visit <http://www.rand.org/standards/>.

Contents

Preface	iii
Tables	xi
Executive Summary	xiii
Acknowledgments	xxv
Acronyms	xxvii
CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction	1
Arts Education and the Role of Arts Partnerships	2
Effects of School Reform on Arts Education	3
The Rise of Arts Partnerships	5
The Case of Los Angeles County	7
Key Concepts from the Literature	8
Types of Arts Partnerships	8
Characteristics of Successful Partnerships.....	10
Study Purpose and Approach	12
Organization of This Report.....	13
CHAPTER TWO	
Los Angeles Unified School District’s Arts Education Plan.....	15
Goals and Objectives.....	15
The Arts Prototype School Program	17
Key Program Personnel	18

CHAPTER THREE

Research Approach 21
Conceptual Framework 21
Sample Selection 22
 School Sample 22
 Arts Organization Sample..... 24
Design of Interview Protocols 26
Analysis of Interview Data 27

CHAPTER FOUR

Arts Organization Characteristics..... 29
Organizational Operations..... 29
Organizational Support for School Partnerships and Programming 30

CHAPTER FIVE

Partnership Goals and Interactions 33
Partnership Goals 33
 Schools and Arts Organizations Have Different Partnership Goals 34
 Both Schools and Arts Organizations Emphasize Exposure to
 the Arts..... 37
Partnership Initiation 37
 Both Schools and Arts Organizations Claim to Initiate Contact 37
 Most Schools Have No Clear Criteria for Selecting Programs 39
 Schools Expressed the Need to Link Arts Programs to Their
 Curricula 40
 Local District Arts Advisors Are Seldom Involved in Matching
 Schools to Arts Programs or in Evaluating Programs..... 41
Information Sharing About Each Partner’s Organization 42
 Schools Do Not Provide Orientation or Training to Arts
 Organization Staff 42
 Arts Organizations Seldom Provide Materials to Schools Before or
 After Programs Are Conducted 42
Communication and Planning..... 43
 Arts Organizations Report that Teachers Are the Main Points of
 Contact, but Contact Is Not Frequent 43

Arts Organizations Report that Most Activities Are Planned Without School Involvement 43

Schools Report Little Communication with Arts Organizations and Virtually No Collaboration on Program Planning 45

Schools Appear to Prefer Minimal Contact with Arts Organizations .. 45

Program Evaluation and Meeting School Needs 46

Most Arts Organizations Conduct Program Evaluations, but Schools Are Not Involved in Designing the Evaluations 46

Arts Organizations Claim that Many Programs Can Be Tailored, but Few Schools Take Advantage of This Option..... 47

Partner Goals and Interactions Indicate Simple Transactions Dominate..... 49

CHAPTER SIX

Partnership Challenges and Facilitators 53

Challenges..... 54

 From the Perspective of Arts Organizations 54

 From the Perspective of Schools 57

 From the Perspective of Local District Arts Advisors..... 61

 Summary..... 61

Facilitators 62

 From the Perspective of Arts Organizations 62

 From the Perspective of Schools 65

 From the Perspective of Local District Arts Advisors..... 67

Absent from the Interview Responses: The Need for Program Evaluation..... 68

 Summary..... 68

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Policy Implications..... 71

Conclusions 71

Recommendations 73

 Build Partnerships That Address the Broader Goals and Needs of Schools and Arts Organizations..... 74

 Focus on Teachers 76

Use the Process of Program Selection to Improve Available
Programming 77
Provide Comprehensive and User-Friendly Information 78
Orient Arts Organization Staff to Schools 80
Facilitate Access to Key Points of Contact at Arts Organizations 81
Enhance the Brokering Role for Local District Arts Advisors 81
Policy Implications..... 83

Bibliography 85

Tables

S.1. Arts Partnership Challenges Cited by School and Arts Organizations, Percentage of Sample	xx
S.2. Arts Partnership Facilitators Cited by Schools and Arts Organizations, Percentage of Sample	xxi
3.1. Characteristics of Schools in Final Sample, Grouped by District Category.....	24
4.1. Arts Organization Self-Categorization	31
4.2. Disciplines Addressed by Arts Organizations	31
4.3. Number of Disciplines of Each Arts Organization	31
4.4. Activities Provided by Arts Organizations to Schools	31
5.1. Schools' Art Partnership Goals.....	35
5.2. Arts Organizations' Partnership Goals.....	36
5.3. Parties Involved in the Program Planning Process, by Percentage of Arts Organization Sample Offering These Programs	44
5.4. Program Location, Cost, and Scheduling.....	47
5.5. Percentage of Arts Organizations with Programs That Can Be Tailored to School Needs or That Are Linked to School Curriculum	48
6.1. Arts Partnership Challenges Mentioned by Arts Organizations ..	54
6.2. Arts Partnership Challenges Mentioned by Schools	58
6.3. Arts Partnership Facilitators Mentioned by Arts Organizations	63
6.4. Arts Partnership Facilitators Mentioned by Schools.....	64

Executive Summary

Arts education is facing some tough challenges in the nation's public schools despite strong public support for arts education and growing evidence of its benefits. Public surveys continue to demonstrate that the vast majority of Americans support arts education, and a growing body of research suggests that arts education provides a range of benefits for young people. National standards for core subjects, including the arts, were established in 1994 as part of the school reform movement, and most states have followed suit by adapting or developing their own arts standards to guide schools in establishing a substantive, sequential curriculum in the arts. But the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 does not require schools to be held accountable for teaching to these curriculum standards for the arts. Although states are required to administer standardized tests in math and reading and soon will be required to do the same in science, they are not required to administer standardized tests for the arts.

These latest policies, combined with the recent budget crises in many states, have resulted in increased instructional time in tested areas and decreased instructional time in non-tested areas, such as the arts. One of the strategies adopted by schools to address this problem is to tap the expertise of community arts organizations that are working in service of students. Recent studies on arts partnerships between schools and arts organizations stress the importance of using such partnerships to move arts education beyond just occasional exposure to the arts, particularly when district resources fail to provide substantive, sequential in-school arts education programs.

The literature we reviewed for this study calls upon arts organizations to provide substantive educational programs for students, to help schools to develop an arts curriculum, to develop assessments of student achievement, and to provide professional development for teachers. Judging from the explosion in the numbers of arts partnerships around the country, the idea is taking hold. Schools benefit from such partnerships by taking advantage of programming and expertise they cannot otherwise afford to provide, and arts organizations benefit by gaining visibility in their communities, earning needed income, making themselves more attractive to donors, and building future audiences for the arts.

Riding a wave of public funding for the arts in the late 1990s, the California Arts Council established the Demonstration Grant Program in 2000 to provide funding to local arts organizations to build such partnerships with schools and to develop and evaluate arts programming for schools. In 1999, a year before the program began, board members of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) approved one of the most ambitious arts education programs in the nation: the LAUSD Arts Education Plan, a ten-year, multi-million-dollar program to implement a substantive, sequential curriculum in arts education in four major disciplines—dance, music, theater, and the visual arts—for all public school children in kindergarten through grade 12 (K–12).

The plan began by providing comprehensive arts programming in select elementary schools (referred to as Arts Prototype Schools). A core component of the plan is to build partnerships with community arts organizations to develop and provide programs that enhance the study of the arts and support the district's arts education goals. The plan also calls for the creation of full-time local district arts advisors, one for each of LAUSD's 11 local districts.

LAUSD's ten-year plan has five primary goals for implementing K–12 arts education standards: (1) provide a substantive program of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in dance, music, theater, and the visual arts in all grades; (2) sponsor year-round professional development for administrators, general teachers, arts teachers, and artists working in schools; (3) develop partnerships with community arts

organizations and businesses to offer fiscal and programmatic support for the study of the arts; (4) employ print and electronic media to achieve Goals 1 through 3; and (5) evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the district's Arts Education Plan.

Our study did not evaluate the progress of this arts education plan. We focused solely on one part of the third goal: the creation of arts partnerships. Our conclusions do not apply to the full range of activities supported by this impressive program; however, they point to the importance of the first and second goals, which place the responsibility for a coherent program in arts education squarely with the schools.

Purpose of Study and Approach

The RAND Corporation received funding from the California Arts Council Demonstration Grant Program to examine the partnerships between local arts organizations and elementary schools in the early stages of the LAUSD Arts Education Plan. Unlike other recent studies, which focus on profiling successful and fairly sophisticated arts partnerships, this study looks at a sample of schools and arts organizations to produce a portrait of how arts partnerships are actually functioning within a large urban school district. The purpose of this study is to describe the range of partnerships operating between schools and arts organizations and to assess the degree to which partnerships have evolved in their complexity and absorbed the lessons provided in the arts partnership literature.

We began by reviewing the literature on arts partnerships, paying particular attention to the best practices that the literature has identified as being characteristic of successful arts partnerships. We then developed interview protocols that would allow us to explore these characteristics within the partnerships we studied. The protocols focus on eliciting information on the following three major aspects of arts partnerships:

- Schools' and arts organizations' goals in forming partnerships
- Patterns of interaction between schools and arts organizations
- Factors that hinder or facilitate the effectiveness of partnerships.

Study Sample

We chose a stratified random sample of 11 schools and used a case-study approach. We conducted several 30-minute, semi-structured interviews at each school, including interviews with the school principal, the school's arts cadre chair, and one arts teacher. We also conducted 45-minute phone interviews with the directors (or the arts education directors at large institutions) of 34 arts organizations and interviewed all ten of the local district arts advisors.¹

Insights from the Literature

The conceptual framework for this study is indebted to insights from the literature on arts partnerships that has been published over the past 15 years. In particular, we benefited from the identification of the various types of partnerships and the key features of successful partnerships, as described next.

Two Types of Partnerships

Recent research on arts education has described arts partnerships as being of two major types:

- **Simple Transactions.** In a simple transaction partnership, an artist or arts organization offers an arts program for a school's students and the school purchases the program. The school does not participate meaningfully in the design of the arts program,

¹ Although, as stated above, there are 11 local districts in LAUSD, one of the local district arts advisor slots was vacant during the interview phase of our study.

and the program provider does little or no needs assessment or adaptation of the program to the specific school site.

- **Joint Ventures.** These are more complex interactions. In a joint venture, a school and arts organization work together to define students' needs and to design an arts education enrichment program. At its best, a joint venture incorporates an ongoing series of events, includes preparatory and follow-up curriculum materials, and provides training for teachers. The focus of such partnerships is on teaching and learning rather than simply exposing students to the arts.

Theoretically, increasing complexity of an arts partnership is related to increasing effectiveness or increasing educational value for students and teachers. Therefore, although simple transactions can be of value, they are associated with lower educational effectiveness compared with joint ventures that are associated with higher levels of educational effectiveness.

Characteristics of Successful Partnerships

Past studies of sustainable and effective partnerships between schools and arts organizations have consistently found the following features present in those partnerships:

- Shared goals with an emphasis on the needs of the students and schools
- Communication between partners and joint program planning
- Program documentation, evaluation, and quality improvement
- Leadership roles played by key stakeholders (e.g., principals, teachers, and parents, and community leaders in government, business, education, and the arts)
- Adequate funding, resources, and support obtained through broad-based ownership and investment in the partnerships.

Study Findings

We organized the major findings of our interviews with arts organization and school-based staff according to three major aspects of arts partnerships: (1) goals, (2) interactions, and (3) obstacles and facilitators of the partnerships.

Partnership Goals

We found that schools and arts organizations shared a common goal of developing students, although both tended to express this goal in terms of exposing students to the arts and providing opportunities for arts appreciation, rather than developing students' knowledge of or skills in the arts. Schools and arts organizations also had some notably different goals for their partnerships. Schools emphasized providing professional development for teachers as a key partnership goal, whereas developing teachers was rarely mentioned as a goal of arts organizations. The goal most often mentioned by arts organizations is promoting public awareness and appreciation of the arts. Promoting their organizations was another frequently mentioned goal.

Partnership Interactions

Interactions between schools and arts organizations are minimal. The arts organizations typically develop programs without input from schools and offer them to the general community of schools for a fee or sometimes for free. Schools select from such programs, often using brochures mailed by the arts organization and little else to make their choices. Almost no communication takes place among school staff about the selection of programs, and none of the interviewees reported having a systematic decisionmaking process for selecting programs. Local district arts advisors, who are in a position to provide guidance in selection and evaluation of programs, are rarely consulted either by schools or by arts organizations. Even after selecting a program, schools and arts organizations seldom communicate, except to resolve logistical issues, such as scheduling or transportation. Neither arts organizations nor schools provide more than minimal orientation

to each other's organizational structures and cultures or preparation for involvement with each other's organizations.

These findings demonstrate that the partnerships described in our sample are simple transactions in which the arts organization is acting as a service provider and the school as a consumer. Most of the individuals we interviewed from both schools and arts organizations said that the arts programs provide students with a one-shot exposure to the arts rather than a program that is linked or integrated with the school curriculum. There appears to be very little interaction and substantive program planning between schools and arts organizations. Schools do not participate in the design of arts programs, and arts organizations do not routinely conduct a needs assessment or adapt programs to specific school needs. Although many arts organizations reported that it is possible for them to do some school-specific tailoring of their programs, schools perceive that such tailoring is either not possible, or too costly, or both.

School staff suggested that they prefer provider-consumer transactions because they require little effort to establish and maintain. School staff members seem to prefer partnerships that require the fewest number of contacts and the least amount of time.

Partnership Obstacles and Facilitators

Although all of the partnerships we examined take the form of simple transactions rather than joint ventures, the schools and arts organizations nevertheless face multiple challenges in working together. Table S.1 lists the obstacles to successful partnering that were cited most often by both schools and arts organizations. Arts organizations reported more specific problems than did the schools, but there is a good deal of overlap in schools' and arts organizations' opinions on some of the main sources of partnership difficulties, including lack of funding, lack of time, and logistics. Both also cited communication problems as obstacles to effective partnerships. For example, although teachers are the key points of contact after a school selects a program, teachers are difficult to reach. They generally are not available until after 3 p.m., and they have neither office phones nor access to e-mail.

Table S.1
Arts Partnership Challenges Cited by School and Arts Organizations,
Percentage of Sample

Schools	Arts Organizations
Funding concerns (64%)	Insufficient funding (32%)
Time constraints (64%)	Logistical problems (29%)
Inadequate accommodation to meet school's needs (55%)	Overburdened teachers (29%)
Logistical problems (45%)	Insufficient instructional time (21%)
Inadequate information (36%)	Communication difficulties (18%)
Communication difficulties (27%)	Unfavorable attitude toward the arts (18%)
	Lack of teacher support (18%)
	Institutional bureaucracy (15%)
	Personnel turnover (15%)

One key difference in the perspectives of schools and arts organizations concerning the partnership obstacles they face is that more than half of the schools said that arts organizations are not accommodating their needs. Although arts organizations offer many programs that seem to address schools' needs—programs offered on-site at the school, during school hours, and sometimes free of charge—schools also have a need for programs that help them meet educational goals. Not surprisingly, given the difference in their diagnosis of the obstacles to good partnerships, schools and arts organizations emphasized different factors facilitating good partnerships. The partnership “facilitators” they cited are listed in Table S.2. Schools claimed that the most important facilitator is the availability of grade-appropriate arts programs that are integrated with the curriculum and that work within the constraints under which schools and teachers operate. This facilitator specifies a key way for arts organizations to meet school needs. Meeting school needs by providing grade-appropriate programs that are linked or integrated with curriculum was not mentioned as either a challenge or a facilitator by arts organizations and demonstrates that this critical need of the schools is not being clearly communicated to arts organizations.

Arts organizations said that developing working relationships with individuals at schools is the most important facilitator of good partnerships. School staff, however, did not seem to be as interested in building relationships as they were in receiving information that will help them to inform their selection of programs and to improve the efficiency of the transaction. Better dissemination of information about arts organization programs to enable more-informed program selection is a commonly cited facilitator mentioned by schools. Both schools and arts organizations highlighted communication and accessibility as being critical facilitators.

It is interesting to note that while some arts organizations found resistance to accessing their programs among teaching staffs, nearly a third of arts organizations viewed teacher enthusiasm as being crucial to a working relationship with schools. School staff did not mention teacher enthusiasm as a facilitator, although they did note the importance of helpful arts organization staff (perhaps as a counterpart to enthusiastic teachers).

Table S.2
Arts Partnership Facilitators Cited by Schools and Arts Organizations,
Percentage of Sample

Schools	Arts Organizations
Programs that are appropriate to grade and school curriculum (73%)	Working relationships with school staff (38%)
Financial assistance (64%)	Teacher commitment and enthusiasm (32%)
Increased dissemination of information (64%)	Communication (29%)
Greater accessibility to arts organization staff (55%)	Professionalism and expertise of arts organization staff and artists (26%)
Point of contact (55%)	Support from school leadership (21%)
Greater school involvement (36%)	
Helpful arts organization staff (36%)	
Greater parental involvement (27%)	
Transportation assistance (27%)	

Conclusions and Recommendations

Although the arts education field has been promoting the formation of joint-venture arts partnerships as the most effective model for arts education, our study found that the arts partnerships in our sample are best described as simple transactions. This finding suggests that simple partnerships may constitute the vast majority of cases within our broader study population. As many observers in the arts education field have suspected, the simple transaction model may be pervasive among the nations' schools and arts organizations.

Just why the simple transaction model dominates is apparent from many of the challenges that were cited, especially by the schools. Ostensibly, a less-complex relationship requires less investment of time and resources and does not rely on the development and maintenance of numerous close-working relationships. However, our study found that even the simple provider-consumer type of partnership is not working as well as it should for either partner and is falling short of schools' and arts organizations' needs. Rather than propose the development of more-complex interactions, we recommend that schools, school districts, and organizations take steps to improve on their current type of partnership, even though more-sophisticated partnerships may have greater potential for educational effectiveness.

The recommendations summarized below are directed toward assuring that arts partnerships in the form of simple transactions address the needs of both schools and arts organizations and thus have greater long-term sustainability.

- **Establish partnerships that address the goals of both schools and arts organizations.** Although the needs of students and schools have been emphasized in the literature as being central to the goals of arts education partnerships, the needs of arts organizations are of equal importance to a partnership's growth and sustainability. Broad support for the arts from key stakeholder groups (e.g., teachers, principals, students, and parents) is a necessary component of arts education's longer-term viability. The potential of arts education partnerships to trans-

form public education and establish the arts as core subjects will not be realized unless schools and arts organizations understand how their goals interconnect.

- **Focus on teachers.** Given the limited resources of schools and arts organizations, both should focus available resources on developing teachers. Teacher support is critical to the success of arts partnerships and to the implementation and sustainability of arts education in schools. Investing in teachers enables the benefits from that investment to be passed on to students, to key stakeholders in arts education (other teachers, principals, parents, community members), and potentially to other schools (when teachers change jobs).
- **Use program selection to improve available programming.** As the consumers in the simple transaction model, schools can shape available programming to better meet the needs of students and teachers through their choice of programs. Schools that identify criteria for program selection and implement a clear selection process can maximize the contribution that external programming makes to their specific educational goals.
- **Provide comprehensive and user-friendly information.** The potential effectiveness of the simple transaction model relies on the efficient exchange of information to supplant close working relationships. Arts organizations require comprehensive information about schools' needs, organizational structures and goals, curricula, and available funding in order to design high-value educational programs. Schools require easy-to-access and relevant information on arts organizations to efficiently and effectively select programs that provide the best fit with school needs.
- **Orient arts organization staff to schools.** In addition to descriptive information about schools, arts organizations need supplemental information in the form of in-person school orientation to gain a realistic view of the challenges surrounding the provision of arts education in the classroom.
- **Facilitate access to key points of contact at arts organizations.** In addition to descriptive information about arts organizations and their programs, schools would benefit from having conven-

ient access to organization staff (e.g., at set times when teachers can call) to get answers to questions on various programs, consultation on program selection, and consultation on development of arts curriculum, classroom materials, and student assessment tools.

- **Enhance the “brokering” role for local district arts advisors.** Both schools and arts organizations tend to be highly diverse and decentralized. The local district arts advisors have the potential to act as information hubs or information “brokers” and can be invaluable links between schools and arts organizations. Their in-depth understanding of the district’s educational goals can provide much-needed guidance to schools that are looking for ways to evaluate art programs and to arts organizations that are working to develop programs that address school needs.

The most significant policy implication of this study is that schools must assume responsibility for creating a coherent, standards-based arts curriculum and become better-informed consumers of arts programs that promote that curriculum, rather than counting on the evolution of more-collaborative arts partnerships to accomplish this task.

The five core goals of LAUSD’s ten-year plan are designed to work synergistically to achieve the implementation of a substantive, sequential arts curriculum for all K–12 students in the district. The designers of the plan recognized the importance of local arts organizations in helping the district to achieve this ambitious outcome, although only in conjunction with significant school-based investment that provides for centralized development and coordination of an arts education curriculum and teacher training. Even within the context of a well-designed and ambitious program such as LAUSD’s, expecting schools and arts organizations to develop complex partnerships may be impractical and inefficient. Arts education partnerships that can work more effectively within a provider-consumer framework may ultimately allow many schools and arts organizations that are struggling with limited resources to make a lasting, positive impact on arts education reform.

Acknowledgments

We extend our appreciation to the California Arts Council (CAC), which sponsored this research, and we especially thank two former CAC staff members Laurie Heller and Paul Minicucci for their help with our project. We would also like to thank LAUSD's Arts Education Branch staff and in particular acknowledge the extensive support and assistance of Richard Burrows, Director of Arts Education, LAUSD. Although confidentiality precludes us from mentioning them by name, we are grateful to the arts organization staff members who participated in this study, as well as to the teachers and principals who so graciously donated their time and insights to this effort. This research also benefited greatly from the insights and intellectual contributions of many RAND colleagues, including Laura Hamilton, who provided expert consultation throughout the project, and Julia Lowell, Julie Marsh, Sheila Kirby, and Susan Bodilly, who provided constructive reviews of an earlier version of this document. Finally, we owe a special thanks to Laura Zakaras, who read and commented on various drafts of this report, and to Nancy DeFavero for all her work in editing this report.

Acronyms

AO	arts organization
APS	Arts Prototype School (program)
CAC	California Arts Council
K–12	kindergarten through grade 12
LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District
LDAA	local district arts advisor
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
POC	point of contact
SES	socioeconomic status
VAPA	Visual and Performing Arts (program)

Introduction

Arts education in today's public schools is full of promise and peril. The promise rests in far-reaching public support for providing arts education in the schools, which is bolstered by recent research on the value of arts education. Previous studies in this area point to the cognitive and social benefits that arts education provides for young people and supply research-based guidance on how to create effective arts programs at different grade levels. National standards for arts education also have been established, and most states have adapted or developed their own standards to guide schools in designing substantive, sequential arts programs. The peril stems from a number of factors including a lack of instructional time in the school day, a lack of trained teachers, and a lack of suitable space, equipment, and supplies needed to teach the arts. Despite evidence that educators and the public acknowledge the importance of teaching the arts, school budgets continue to marginalize arts education. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has had the effect of further diminishing instructional time and school resources needed to implement an arts curriculum. A recent survey of 82 school districts in Los Angeles County revealed that most school districts dedicated less than 1 percent of their total budget to arts education. The report's main finding was that most children in the county receive ad hoc exposure to the arts without any coherent arts education (United Arts, 2001, p. 8).

To address this situation, board members of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) in 1999 approved the LAUSD Arts Education Plan, one of the most ambitious arts education programs

in the nation—a ten-year, multi-million-dollar program to implement a substantive, sequential arts curriculum in four major disciplines—dance, music, theater, and the visual arts—for all public school children in kindergarten through grade 12 (K–12). The plan starts by providing comprehensive arts programming in select elementary schools (referred to as Arts Prototype Schools [APSs]). A core component of the plan is to build “extensive and well-articulated programs with the Los Angeles arts community,” which includes hundreds of arts organizations that offer programming aimed at students. The plan also called for the creation of full-time local district arts advisors (LDAAs), one for each of LAUSD’s 11 local districts.

The emphasis on schools building arts partnerships in arts-rich Los Angeles provided a unique opportunity for research and analysis. In the fall 2001, RAND received funding from the California Arts Council (CAC) Demonstration Grant Program to examine partnerships between local arts organizations (AOs) and elementary schools in the early stages of the new LAUSD program. Focusing exclusively on the partnership component of the new program, we sought to understand the goals of these partnerships, the interactions they entail, and how they can be improved.

Arts Education and the Role of Arts Partnerships

There is evidence of increased public interest in providing a substantive education in the arts to all students. National and state surveys show that the majority of Americans believe that the arts should be taught in U.S. public schools (e.g., California Arts Council, 2001; National Endowment for the Arts, 1992). Research on the benefits of arts education has grown rapidly over the past decade. Mounting evidence suggests that arts education is linked with desirable academic, psychological, cognitive, developmental, and social outcomes (see Deasy, 2002; Fiske, 1999). Hours of academic arts instruction have been linked with better student performance on tests in other academic areas, reduced drop-out rates, reduced hours of television watching, increased numbers of hours of reading for pleasure, and a

narrowed test-score gap between students with low socioeconomic status (SES) and high SES in academic test performance (Catterall, Chapleau, and Iwanaga, 1999).

Despite such research and widespread public support for the arts, arts education in U.S. schools has often been limited to merely exposing students to the arts, rather than providing a discipline-based substantive education in the arts through sequential curricula comparable to the curricula in other subjects, such as math, reading, and science. School funding for arts programs often relies heavily on sources outside of the school budget. Many schools would not have any arts education programming without the aid of parent associations, fundraising, and grants.

Effects of School Reform on Arts Education

In 1994, experts in education and the arts developed the National Standards for Arts Education. The standards established what students with a complete, sequential curriculum in the arts should know. Since the development of the National Standards, the majority of states have also established standards for education in the arts. Almost half of these states have mandated that local school districts implement those standards in their schools.

Standards are a key part of the United States' current approach to school reform. The establishment of standards at the national, state, and local school district level is an important step toward making the arts a core subject in the school curriculum. Rod Paige, U.S. Secretary of Education, has said, "I think music and the arts should be considered core subjects in our nation's schools. There is absolutely no conflict between the expansion of our fine arts programs [and] our music programs and [our] focus on other academic programs."¹

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 established a test-based accountability system that required states to immediately adopt standards in math and reading and to adopt standards in sci-

¹ See the Americans for the Arts website (www.americansforthearts.org), which contains further information on the new arts education standards.

ence by 2005–2006. The NCLB *recommends* that states adopt standards in the four major arts disciplines of dance, music, theater, and visual arts; however, the NCLB does not *require* states to do so. The cornerstone of the reform is test-based accountability. States are expected to develop and implement standardized tests in all subject areas for which standards are required. Without a federal mandate, states are unlikely to conduct standardized tests in music, dance, theater, or the visual arts.

Functionally, this leaves the arts out of the NCLB accountability system and may inadvertently encourage schools to focus most of their resources in subjects that will be tested. As such, testing required by the NCLB may be a double-edged sword for arts education. As noted by some researchers, the emphasis on testing in reading and mathematics could easily result in decreased instructional time in non-tested areas and reduced attention to curriculum development in non-tested areas (Stecher, Hamilton, and Gonzalez, 2003). In fact, a report recently released by the Council for Basic Education (Von Zastrow and Janc, 2004) confirms this concern. Findings from a survey of 965 elementary and secondary school principals from four states (New York, New Mexico, Maryland, and Illinois) found that 25 percent of schools have decreased their instructional time for the arts, whereas 75 percent have increased their instructional time for math, writing, and reading.

The arts are particularly vulnerable to the unintended negative impact of the NCLB on instructional time, given that instructional time is already limited in many schools. In 1997, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Arts Report Card was released. The NAEP Arts Report Card is the only national sampling of schools that reports on the availability of arts instruction in the schools, with the 1997 NAEP report being the most recent.² According to the NAEP, only 43 percent of schools provided music instruction at least three times a week, and only 52 percent provided visual arts instruction at least that often. Only 3 percent of schools

² The NAEP report is limited to a national sample of 8th-grade classrooms; funding limitations precluded the inclusion of other grades.

provided dance instruction at least three times a week, and the majority (80 percent) of schools did not provide any opportunity for dance classes. Similarly, only 10 percent of schools provide theater instruction at least three times a week, and the majority of schools (74 percent) did not teach theater. Moreover, even in schools in which music, visual arts, dance, or theater instruction was available, most of those schools were offering that instruction to only a subset of the total student population.

The Rise of Arts Partnerships

Arts partnerships between schools and community arts organizations have developed largely to provide students with exposure to the arts, particularly in schools without arts teachers, such as most schools serving kindergarten through 8th-grade students and schools in lower-income areas. The number of partnerships between schools and arts organizations seems to be growing rapidly (Myers, 2001). Schools benefit from these partnerships by taking advantage of supplementary programming and expertise in the arts that they cannot otherwise afford to provide. Arts organizations benefit by gaining visibility in their communities and by building future audiences for their work through exposing children to the arts (McCarthy and Jinnett, 2001). For some arts organizations, working with schools can provide some needed income and make the organizations more attractive to donors.

Recent research has built a case for the importance of building arts partnerships as a critical part of the effort to move arts education beyond exposure-oriented, extracurricular activities for a select few to part of the daily curriculum for all students in all grades (for an overview and history of such partnerships see Remer, 1996).

Much has been written about how to define these partnerships and what makes them successful (e.g., Lind and Lindsley, 2003; Dreeszen and Deasy, 1999; Hirzy, 1996; Longley, 1999; Remer, 1996; Myers, 1996; Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, 2001). Success has been defined in a variety of ways, including by the sustainability of the partnership and by student, teacher, and school outcomes. Overviews of partnership outcomes suggest that arts education programming developed through arts partnerships can have positive im-

pacts on teacher instruction, school climate, and student learning and social development (Deasy, 2002; Fiske, 1999; Horowitz, 2004). While most observers agree that exemplary partnerships can play an important role in the implementation of arts education, some caution that the typical partnership primarily provides students and teachers with arts appreciation and exposure to the arts rather than substantive learning and sequential programming (Myers, 2001; Remer, 1996).

Recent discussions among experts in the field of arts education have focused on the need for arts organizations to help schools develop curriculum and assessments of student mastery, and to work with schools to provide professional development for both arts specialists and teachers that are generalists who want to teach the arts and/or integrate them into instruction in other subject areas (Remer, 1996; Dreeszen, 2002; Myers, 2001; Burnaford, 2001). The need for partners to conduct program evaluations to assess the quality of arts programming, ensure responsiveness to school needs, and document program outcomes is also of growing importance (e.g., Dreeszen, 2002).

School districts in the process of implementing arts education programs have identified the role that arts partnerships play as being critical to their success. A study titled *Gaining the Arts Advantage* (Longley, 1999) of 91 school districts around the country that were working to implement and sustain arts education programs in their schools identified a number of important factors contributing to their efforts. Those factors included support from the school board, superintendent, and principal; continuity in school and community leadership; the hiring of district arts coordinators; development of teachers with experience and expertise in the arts; a strong elementary school foundation; and a comprehensive plan for program implementation and continuous program improvement. However, the central finding of the study was that the single most-critical factor in sustaining arts education in schools is the active involvement of influential segments of the community—parents, local businesses, civic leaders, and institutions, and, of course, local arts organizations and artists. In particular, the study identified school partnerships with arts organizations as a frequently used strategy that school districts em-

ployed to support arts education and that proved to be important to the development of curriculum, teacher training, and student exposure to the arts. Notably, the LAUSD ten-year plan includes many of the factors identified in the Longley report as being critical to implementing arts education programs.

The Case of Los Angeles County

In 2001, the Arts Education Task Force for LA³ commissioned a Los Angeles County-wide survey of all 82 school districts serving the 1.7 million students across the 1,745 schools in the county, the most populous county in the United States. The goal of the survey was to establish current information on arts education in the county (e.g., staffing, resources, funding, partnerships, availability of sequential arts education, professional development). Thirty-seven percent of districts reported that they have no defined sequential curriculum of arts education in any discipline in any grade in any school. The most commonly cited sources of arts education funding were support from parent associations and fundraising activities. Schools also relied on state grants, including those from the CAC and the California Department of Education. The majority of districts said they dedicated less than 1 percent of their total budget to arts education. The authors of the report on the survey summarized their overall findings by saying, “Most of the children in the county’s educational system experience arts education in an ad-hoc fashion rather than sequentially . . .” (United Arts, 2001, p. 8).

The main source of students’ exposure to the arts was programs provided through partnerships with local organizations. Eighty percent of districts reported that programs from outside providers were in regular use throughout their school district. Fifty-four percent reported being involved in arts education partnerships with outside organizations, although most districts considered the partnership to be just a simple sponsorship arrangement. Partnerships in which partici-

³ The Arts Education Task Force for LA is composed of leaders in the arts and public education communities. Its focus is on the advancement of quality arts education curriculum and programming in K–12 public schools throughout Los Angeles County.

pants created shared goals and worked together to achieve them were rare. In fact, the authors of the 2001 report on the Los Angeles County-wide survey noted that all district respondents expressed caution about investing time in developing partnerships that may not be worthwhile or sustainable. Yet, the authors also noted that the role of partnerships in providing arts programs to students would be increasingly significant if district resources failed to provide better in-school programming.

Key Concepts from the Literature

The conceptual framework for this study is indebted to insights from the literature on arts partnerships that has been published over the past 15 years. In particular, we benefited from the identification of the different types of partnerships and the key features of successful partnerships, as described next.

Types of Arts Partnerships

One of the most important concepts in the arts partnership literature is the distinction between “simple transactions” and “joint ventures.” Jane Remer (1996, pp. 116–117) adapted these terms from a study by Craig Dreeszen (1990) and defines partnerships between schools and arts organizations as being one of two types:

- **Simple Transactions.** In a simple transaction, an artist or arts organization offers an arts program for a school’s students, and a school purchases the program. The arts group acts as a vendor, and the school acts as a consumer. The school does not participate meaningfully in the design of the arts program, and the program provider does little or no needs assessment or adaptation of the program to the specific school site.
- **Joint Ventures.** A joint venture is a more-complex interaction. A school and arts organization work together to define the students’ needs and to design an arts education enrichment program. Even if this interaction is a one-time event, it can still be

considered a joint venture. A succession of joint ventures may lead to an ongoing collaboration.

Remer also provides a framework for schools and arts organizations to evaluate what she terms the “effectiveness” of different types of partnerships. The elements she identifies could be considered potential predictors of a program’s impact on students, teachers, and schools. The elements she includes are the intensity, nature, and mode of instruction; needs assessment and planning; artist training; type of program provided (e.g., professional development, curriculum development, educational resource materials); program documentation and dissemination of documentation; program evaluation; and student assessment. To date, there has been no systematic comparative study of simple transactions versus joint-venture arts partnerships that examines relative effectiveness and impact on students, teachers, or school outcomes.

However, Remer associates simple transactions with lower educational effectiveness. She is careful to note that this association may not always be the case and that even simple transactions with lower effectiveness can be of value. In a simple transaction, the service is designed and provided by an outside AO, artist, or agency. The partnership with the AO is relatively passive and informal, and it provides only periodic exposure to the arts. No needs assessment is conducted to determine what would benefit the school, teachers, or students. Programs consist of a single activity, planned without input from teachers. The programs are isolated from or unrelated to the school curriculum, artists are not used as resources, no materials are available to teachers, no training is provided for teachers, and artists do not work with teachers or students. Performances, exhibits, and field trips are the usual mode of instruction. If a program evaluation is done, it is conducted by the AO.

Joint ventures, according to Remer, are more likely to be associated with higher educational effectiveness. At the highest level of effectiveness, a program grows out of a cooperative effort, incorporates an ongoing series of events, includes preparatory and follow-up curriculum materials, and provides orientation and training for teachers

and artists. Artist residencies, workshops, and teacher/staff development appear further along the effectiveness continuum and reflect more-complex transactions between the school and the AO. Evaluation is jointly developed and conducted by the school and AO. The focus of the partnership is about teaching and learning rather than simply exposing students to the arts.

Characteristics of Successful Partnerships

Recent studies that have focused largely on successful and relatively sophisticated joint venture partnerships (e.g., Dreeszen, 2002; Dreeszen and Deasy, 1999; Hirzy, 1996; Longley, 1999; Myers, 1996; Remer, 1996; Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, 2001) consistently have found a certain set of features that characterize strong partnerships:

- **Shared Goal.** At the core of successful partnerships is an explicit goal, shared by the arts organization and school, to make the needs of students and schools the main priority of the partnership's mission. This goal demands that arts organizations and schools work together to identify the needs of the schools, teachers, and students and find ways for the arts organizations to adapt to those needs. Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello (2001) found that the partnerships that survive are those in which artists and arts organizations place the needs of the students and teachers second to their own needs.
- **Effective Communication.** Communication between partners is critical to individuals' and organizations' understanding and respecting each other's values, cultures, goals, and limitations. Obviously, the more that partners know about each other, the better they will be able to develop successful and sustainable programs. Limited communication can result in misunderstandings and misperceptions of others' needs or motives. For example, teachers and schools may complain that artists do not understand educational priorities and a school's culture, while arts organizations may not understand why schools are resistant

to allowing students to leave the classroom to attend arts programs.

- **Program Evaluation.** Partners need to document and evaluate their own programs. Partnerships focused on providing student instruction should also include an assessment of student learning. The results of the program evaluation or student assessment should be used to improve arts education programming to better meet educational goals. Documentation of program and student outcomes can also be used to garner necessary funding and resources and support arts education advocacy. Partnerships that fail to include documentation, evaluation, and assessment run the risk of developing programs that do not produce educational gains for students or teachers or that do not convince potential supporters that the programs are of value.
- **Leadership.** Partnerships rely on individuals who are strongly committed to arts education. Leaders provide the vision for the partnership, solicit the involvement of others in the community, give direction and focus to participants' efforts, and facilitate goal setting. Principals—the “gatekeepers” for school resources, especially staff and instructional time—can make or break a partnership or an entire arts education program.
- **Adequate Resources.** Successful partnerships require adequate resources (broadly defined as time, human capital, money, and facilities) from the community at large as well as from the schools and school districts. Creating broad-based ownership of and investment in arts partnerships helps to keep programs going through difficult times when resources are scarce and enhances the programs' efforts when resources are more plentiful. Successful partnerships require a continuous effort to involve others in the community—other teachers, other artists, parents, administrators, community leaders, and local businesses.

Study Purpose and Approach

Using the insights from the literature to form the conceptual framework for our empirical analysis, we set out to examine a sample of arts partnerships established by the Arts Prototype Schools as part of the LAUSD Arts Education Plan. Unlike previous studies of arts partnerships, which have profiled a handful of the most successful and sophisticated partnerships drawn from hundreds around the country, this study looked at a sample of *typical* arts partnerships to find out how they are actually functioning in a large urban school district. The purpose of this study was to identify the types of partnerships operating between schools and arts organizations and to examine the extent to which features found by previous studies to characterize successful partnerships were present in the partnerships we sampled. Specifically, our project aimed to

- identify the goals of schools and arts organizations in forming partnerships
- examine patterns of interaction between schools and arts organizations and describe the types of partnerships found in our sample
- reveal factors that facilitate or hinder effective partnerships.

The heart of the study is a series of semi-structured interviews with teachers and principals, directors of arts organizations (or arts education directors at larger organizations), and local district arts advisors.⁴ We chose a stratified random sample of 11 schools and used a case-study approach, conducting several 30-minute interviews at each school with the principal, the school's arts cadre chair, and one arts

⁴ The project plan originally included two phases. The findings from the first phase are provided in this report. In the second phase, we planned to conduct an in-depth assessment of the impact of partnerships on teacher outcomes (e.g., attitudes toward arts education, changes in instructional practices, integration of arts into curriculum, knowledge of the arts, and job satisfaction). The second phase of the project plan was canceled due to severe CAC funding cuts in fall 2004, which eliminated all grants.

teacher. We also conducted 45-minute phone interviews with the directors (or arts education directors) of 34 arts organizations and interviewed all 10 of the local district arts coordinators.⁵

It is important to note that this study focuses on only one component—the creation of arts partnerships—of several goals of LAUSD’s plan, which is described more fully in Chapter Two. This report was not intended to be an evaluation of LAUSD’s progress in achieving the overall goals of the plan, although our findings may shed light on what may be hindering or facilitating the progress of reaching those goals.

Organization of This Report

As mentioned above, we describe the LAUSD’s Arts Education Plan more fully in Chapter Two. In Chapter Three, we provide information on our research approach, including how we chose our sample of schools and arts organizations, how we designed the interview protocols, and how we collected and analyzed data. In Chapter Four, we describe the characteristics of the 34 arts organizations in our sample—their budget, staffing, programming, mission, and experience with schools—as a context for our interview findings. In Chapter Five, we present a description of the partnerships reported by schools and arts organizations, including the stated partnership goals; how partnerships are initiated; communication between partners; program planning; and program evaluation. In Chapter Six, we report on the various challenges in and facilitators of successful partnerships that were identified by arts organizations and schools. In Chapter Seven, we summarize our conclusions, offer guidelines for improving arts partnerships, and discuss the policy implications of our results.

⁵ Although there are 11 local districts in LAUSD, one of the local district arts advisor slots was vacant during the interview phase of our study.

Los Angeles Unified School District's Arts Education Plan

LAUSD's ten-year Arts Education Plan is based on the work of the district's Blue Ribbon Committee on Arts Education. The committee was composed of a number of prominent local individuals, including the committee co-chairs, Harold Williams, president emeritus of the J. Paul Getty Trust, and Steven Lavine, president of CalArts. The group worked in conjunction with a staff of certified art teachers to develop the plan, which was adopted by the full board of LAUSD. Despite the state's budget crisis over the past several years, which imposed pressure on LAUSD to cut school programs, the strong support of the LAUSD Board of Education allowed the budget for implementing the district's Arts Education Plan for 1999 to 2009 to pass through budget reviews unscathed.

Goals and Objectives

LAUSD's ten-year plan for arts education has five primary goals:¹

- **Goal 1.** Provide a substantive program of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in dance, music, theater, and the visual arts in grades K–12.
- **Goal 2.** Sponsor year-round professional development programs for administrators, general classroom teachers, arts teachers, and

¹ See *Los Angeles Unified School District Arts Education Plan 1999–2009*, 1999, pp. 4–5.

artists working in schools that are aligned with the district’s arts education standards, curricula, and performance assessments.

- **Goal 3.** Develop partnerships with public and private community arts organizations and with businesses to offer fiscal and programmatic support to augment and complement the district’s arts education goals.
- **Goal 4.** Employ print and electronic media to achieve Goals 1 through 3.
- **Goal 5.** Evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the LAUSD Arts Education Plan.

This study focuses on Goal 3, specifically the third objective of that goal. All three objectives of Goal 3, and the strategies in achieving those objectives, are as follows:²

- **Objective A.** Create an arts education clearinghouse to coordinate efforts between the community and the district and to provide additional financial resources to augment the district’s Arts Education Plan.
- **Strategy 1.** The district superintendent should ask the Blue Ribbon Committee for Arts Education to provide advice and counsel regarding the creation and implementation of an arts education clearinghouse.
- **Objective B.** Create a “Careers in the Arts” series of classroom visits by professionals from the arts, entertainment, and technology industries.
- **Strategy 1.** Designate one month during the school year as “Careers in the Arts Month” when arts professionals are invited to visit schools to talk about their work and meet with students.
- **Strategy 2.** Ask representatives from professional entertainment industry associations—e.g., the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences, the Screen Actors Guild, the Screen Writers Guild, and other such organizations—to identify association

² From *Los Angeles Unified School District Arts Education Plan 1999–2009*, 1999, p. 19.

members who would be willing to visit schools and share with students information about their professions.

- **Objective C.** Encourage partnerships with public and private community arts organizations to develop and provide programs to enhance the study of the arts.
- **Strategy 1.** Invite community arts organizations to offer in-school performances, classroom workshops, residence programs, and master classes in various arts disciplines in conjunction with Goal 1, Objective C.³

The Arts Prototype School Program⁴

The LAUSD Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) program director and staff are overseeing implementation of the master plan for the ten-year Arts Education Plan.⁵ A key implementation component of the plan has been the Arts Prototype Schools (APS) program, which is now being conducted at the elementary and middle school level with the goal of later being expanded to high schools. Elementary and middle schools apply to the APS program to become a prototype school, and as prototype schools they each receive \$40,000 in supplemental annual funding toward materials and program support (e.g., professional development, external arts programming for students, traveling art teachers).

Based on information supplied in the APS applications, schools are assigned to one of four stages. All schools must begin at Stage I and ideally move up a stage each year, ending at Stage IV, which is considered full implementation. Advancement is based primarily on

³ Goal 1, Objective C is as follows: Collaborate with community arts resources, such as museums and performing arts organizations, to offer curricular trips and in-school experiences that align and reinforce the district's Student Learning Standards in the Arts.

⁴ The information in this section is based on informal personal meetings and phone conversations with LAUSD Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) program personnel in Los Angeles in fall 2001 and on materials describing the Arts Prototype Program that were supplied by VAPA personnel.

⁵ The VAPA office, a branch of LAUSD, oversees all arts education for the district.

the number of classes served by the program (which, at the elementary level, is synonymous with the number of teachers involved in the program). Stage I begins with four teachers, increasing in intervals to eight teachers in Stage II, 12 teachers in Stage III, and 16 teachers to all teachers in a school in Stage IV.⁶

Schools must reapply to the program each year. In practice, not all schools have been able to expand to the next stage, and some revisit a stage for a second year, but most participating schools have been accepted for continued funding. We started our project in fall 2001, which was the third year of the APS program. There were 134 schools in the program. Forty-seven schools were at Stage I, 37 were at Stage II, 37 were returning for a second year at Stage II, and 13 were at Stage III.

Key Program Personnel

Principals have primary responsibility for administering the APS program at their schools. Many details of the program are mandated by VAPA within LAUSD, but each school does have some discretionary money and influence over implementation of the program. Key personnel at each school include the cadre chair and arts cadre teachers. As noted earlier, the number of arts cadre teachers varies by the stage of the program. Arts cadre teachers receive training by traveling arts teachers in all four disciplines—dance, music, theater, and the visual arts. Local district arts advisors were hired as part of the ten-year plan to provide arts education program support for all schools in their districts, including APS schools. The following list provides a more de-

⁶ The number of cadre teachers and the schedule of visiting artists have been modified for schools on a multi-track calendar. (As defined on the Public School Parents Network website [www.psparents.net], “Single-track programs provide for [an] entire student body and staff to follow the same school calendar, whereas multi-track programs divide students and teachers into groups and assign each to one of several tracks with staggered instructional blocks and vacation periods.”)

tailed description of the roles and responsibilities of the arts cadre chairs, traveling arts teachers, and local district arts advisors.

- Traveling arts teachers are hired and managed by the VAPA office. Teachers are scheduled to visit classrooms at all APS schools once a week for eight weeks. They visit a select group of classrooms (the “arts cadre”) designated by the school. The VAPA teachers provide lesson plans, demonstrate model lessons, and work with the classroom teachers so that those teachers are able to integrate the arts into the school curriculum and sustain the program past the life of the grant.
- Cadre chairs are responsible for overseeing the Arts Prototype program at the school. One teacher from within the cadre is designated as the cadre chair. Responsibilities generally include managing the budget, scheduling the arts activities, and acting as a point of contact for other cadre teachers and for VAPA personnel. The cadre chair receives a stipend for his or her extra labor.
- Local district arts advisors⁷ are supposed to support both prototype and non-prototype schools through an extensive assortment of duties, such as assisting with the development of a standards-based arts education curriculum; providing instructional support to schools and teachers and assisting with the development of student assessments in dance, music, theater, and visual arts and assessing that instruction; providing support and follow-up for ongoing staff development; and organizing and conducting meetings, workshops, performances, and exhibits.

To a large extent, the successful implementation of the LAUSD ten-year plan hinges on these key individuals and their ability to build capacity within schools to teach a sequential arts curriculum, integrate arts instruction with other core subjects, and access supplement-

⁷ The LDAAs are managed directly through the VAPA office, and they service not only the schools in the APS program but also all other schools in the LAUSD system.

tal programming and professional development provided by arts organizations.

Research Approach

In this chapter, we describe our research approach to this study. First, we discuss the conceptual framework (i.e., the goals) upon which this study was based, we then describe how we selected the samples of schools and arts organizations we interviewed, and, finally, we describe our strategy in analyzing the interview data.

Conceptual Framework

Research findings on arts partnerships have provided a consistent set of guidelines and practices for schools and arts organizations to develop effective and sustainable partnerships. The hope within the arts education field is that schools and arts organizations will take advantage of this information and develop more-sophisticated partnerships in their own communities.

A concern of some arts education observers is that many partnerships between schools and arts organizations are simple transactions (see Chapter One) in which schools are consumers of pre-packaged arts programs rather than true partners with schools. One of the goals of this study was to examine the extent to which typical partnerships were simple transactions or more-complex ventures. We also wanted to examine the extent to which the features that characterized successful partnerships—such as shared goals and effective communications—were present in the partnerships we sampled. We

had these purposes in mind in designing our protocol and analyzing the survey data.

Sample Selection

We targeted four key groups for this study: directors of arts organizations (or directors of arts education programs at larger organizations), school principals, teachers, and local district arts advisors (as noted earlier, each of the 11 local districts in LAUSD has one full-time LDAA position; however, one position was vacant at the time of our interviews).

The principals and teachers in our sample were working at schools that were part of the LAUSD Arts Prototype School program. The teachers in our sample included both arts cadre chairs and teachers who were part of the cadre and who were participating in the prototype program. We interviewed all ten district arts coordinators. The sample of arts organizations was a convenience sample constructed from a list of arts organizations identified by the APS program and the California Arts Council. The school sample and arts organization sample are described more fully below.

School Sample

The school sample was constructed using a case-study approach. Each school was regarded as a unit of analysis, and multiple interviews conducted at each school served as the basis for our school-level analysis. Interviews were conducted with the principal of each school, the school's arts cadre chair, and one arts teacher randomly selected from all teachers participating in the program at each school.

During the 2001–2002 school year, 133 elementary schools participated in the APS program. Of these, 124 completed the APS program application. For these 124 schools, we constructed a database that included a range of characteristics for each school based on information on the 2001–2002 APS application data (see Chapter Two) and data available on the LAUSD website, which was downloaded in January 2002. The application data and data on school

stages were provided by the VAPA program director who oversees the implementation of the APS program. SES and enrollment data also were downloaded from the LAUSD website in January 2002.

Specifically, the following information was used to construct the database from which we selected a stratified random sample of schools:

- A school's stage in the prototype program (Stage I, II, or III; see Chapter Two for a discussion of the stages)
- The number of arts organization partners reported on a school's application for the APS program
- Socioeconomic status of a school using percentage of students in the free and reduced-price lunch program as a proxy
- Total number of students enrolled at a school.

Project resources allowed us to target a sample of 12 schools for inclusion in our study. To select the sample of 12 schools from the 124 schools represented in our database, we used the following procedure:

Data were aggregated at the district level for each of the four criteria listed above. The 11 local districts were then each assigned to one of four categories: (1) high prototype program stage, high SES; (2) low prototype program stage, high SES; (3) low prototype program stage, low SES; (4) high prototype program stage, low SES. The "stage" criterion was converted to a numeric variable in order to generate a mean "stage score" for each district, which served as a measure of the overall level of implementation of prototype programs in the district. The sample was then narrowed down to four local districts based on geographic location, such that regions representing predominantly urban, suburban, and more rural areas were included.

A final selection of three schools for each of the four districts (for a sample of 12 schools) was made by selecting one school for each of the three stages while also selecting schools that provided a range in the number of reported arts partners and the number of students enrolled at the schools (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1
Characteristics of Schools in Final Sample, Grouped by District Category

School	Stage	Number of Partners	Enrollment	% of Students in Free Lunch Program
High-Stage, High-SES District				
1	Stage I	1	528	36.10
2	Stage II	3	800	94.61
3	Stage III	8	825	6.50
Low-Stage, High-SES District				
4	Stage I	3	854	92.86
5	Stage II	18	760	29.15
6	Stage III	6	328	79.94
Low-Stage, Low-SES District				
7	Stage I	6	375	94.57
8	Stage II	2	900	93.27
9	Stage III	8	640	87.89
High-Stage, Low-SES District				
10	Stage I	4	884	76.74
11	Stage III	7	1,449	97.10

One of the 12 cases could not be completed. After multiple attempts to complete interviews with two schools originally selected for our sample, we were able to replace only one of the schools before our data-collection phase ended. This resulted in only two, rather than three, high-stage/low-SES schools and three, rather than four, Stage II schools, for a final sample of 11 schools (one principal, one teacher, and one cadre chair interviewed at each school) and a response rate of 83 percent.

Arts Organization Sample

Arts organizations included those that were working with LAUSD elementary schools, including Arts Prototype schools, and that were located in Los Angeles County. A few of the organizations that we included were funded by the California Arts Council under its Exemplary Arts program. The following criteria were developed to construct a convenience sample of arts organizations:

1. Geographically located in Los Angeles County
2. Listed in the 2002 APS application as an arts education provider and/or
3. Identified as being funded by the CAC Exemplary Arts program
4. Working with LAUSD APS elementary schools.

In addition to the 30 arts organizations already listed in the 2002 APS application, the application allowed for write-ins. We did not find a write-in organization that was serving more than a handful of schools; therefore, we decided to limit our sample to only those organizations listed in the application, with one exception.¹

CAC provided us with a list of 16 arts organizations located in Los Angeles County that were funded in the previous year under its Exemplary Arts program funding, which requires that AOs work with local public schools. The list from CAC included the phone number, address, and name of the director for each organization. We included these organizations in our sample because we thought they would be likely to partner with APS schools due to their geographic proximity to the schools and because their participation in CAC's program suggested that they had a history of partnering with schools.

Contact information for organizations identified by VAPA staff was compiled through a combination of web searches and phone directory searches. To identify the appropriate contact person, RAND project staff called each organization and requested the name and phone number of the organization's director and/or the name of the person in charge of arts education. In some larger institutions, the contact person was the head or director of an actual arts education program at the organization, while in smaller AOs the contact person typically was a staff member who wore many different hats within the organization.

A total of 43 organizations were identified for inclusion in our convenience sample and were contacted for participation in the study (three organizations were identified by both VAPA and CAC). Of

¹ One local arts organization that was working with APS schools contacted us, and we added the organization to our sample even though it was not included in the APS application list.

these, 34 completed the phone interviews, for a response rate of 79 percent.

Design of Interview Protocols

As discussed in Chapter One, all interview protocols were based on our conceptual framework and designed to address critical aspects of arts partnerships, including the goals of schools and arts organizations, interactions between schools and arts organizations, and challenges to and facilitators of developing effective partnerships. Interviews were conducted one-on-one either by phone or in person by one of two team members with extensive interviewing experience. Interviews with arts organization directors were designed as 45-minute phone sessions with semi-structured protocols. Interviews with arts organizations covered the following topics:

- Professional background and responsibilities
- Characteristics of the arts organization
- Program operation and program content
- Mission and goals of the arts organization related to arts partnerships with schools
- Frequency and quality of interactions with schools
- Evaluation of arts education programming
- Challenges in and facilitators of developing effective school partnerships.

Interviews with individuals at the schools were designed as 30-minute in-person sessions with semi-structured protocols, which were conducted during on-site visits to schools. We created a slightly modified version for each of the key people we interviewed at schools: principals, arts cadre chairs, and teachers. Interviews with schools covered the following topics:

- Professional background and responsibilities
- Description of school arts program

- Goals of partnerships with arts organizations
- Selection and evaluation of arts organizations programs
- Frequency and quality of interactions with arts organizations
- Challenges in and facilitators of being able to develop effective arts partnerships.

Interviews with local district arts advisors were designed as 30-minute phone sessions with semi-structured protocols. Interviews with LDAAs covered the following topics:

- Professional background and responsibilities
- Frequency and quality of interactions with arts organizations
- Frequency and quality of interactions with schools
- Challenges in and facilitators of effective arts partnerships
- Ways to increase the impact of the LDAA's role in a partnership.

Analysis of Interview Data

In our analysis and synthesis of the data, we followed a strategy similar to the approach used by Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello (2001) in their study of 21 school/arts organization partnerships for which they conducted and analyzed more than 300 interviews. For each question used in our study, we created a template to summarize interview data for each group we interviewed (i.e., schools, arts organizations, and local district arts advisors). All data were independently summarized by one of the two RAND interviewers and another team member.

Using these summaries and based on our conceptual framework and literature review, team members then worked together to establish preliminary categories for coding the interview data. The data were independently coded by at least two team members, and inter-rater agreement was established. Marked discrepancies between raters were rare, but, in those cases, a third team member was asked to review the data to resolve the discrepancies.

In Chapters Five and Six, we present the final set of themes that emerged from the interview data and report the percentages of

schools, arts organizations, and LDAAs whose responses were consistent with a particular theme to provide the reader with some understanding of the pattern of responses within each sample. Although we structured both samples to reflect a broad range of relevant school and arts organization characteristics, our small sample sizes for both the schools (a total of 33 individual respondents examined within 11 cases) and the arts organizations (34 respondents) prohibit statistical inference.

In our analysis of the data, we also looked for response patterns related to the stage of the program. We found few observable differences among Stage I, II, and III schools, but we have noted these differences in Chapters Five and Six, where relevant. Some of the questions we asked were closed-ended, and/or we asked the respondent for quantitative or factual information. This information is presented in Chapters Five and Six as descriptive quantitative data; however, it is critical to keep in mind that the information is based on the respondent's recall and therefore is likely to have some degree of error and/or subjective bias.

Arts Organization Characteristics

As part of this study, we collected information from our sample of 34 arts organization on their budgets, staffing, missions, programming, and experience working with schools. Although our sample of AOs represents only about 10 percent of all AOs who offer school-age arts education programming in Los Angeles County, we found great diversity in the sample's size, staffing, resources, goals, and scope of work.

Organizational Operations

The annual budgets of the arts organizations we sampled ranged widely, from \$50,000 to \$52,000,000. The number of paid staff in these organizations also ranged widely, from no paid staff to 375 paid individuals; total staff, including volunteers, ranged from one to 675. The number of total staff members dedicated to working with schools ranged from one to 42, including unpaid staff. Most of the AO respondents (85 percent) characterized the background of their staff members working with schools as predominantly that of professional artist; 21 percent of organizations we sampled characterized their staff as also being composed of credentialed teachers as well as professional artists, and 32 percent reported that they have staff members with arts degrees.

Organizations were asked to self-categorize as one of three types of organizations: art museum, arts education organization, or per-

forming arts organization (or “other” if none of the three categories was appropriate) (see Table 4.1). Only four AOs selected more than one category, categorizing themselves as both an arts education organization and performing arts organization or art museum. Organizations classified as arts education/other represented organizations whose exclusive focus was on providing arts education or related services, such as an arts camp.

We also asked AOs which discipline or disciplines their programs addressed (see Table 4.2). The majority cited either just one major discipline or all four disciplines (see Table 4.3).

Organizational Support for School Partnerships and Programming

Sixty-eight percent of the arts organizations we sampled reported that their mission statement includes working with schools, and 79 percent stated that they have school-related goals documented either in their mission statement or in a separate document. The number of years each organizations had worked with schools ranged from two to 52, with a median of 12 years. Fifty-six percent of organizations have worked with schools for ten or more years. Seventy-nine percent of organizations reported working with APS schools for at least one year.

Organizations also varied in the number of schools with whom they reported working (the number ranged from one to 600). Twenty-one percent of the sample reported working with ten or fewer schools, another 21 percent reported working with 11 to 30 schools, and 59 percent reported working with more than 30 schools (adds to more than 100 percent due to rounding). Activities provided by the arts organizations fell into five categories: artist-in-residence programs, professional development for teachers, performances held at schools or at performance venues, field trips to museums, and workshops or classes for students (see Table 4.4). Thirty-eight percent offered one type of program, 24 percent offered two types of programs, 26 percent offered three types of programs, and 12 percent offered programs in four of the five categories.

Table 4.1
Arts Organization Self-Categorization

Organization Type	Number of AOs	% of Sample
Performing arts	19	56
Arts education	10	29
Art museum	7	21
Other	3	9

NOTE: Some organizations self-categorized as more than one type.

Table 4.2
Disciplines Addressed by Arts Organizations

Discipline	Number of AOs	% of Sample
Music	22	65
Dance	16	47
Theater/drama	23	68
Visual arts	20	59

NOTE: Some AOs are multi-discipline.

Table 4.3
Number of Disciplines of Each Arts Organization

Number of Disciplines	Number of AOs	% of Sample
One	14	41
Two	3	9
Three	3	9
Four	13	38

NOTE: One organization did not select a discipline.

Table 4.4
Activities Provided by Arts Organizations to Schools

Activity	Number of AOs	% of Sample
Artist-in-residence	13	38
Professional development	17	50
Performances	19	56
Field trips to museums	8	24
Student workshops /classes	11	32

NOTE: Some organizations offer more than one type of activity.

In summary, the basic characteristics of arts organizations working with schools—such as budget, staffing, disciplinary focus, and the types of available programming—are extraordinarily diverse. We found ample evidence of a commitment on the part of these organizations to working with schools. Most have a long history of working with schools, offer a diverse set of programming, and include working with schools in their mission statement. The fact that many of the arts organizations in our sample provided professional development and artist-in-residence programs would suggest, according to Remer's framework (see Remer, 1996), that some of their partnerships with schools may be consistent with joint ventures (rather than simple transactions) to the extent that these activities would seem to elicit more involvement from schools in planning the substantive content of programs and program evaluation.

Partnership Goals and Interactions

This chapter describes the various characteristics of the arts partnerships that we studied, including the goals of the partners, how relationships are established, the nature of the interaction among partners, the extent of collaborative program planning, and program evaluation. These partnership features reflect many of the elements that Jane Remer in her book on arts partnerships (1996) suggested using to describe whether a partnership is a simple transaction or a joint venture, and to evaluate the partnership's level of effectiveness.

Partnership Goals

The current literature on arts education has cited shared goals as being key to the development and maintenance of schools' partnerships with arts organizations. Goal alignment, or a lack thereof, is often at the root of why partnerships succeed, or fail. The arts education literature emphasizes that both parties in arts partnerships need to give top priority to student learning and the needs of schools and teachers (Dreeszen, 2002; Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, 2001; Lind and Lindsley, 2003). The needs of AOs generally are not the explicit focus of arts partnerships. Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, for example, state that AOs should place the needs of students and schools above their own needs when working with schools. On the other hand, other researchers have noted that AOs often pursue partnerships primarily to increase visibility for the arts and as a strategy for audience building

for their own organizations (Dreeszen, 2002; McCarthy and Jinnett, 2001; Remer, 1996). Interview responses in our sample demonstrate widespread misalignment between the goals of schools and those of arts organizations. Although both schools and arts organizations clearly share the goal of developing students' appreciation of the arts by increasing their exposure to the arts, arts organizations' broader interests in increasing visibility for the arts and creating a wider audience for their work are also apparent.

Schools and Arts Organizations Have Different Partnership Goals

There was a good deal of consensus among schools about their main goals. As Table 5.1 shows, 10 out of 11 schools mentioned developing teachers and developing students as the two primary goals of arts partnerships.¹ Teacher development includes professional development, arts appreciation, and knowledge of the arts. Student development includes art appreciation, knowledge, and expression through the arts. Schools recognize the importance of training teachers to teach the arts and to be comfortable with incorporating the arts in their instruction. Schools also recognize that it is important to make teachers more aware of the arts and enthusiastic about the inclusion of the arts in public education.

More than half of the schools also mentioned enhancing arts education in the schools as a goal. The only other goal cited by schools was fostering stronger relationships with AOs (ostensibly to better meet the other goals). Arts organizations, by contrast, cited a broader array of goals—six types of goals as opposed to only four types cited by the schools—but no one goal was mentioned by a majority of organizations (see Table 5.2).

As with the schools, one of the top goals of arts organizations is developing students (cited by 29 percent). This area forms the common ground between arts organizations' and schools' partnership goals. Promoting arts appreciation (cited by 38 percent) and pro-

¹ The comments listed in the tables in this chapter are intended to illustrate the various response categories (i.e., themes) and to convey the types of responses included in a response category.

moting the programs of the arts organization (cited by 26 percent) were also common partnership goals among arts organization respondents. These goals reflect the broader missions of many arts organizations. Only 15 percent of arts organizations mentioned teacher development, a goal that was mentioned by 91 percent of the schools. Although teacher training was rarely mentioned by arts organizations, more than half of these institutions provide professional development for teachers as part of their program offerings to schools.

Table 5.1
Schools' Art Partnership Goals

Develop Teachers	Ten Schools (91% of sample)
	Obtain personal and professional development for teachers [Increase] awareness among the staff and maintain that awareness and enthusiasm for the arts Get teachers to be more comfortable teaching the arts Increase participation—get all teachers involved
Develop Students	Ten Schools (91% of sample)
	Expose as many kids as possible to all forms of the arts Offer an experience for students in audience participation Provide opportunities for kids to express themselves Develop kids' individuality, appreciation [of the arts]
Enhance School's Arts Program	Six Schools (55% of sample)
	Provide more arts-related learning opportunities for the kids Cover as many areas of art as possible Take the music program beyond recorders
Foster Relationships with Arts Organizations	Three Schools (27% of sample)
	Build stronger connections with these institutions Have stronger relationships, more "partnering" with arts organizations

NOTES: The sample included 11 schools. School-level percentages reflect one or more statements by a teacher, cadre chair, or principal that are consistent with that theme or category of response. Statements are verbatim excerpts from interviews conducted with teachers, cadre chairs, and principals.

Table 5.2
Arts Organizations' Partnership Goals

Promote Arts Awareness and Appreciation of the Arts	<p>Thirteen Organizations (38% of sample)</p> <p>Introduce as wide a range as possible of the experience of looking at art Help inspire a love and knowledge of music Increase public's appreciation [of the arts]</p>
Develop Students	<p>Ten Organizations (29% of sample)</p> <p>Expose kids to new ways they can express skills and knowledge Help kids to re-imagine their ideas about themselves Help students to be able to describe and interpret what they see Stimulate artistic imagination of children</p>
Promote Arts Organization	<p>Nine Organizations (26% of sample)</p> <p>Create more visibility of the museum as a school resource Develop future audiences Advertisement for arts organization Increase awareness of the museum and its programs</p>
Develop Arts Education in Schools	<p>Eight Organizations (24% of sample)</p> <p>Enhance school district curriculum through the lens of the arts Increase use of standards-based art instruction Help in efforts to put the arts back in the schools</p>
Develop Teachers	<p>Five Organizations (15% of sample)</p> <p>Work with drama teachers and validate what they're doing Enhance teaching Get the teacher involved, feeling confident, and inspired to teach</p>
Promote Awareness and Appreciation of Cultural Diversity	<p>Four Organizations (12% of sample)</p> <p>Make students aware of other cultures Communicate that there is diversity in Los Angeles Show students a diverse cast [of performers]</p>

NOTES: The sample included 34 arts organizations. Percentages reflect one or more statements by a respondent at an arts organization that are consistent with that theme or category of response. Statements are verbatim excerpts from interviews conducted with arts organization staff.

Both Schools and Arts Organizations Emphasize Exposure to the Arts

The goals expressed by both schools and arts organizations emphasize the importance of exposing students to the arts and providing them with opportunities for arts appreciation rather than increasing students' knowledge of, skills in, and performance of the arts. This somewhat limited focus is consistent with partnerships that are simple transactions in which the arts organization is primarily providing a one-time arts appreciation experience, usually in the form of a performance or visit to a museum.

Partnership Initiation

The way in which an arts organization and school approach each other to form a relationship can set the tone for their future partnership. The information they provide each other about their organizational goals, needs, structures, and limitations will also shape the type of partnership they will have. If those goals, needs, structures, and limitations are clear to both partners from the beginning, effective communication and program planning can follow more easily.

Both Schools and Arts Organizations Claim to Initiate Contact

The majority of schools reported that brochures they receive through the mail are the primary way they learn about arts organizations' programs, although occasionally a teacher or principal will receive a call from an AO. A few respondents also noted that they learned about programs through VAPA's annual conference, where AOs set up booths. VAPA's traveling artists provided recommendations to some school respondents, and a couple of schools mentioned VAPA's list of AOs (the same list that we used to establish our sample of AOs). Schools also rely on word of mouth (either through past experience or through public awareness of an organization) to learn about AO programs. None of the respondents from the schools mentioned a central database of information on arts organizations (although there is a di-

rectory that provides information on arts organizations offering K–12 arts education programs—the *Greater Los Angeles Arts Resource Directory and Arts & Education Guide* [2000]), and only a couple of school respondents mentioned contacting LDAAs for references. The initial personal contact between schools and AOs tends to occur at the “purchase” point; only a few schools stated that they called AOs prior to program selection to collect information on programming.

There seems to be a difference between Stage III and Stage I and II schools in how they select an AO program (see Chapters Two and Three for a discussion of the various stages). Respondents from Stage III schools reported that they engaged in more proactive behavior in seeking information about arts organizations and utilized a variety of ways to get that information, rather than only one or two. Of particular note, personal connections were mentioned by all Stage III schools as a way of initiating partnerships with AOs.

Interviews with AOs produced a slightly different picture of how relationships are initiated. AOs reported making the initial contact through a combination of mailings and phone calls. Half of the AOs reported sending brochures directly to schools through mass mailings or including information on their organizations in mailings sent to the schools by VAPA. More than half of the arts organizations (56 percent) reported phoning or e-mailing the school principal, and about a quarter (24 percent) reported phoning or e-mailing a local district arts advisor to initiate a contact. LDAAs reported that they receive numerous brochures and mailings from arts organizations. They reported that one of the key roles they play is as an information broker helping AOs to disseminate materials to schools. LDAAs also reported that they do not routinely phone or e-mail arts organizations and rely on the organizations to contact them if they need help in disseminating information to schools.

From the AOs’ perspective, the organizations are doing a lot to initiate contact with schools, whereas from the schools’ perspective, the schools are the ones who generally make the initial contact. This discrepancy stems from one’s perception of what constitutes a “contact.” AOs see mailings as a means of outreach and as an active and efficient way to establish relationships with schools. From the schools’

perspective, mailings are discounted as an effective means of initial contact because they are impersonal and not tailored to a school's specific needs. As respondents at some schools noted, the flyers they receive are not always grade-appropriate for their student population and do not always provide the information they need to evaluate the programs for their students and school. As one respondent stated, "They toss it out to you and you're on your own."

The process for initiating contact is consistent with a simple transactional relationship. The intent of the contact is not to build a relationship or partnership; the intent is to connect the consumer to a service. The role of the LDAAs is consistent with this model. The LDAA acts as a "clearinghouse" for information on AO programs and helps to connect vendors (i.e., AOs) with consumers (i.e., schools). Although this approach has some merit (e.g., it exposes schools to a variety of programs), schools expressed much frustration with this process.

Most Schools Have No Clear Criteria for Selecting Programs

None of the schools we surveyed had a formal process for deciding which AOs to work with each year.² Terms such as "serendipitous" and "luck of the draw" were used to describe some schools' selection process, and in most of our interviews with schools, respondents stated that there is little time to devote to the process.

More than half of the schools mentioned that the cadre chair was the key decisionmaker, and teacher feedback was the most commonly mentioned factor for why a particular AO program would be selected. Other selection factors that schools listed include popularity of an AO at other schools, previous experience with the AO, cost, scheduling and timing, and fit with classroom curriculum. A couple of Stage III schools were better able to articulate a comprehensive set of criteria and reported doing some kind of research to evaluate AO programs (e.g., attending a group's performance first before inviting

² A formal selection process might include a systematic collection of information on available programs and a process for evaluating and selecting programs that fit with strategic goals (e.g., teacher training or student learning in key areas).

the group to the school, checking with other schools to get their opinion of certain AOs, collecting student feedback on AOs, getting recommendations from parent committees, contacting AOs for further information).

This lack of a clear set of criteria for selecting AOs and the limited time for planning and discussion of AO selection seem to lead many schools to rely on an AO's direct mailings or an AO's visibility in the community to make the choice for them (this would seem to lead to higher utilization of larger AOs). As mentioned earlier, many AOs offer free programming. Although schools cited cost as a major consideration, it appears that many schools were unaware of the extent of free AO programming that is available. No school respondents explicitly mentioned searching for free programming as part of their selection process, although a few mentioned that some programs do not require a fee.

Schools Expressed the Need to Link Arts Programs to Their Curricula

Because the schools we surveyed are participants in the APS program, we anticipated that integrating arts programs into their curricula would be an important part of their explicit effort to implement a substantive, sequential arts education curriculum. We queried schools on the importance of integrating programs provided by arts organizations into their curricula. Most schools said that organizations that not only link their arts programming to a school's arts curriculum but also work to integrate arts education into other subject areas are most desirable. The Open Court Reading program was cited as the most common example of integrating arts and other required curriculum. Open Court is a standards-based reading program that typically requires three hours of language arts instruction each school day. It satisfies a recent LAUSD curriculum requirement aimed at improving reading for all students in grades K–5.³ As one respondent said, “The arts activities fit very well [with the program] . . . the stories in the

³ A fact sheet describing the LAUSD Elementary Reading Plan and the Open Court program can be found at http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us/newLAUSDnet/pdf/FACTSHEET_elementaryreading.pdf.

kids' reading books can be linked to drama, music, and dance. Associating the arts with the stories makes [the stories] more dynamic and interesting; more enriching for the kids." Open Court uses up a lot of the school day, so schools try to pick programs that fit into the Open Court curriculum. For example, a program called "We Tell Stories" was a popular AO program selection because of its fit with the Open Court program. A few school respondents noted that the programs do not necessarily need to fit with the curriculum—they are still valuable in their own right.

Local District Arts Advisors Are Seldom Involved in Matching Schools to Arts Programs or in Evaluating Programs

Although LDAAs may pass information between schools and AOs, it is apparent that neither AOs nor schools are broadly utilizing LDAAs to aid in matching schools with AO programming or in evaluating arts programming. Local District Arts Advisors are in a natural position to act as a point of contact for AOs and as a resource for schools involved in the evaluation of AO programs. Few LDAAs mentioned that they had evaluated AO programs, and two LDAAs explicitly noted that they think it is better to let schools pick their own programs without the influence of an LDAA. Local District Arts Advisors reported, as did the schools, that the number of AOs can be overwhelming and acknowledged that it is difficult for schools to decide on which AO to select.

One guideline that schools might rely on is whether a program is aligned with district standards. The majority of arts organizations reported that their programs are aligned with those standards. However, several school respondents noted that the standards are so broad and subjective that almost anything can be considered "aligned." Therefore, the guidance that schools need to make a selection must be at a higher level than just whether a program is "standards based." Programs also need to be evaluated on how well they fit with a school's curriculum and learning goals.

LDAAs have the greatest expertise in this area, but do not have the time to provide this evaluation service for schools. Perhaps more notable, LDAAs did not appear to have much time to actually work

with AOs to help them develop their programs to be complementary or integrated with schools' curriculum goals. One LDAA posed two succinct questions that schools should ask when evaluating AO programming: What is available? How does it improve our instruction? LDAAs are providing help to some schools to answer the first question, but schools are not utilizing LDAAs to help them establish evaluation criteria and gather information needed to evaluate the potential contributions an arts organization program will make to improving instruction.

Information Sharing About Each Partner's Organization

An important foundation for establishing a good relationship between a school and arts organization is the extent to which they both receive information, orientation, and training about each other's work and organization.

Schools Do Not Provide Orientation or Training to Arts Organization Staff

As mentioned in Chapter Three, most of the arts organizations staff who work with schools are professional artists who have little knowledge of the organizational structure of a school, its teachers and students, curriculum, instructional practices, and school goals. We asked AOs if schools or districts provided them with orientation or training for working with the schools. None of the respondents reported receiving any such orientation or training, although three AOs noted that they were invited to observe school activities and/or were invited to an LAUSD Arts Prototype School program-planning meeting.

Arts Organizations Seldom Provide Materials to Schools Before or After Programs Are Conducted

Similarly, we asked arts organizations if they provided teachers with any program orientation or preparatory materials regarding their programs. Field trips (cited by 38 percent of AOs) were the most common type of program for which preparatory materials were provided

to teachers. Only 16 percent of AOs reported providing advance materials for arts performances, and only 9 percent provided teacher preparation for artist-in-residence programs. None of the arts organizations reported providing teachers with orientation or preparatory materials for student workshops or for professional development. AOs appear to provide orientation on their programs and organization more often than schools provide orientation on how they work, which is consistent with the AO role of providing a service to schools.

Communication and Planning

Communication and planning are at the core of partnerships between schools and arts organizations. Without effective communication and planning, programs are likely to be limited in their effectiveness and may leave both sides frustrated and dissatisfied.

Arts Organizations Report that Teachers Are the Main Points of Contact, but Contact Is Not Frequent

After a school and AO have established a working relationship, teachers tend to be the point of contact (POC) at the schools. Seventy-nine percent of AOs reported that they were in contact with a teacher or cadre chair. Fifty percent reported they were in contact with school principals. Only 32 percent reported that they were in contact with local district arts advisors. AOs more often reported that communication with POCs was done by phone (50 percent) or in person (53 percent); e-mail was not a method that AOs commonly used to communicate with POCs (only 24 percent of AOs use e-mail to communicate with schools). Fifty-three percent of AOs reported that contact with their POCs was “variable,” “as needed,” or “sporadic.”

Arts Organizations Report that Most Activities Are Planned Without School Involvement

When asked who plans program content, 65 percent of AOs reported that they primarily plan program content, while only 29 percent reported that schools and AOs jointly plan content. When asked in

more detail about who it is they work with during the planning process, the percentage of AOs citing school or district staff as being involved in substantive planning varied greatly across type of program (see Table 5.3). The planning of field trips and on-site or off-site arts organization performances appears to involve very little school participation. This finding is not so surprising, because these types of activities may be more difficult to tailor to a specific school than are other activities.

However, even artist-in-residence programs typically do not involve school or district staff in the planning process. Even when an artist is working in a school, there appears to be little collaboration between the artist and the school in planning the artist's work in the classroom. According to the arts organization respondents, professional development, student workshops, and classroom instruction elicit greater school involvement in program planning, and those who are involved in the planning typically are school-level staff rather than district-level staff. Nonetheless, more than half of the arts organizations we surveyed did not report school or district involvement in these activities. Professional development appears to be an area in which the most amount of joint planning occurs and is perhaps an area that affords the greatest opportunity for collaboration.

Table 5.3
Parties Involved in the Program Planning Process, by Percentage of Arts Organization Sample Offering These Programs

Type of Program	AO Staff	School Staff	District Staff
Artist-in-residence	85%	23%	8%
Performances	95%	16%	11%
Field trips	75%	25%	0%
Professional development	76%	47%	18%
Student workshops/classes	91%	36%	0%

NOTES: Arts organization may offer more than one type of program. See Table 4.4 in Chapter Four for the sample numbers for these percentages.

Schools Report Little Communication with Arts Organizations and Virtually No Collaboration on Program Planning

The reports from the school respondents in our sample did not reflect the same degree of communication as was reported by the arts organization sample. Principals, cadre chairs, and teachers reported having minimal contact with AOs, with only two exceptions. One cadre chair reported having ongoing communications with an individual at an organization, and another cadre chair reported having “a lot of” contact with one particular organization before, during, and after an event in order to provide feedback to the AO. Otherwise, school staffs’ contact with AOs was very infrequent and limited to matters of how to efficiently resolve logistical issues (e.g., scheduling an event, communicating information on time and place, arranging for transportation). Two respondents mentioned that their school’s parents committee had contact with an AO, but it was unclear how extensive this contact was.

Although many AOs reported having at least occasional as-needed contact with schools, the schools’ responses suggest that this communication is focused primarily on executing a transaction. Program “planning,” according to most school respondents, consists of planning the *logistics* of an event, rather than planning the actual program *content*. None of the schools reported using AOs as a resource for input on programming, curriculum development, or help in developing student assessments.

Schools Appear to Prefer Minimal Contact with Arts Organizations

Interviews with school respondents revealed an important insight about arts partnership communication. Schools did not express the need for greater contact with arts organizations. In fact, respondents complimented some organizations for the little effort and contact that was required of schools. The preference for minimal interaction may be partly based on teachers’ time constraints and partly based on a lack of understanding of what a school can gain by building an arts education partnership. One respondent said, “I want more contact with arts organizations, but I don’t know what they can do for us, and everything costs money. They have certain programs [and we

can] ‘take it or leave it.’ They are not willing to meet [our] specific needs, not really.” It may also be that because our sample of schools is in the APS program, they have less incentive or need to work with AOs to develop curriculum, student assessments, and to collaborate on conducting program evaluation because LAUSD is playing an active role in addressing these areas through centralized efforts within the district.

Program Evaluation and Meeting School Needs

Program evaluation and student assessment is important for assessing the impact of partnerships on students, teachers, and schools. The results of program evaluation or student assessment can be used to improve arts education programming to better meet educational goals. Without evaluation and assessment, arts organizations risk developing programs that do not produce educational gains for students or teachers.

Most Arts Organizations Conduct Program Evaluations, but Schools Are Not Involved in Designing the Evaluations

We asked AOs if they collaborate with schools on conducting program evaluations, planning classroom curriculum, designing student assessment tools, or promoting community and parent involvement. Fifty-three percent reported that they collaborate with schools to conduct program evaluations, 32 percent said they work with schools to plan classroom curriculum, 24 percent reported working with schools to design student assessment tools, and 47 percent said they collaborate with schools to promote community and parent involvement.

Most AOs (53 percent) reported collecting feedback on their programs. Of those who collected feedback, they typically did it through teacher surveys (cited by 68 percent of AOs) and student surveys (cited by 50 percent). The feedback is used for a variety of purposes, including reports to the state or local district (cited by 24 percent of AOs), reports to the arts organizations (29 percent), public

relations (26 percent), reports to funders or reports as part of a grant application (32 percent), and, of course, as feedback to improve the program (68 percent). Although program evaluation appears to be done by most arts organizations, schools did not report working with arts organizations to design the evaluation questions. If schools did so, it may help AOs to design programs that address school needs, such as standards-based programs that are linked to or integrated with school curriculum.

Arts Organizations Claim that Many Programs Can Be Tailored, but Few Schools Take Advantage of This Option

Arts organizations said they provide many programs that address the resource and scheduling needs of schools, including free programs, programs conducted during school hours, and other programs conducted at the schools. Table 5.4 lists the various locations where arts programs are conducted, whether organizations charge for the programs, and the scheduling of the programs.

Table 5.4
Program Location, Cost, and Scheduling

	% of AO Respondents in Sample
Location of Arts Program	
On-site at arts organization only	38
School site only	21
Both	32
Other facility	6
Arts Organization Charges School for Program	
Yes	29
No	56
Sometimes	15
Scheduling	
During school hours	88
During non-school hours in school year	62
Outside of school year	24

Many arts organizations (85 percent) reported that their program content is in alliance with state arts education standards. However, very few arts organizations reported that their programs are linked to the school curriculum (see Table 5.5). This is of special note, considering the importance to the schools of providing programs that are linked to school curriculum. Either this need is not being communicated to AOs, or AOs are unable to develop programs that are linked to curriculum.

Although many arts organizations are able to tailor their programs to schools' needs, schools are not asking for tailored programs. When we asked schools their thoughts about program tailoring, they expressed skepticism that tailoring was possible, or expressed the belief that it would be too time consuming or too costly, or were uncertain about what to ask for specifically.

Only three schools in our sample had asked an arts organization about tailoring a program to meet their specific needs. One of those schools reported that an AO did not deliver on its promise to specially tailor a program, while another reported a positive experience with an AO's tailored program. One cadre chair reported that she was working with an AO to tailor a program for her school, but expressed

Table 5.5
Percentage of Arts Organizations with Programs That Can Be Tailored to School Needs or That Are Linked to School Curriculum

Type of Program	Can Be Tailored to School Needs	Linked to School Curriculum
Artist-in-residence program	54%	8%
Performance	53%	5%
Field trip	63%	13%
Professional development	35%	12%
Student workshop/class	55%	18%

NOTE: Arts organization may offer more than one type of program.

some uncertainty on whether it would turn out well. A few schools mentioned that they had the impression that tailoring was expensive, and therefore they did not request it. One school that worked with an AO to form a tailored program did so by procuring funds through a grant proposal. A few schools mentioned that they received help from the AO in selecting a program and thought of this service as tailoring the program to meet their needs.

Partner Goals and Interactions Indicate Simple Transactions Dominate

One of the goals of this study was to examine the extent to which typical arts partnerships are simple transactions or more-complex ventures. Arts education policy discussions among experts, advocates, and policymakers within the field of arts education have encouraged schools and arts organizations to develop more-complex partnerships, although some of those involved in these discussions have expressed concern that simple transactions, associated with lesser educational value, are too often the norm.

Using Remer's definition of simple transactions versus joint ventures (Remer, 1996), we found that the typical art partnership relationship in our study samples had all the characteristics of a simple transaction:

- The arts organization is the provider of arts programs that schools may purchase (or that are sometimes provided for free), and the school plays the role of the consumer, selecting from a variety of arts program options.
- There appears to be very little interaction and substantive program planning between schools and arts organizations.
- Schools do not participate in the design of the arts organizations' programs, and AOs do not routinely conduct a needs assessment or adapt a program to specific school needs.
- Although many AOs reported that it is possible for them to do some school-specific tailoring of their programs, schools per-

ceived that such tailoring is either not possible or too costly or both.

- Schools communicate with AOs mostly to solve logistical issues (e.g., how to transport students, what time an artist should show up), and programs that require the fewest number of contacts and the least amount of time from school staff seem to be ones that schools prefer.

The potential effectiveness of some arts programs appears to be hindered by a lack of communication between schools and arts organizations and a lack of a clear understanding by AOs of schools' needs beyond the basics, such as funding, scheduling, and transportation. Schools expressed a clear need for help in selecting programs and perceived that AOs are often inflexible or insensitive to school needs. Neither the arts organizations nor the schools provide more than minimal orientation to each other's organizational structures and cultures or preparation for involvement with each other's organizations. Schools are not receiving the kind of information they need to make the best choices among the programs offered by AOs, and the types of programming offered by AOs do not appear to address schools' desire for standards-based programming that is linked to school curriculum.

Limited communication between schools and AOs may explain the "disconnect" between school needs and what arts organizations are offering. Many of the potential benefits that accrue from more-sophisticated partnerships are lacking because of limited communication between schools and AOs. For example, schools are not utilizing AOs as a resource for input on programming, curriculum enrichment, or student assessment. Yet, despite a lack of communication and collaborative substantive planning, some programs provided by a few of the largest arts organizations are held in high regard by the schools, and respondents felt that there was no need to change them. This feedback may reflect the ability of some of these larger organizations to meet schools' needs without extensive communication or the development of complex working relationships with each school.

Although the types of partnerships we observed in our sample most resemble simple transactions, the challenges inherent in these partnerships are complex. In the next chapter, we report on the challenges and facilitators described by schools and arts organizations.

Partnership Challenges and Facilitators

The previous chapter described the goals and interactions of the schools and arts organizations in our sample and established that the arts partnerships we studied are best characterized as simple transactions. As such, the challenges in and facilitators of good partnerships, as reported by our respondents, should be viewed in that context. As indicated by the comments listed in the tables in this chapter, respondents tended to focus on why it is difficult for schools and arts organizations to have any working relationship (even a simple one) and what can help to improve the partnership within the context of a simple transaction model.

Other studies on the challenges facing arts partnerships have reported that partnerships are commonly hindered by lack of time, money, planning, information, communication, support, and evaluation (e.g., see Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, 2001; Dreeszen, 2002). A shortage of these key elements inherently limits the type of partnership that can be developed and theoretically also limits a partnership's effectiveness. Facilitators that address these arts partnership shortages include access to funding, joint program planning and assessment of school needs, sharing of information and increased communication, encouragement of broad support for arts education, and reallocation of time in the school day and/or in a teacher's schedule. The challenges and facilitators cited by the schools and arts organizations in our sample touch on all of these elements.

Challenges

From the Perspective of Arts Organizations

Arts organizations cited many challenges in working with schools (see Table 6.1),¹ with the most common falling into three broad categories: insufficient funding (cited by 32 percent of AOs in the sample),

Table 6.1
Arts Partnership Challenges Mentioned by Arts Organizations

Insufficient Funding	Eleven Organizations (32% of sample)
	<p>Funding is the major challenge; nonprofits in general are on the edge financially, especially with the recession and September 11</p> <p>The school budget is not enough to support arts programming</p> <p>Some schools cannot get funding for transportation</p>
Logistical Problems	Ten Organizations (29% of sample)
	<p>When a school is not close to the arts organization, sometimes staff do not want to attend meetings at the school, and it is hard for people from the school to come to them</p> <p>School calendar is totally inflexible, especially for schools on the multi-track schedule</p> <p>Transportation is hard; the expense of bussing is prohibitive to some schools</p> <p>Facilities are lacking: lack of working auditorium and rooms with [moveable] desks</p>
Overburdened Teachers	Ten Organizations (29% of sample)
	<p>Teachers are overwrought</p> <p>Teachers are exhausted, hard to get a hold of, difficult to pin down</p> <p>Teachers are completely preoccupied with tests</p>

¹ The comments listed in the tables in this chapter are intended to illustrate the various response categories (i.e., themes) and to convey the types of responses included in a response category.

Table 6.1—Continued

Insufficient Instructional Time	<p style="text-align: center;">Seven Organizations (21% of sample)</p> <hr/> Time pressures within the schools Time is a major challenge Visits to arts organization are 60 to 75 minutes long, which is not much time to connect with kids Arts education competes with literacy instruction for time
Communication Difficulties	<p style="text-align: center;">Six Organizations (18% of sample)</p> <hr/> Teachers often do not get messages and are generally hard to reach during the day Communication is hard with teachers and staff; staff folks do not get messages, do not have phones Teachers are hard to pin down; hard to have a good 20-minute conversation
Unfavorable Attitude Toward the Arts	<p style="text-align: center;">Six Organizations (18% of sample)</p> <hr/> People say the arts are important but they do not necessarily really believe that since arts are always the first thing cut Some people view artists as flakes Arts are not a priority, especially for classroom teachers
Lack of Teacher Support	<p style="text-align: center;">Six Organizations (18% of sample)</p> <hr/> Teachers can have different levels of commitment Not always possible to get agreement from the non-art teacher (for multiple-class-period field trips) Teachers are hesitant to add to their commitments
Institutional Bureaucracy	<p style="text-align: center;">Five Organizations (15% of sample)</p> <hr/> Schools and districts are large institutions where it is hard to make connections; they are difficult to penetrate The school is part of a large monolithic institution (the district) so it is difficult to effect change District has a lot of checks and balances it has to clear before it can move
Personnel Turnover	<p style="text-align: center;">Five Organizations (15% of sample)</p> <hr/> Hard to develop something ongoing with people changing jobs [so often] Arts organization has to keep proving itself because there have been management changes at LAUSD The challenge is having to recreate buy-in when there is turnover in the principal

NOTES: The sample includes 34 arts organizations. Statements are verbatim excerpts from interviews with arts organization staff.

logistical problems (cited by 29 percent), and overburdened teachers (cited by 29 percent), while six other challenges were mentioned by 15 to 21 percent of the sample. They are all described next in order of how often they were cited by arts organization respondents.

Arts organization respondents reported that schools do not have enough funds to pay for programming, and AOs do not have the money to provide all the free programming that schools want. This is true for both APS schools and schools that are not in the APS program. AOs also commented that no central resource exists for finding out what sort of funding is available at individual schools. The majority of school districts in Los Angeles County spend less than 1 percent of their total budget on arts education, and funds that are available for schools to access supplemental arts programming are minimal and often rely on parent-generated funds (United Arts, 2001). Although APS schools are provided with supplemental funding for arts education, more than half of the funding is used to cover other critical components of the APS program, including payment to traveling teachers, supplemental arts textbooks, and necessary equipment and supplies. Therefore, even the APS schools have somewhat limited funds with which to purchase supplemental programs.

Related to the funding issue are some logistical issues. Even if an AO offers a free program, schools still need to transport students to wherever the program is taking place. A lack of adequate school facilities (e.g., auditoriums with stages, rooms with movable desks) can be an obstacle to AOs being able to stage a full performance or any program at all at a school. Difficulty in scheduling programs due to the inflexibility of school schedules and school calendars is another commonly cited problem. Another logistical issue mentioned by respondents is the difficulty that teachers and AO staff have in being able to meet in person. If a school and participating organization are a long distance apart, staff on either end may be unwilling or unable to attend planning meetings.

AOs also commented on how overextended many teachers are and how difficult it is for teachers to even return a phone call. AOs noted that adding yet another task to teachers' already heavy work-

load presents a significant obstacle to developing better relationships with schools.

The challenge of insufficient instructional time is related to organizations' awareness that schools give greater priority to subject areas other than the arts and do not dedicate much classroom time to arts instruction or supplemental arts programming. This issue is also directly related to the AOs' perception that the general public does not have a favorable stance toward the arts in general and that teachers and principals do not consider the arts to be a priority in a child's education.

AOs cited challenges in working with a system that is highly complex, inflexible, bureaucratic, and lacking transparency to outsiders. As part of a decentralized system in which every school makes its own decisions about what arts programs it will provide, schools present a significant challenge to AOs in terms of relationship building. To establish partnerships with individuals who have decisionmaking authority on program funding or authority over allocation of instructional time for arts programming, an AO may need to develop a working relationship with dozens of school principals at the local district level, or even hundreds at the district-wide level. At the program planning stage, AOs might work with an even larger number of teachers. Not surprisingly, personnel turnover is a problem for AOs who are trying to develop stronger ties with schools. In a decentralized and highly bureaucratic system such as a large school district, where relationship building is time-consuming, establishing a partnership is a major investment. However, the large numbers of individuals in the school system virtually guarantee an ongoing change in personnel.

From the Perspective of Schools

The list of challenges mentioned by school respondents (see Table 6.2) is shorter than the list of challenges noted by the organizations and shows greater consensus about where the problems in arts partnerships lie. The challenges from the schools' perspective fall into six broad categories: lack of funding (64 percent), lack of instructional

Table 6.2
Arts Partnership Challenges Mentioned by Schools

Funding Concerns	Seven Schools (64% of sample)
	<p>[Limited] budget Rates for individual performances are too high It's costly getting all the supplies [that are] needed</p>
Time Constraints	Seven Schools (64% of sample)
	<p>The 30 district days of staff development are always for reading and math, so teachers would have to give up another day for more staff development Finding time to contact arts organizations Time—some teachers feel so constricted with Open Court and other demands that they don't have the flexibility to work with the arts organizations</p>
Inadequate Accommodation to Meet School Needs	Six Schools (55% of sample)
	<p>I don't think arts organizations think about elementary schools, e.g., many times they send things for fifth and sixth graders [instead of for the lower grades] Artists do what they want to do, which doesn't always mesh perfectly with how schools operate Challenging to align activities with state standards</p>
Logistical Problems	Five Schools (45% of sample)
	<p>Getting buses is hard Scheduling is hard Space is a big challenge—we don't have enough space to host artists or performances Difficult to find an arts organization close enough to the school that is interested in working with it</p>
Inadequate Information	Four Schools (36% of sample)
	<p>Lack of information I want more contact with arts organizations, but I don't know what they can do for us Not knowing what to ask for</p>
Communication Difficulties	Three Schools (27% of sample)
	<p>Communication—it's hard to reach teachers and it's hard for teachers to reach the arts organizations Communication—I don't have a phone in my room</p>

NOTES: The sample includes 11 schools. Statements are verbatim excerpts from interviews with teachers, cadre chairs, and principals.

time (64 percent), lack of accommodation by arts organizations to school needs (55 percent), logistical issues (45 percent), inadequate information about arts organizations (36 percent), and difficulties with communication (27 percent). Several key challenges—such as insufficient funding, insufficient instructional time, and logistical problems—overlap those cited by arts organizations. But one major challenge cited by schools does not appear on the AOs' list of challenges: the lack of accommodation by arts organizations to school needs.

Individuals we interviewed at the schools are acutely aware of the challenges that the lack of instructional time presents in incorporating arts programming into the curriculum. The school day allows very limited time for arts programming, both in available time for programs presented by AOs and more generally in time for teachers to integrate arts education into their curriculum. Schools also noted that a teacher's professional development time is focused on "core" subject areas, such as math and science, and little or no time is left for professional development in the arts. This is not a concern that was mentioned by AOs, but two-thirds of those we interviewed at the schools are very concerned about professional development, given that most of them are teachers who are interested in developing their professional skills and knowledge in arts instruction. As leaders of the Arts Prototype School program, these teachers naturally would be interested in building an arts education program and would be concerned about professional development to build capacity for arts instruction within the teaching staff.

To address the issue of limited instructional time, schools noted that they are making an effort to (1) integrate arts instruction with instruction in other subject areas (e.g., staging a play to illustrate a history lesson) and (2) provide students with external arts programming that is standards-based and, more important, that links to a school-based arts curriculum or can be integrated with the curriculum in other subjects. As such, when schools noted that AOs do not accommodate their needs, the schools were generally referring to the fact that the programs that AOs offer are not always age-appropriate for their students, and that the programs may not help schools to

achieve their instructional goals. Schools have the sense that artists and AOs do not understand the importance of providing programming that meets these needs.

Schools, as did the arts organizations, cited physical distance between the AOs and schools as a logistical issue that impedes partnerships. Physical distance makes it more difficult to conduct in-person meetings between AOs and school staff and makes it more difficult for teachers and students to access programs. To attend performances conducted off-site—for example, at an arts organization's center—students must be transported to the site; schools often cannot take advantage of off-site programs because they are unable to pay for the transportation. Teachers sometimes cannot attend professional development programs if attendance requires a lot of travel time and/or takes place after an already long workday.

Lack of information about AOs, what they have to offer, and what they can do to help schools is another partnership challenge noted by school respondents. This problem is consistent with schools' lack of utilization of tailored programming. AOs did not mention a lack of information about arts organizations as a partnership challenge, so they seem to be unaware that some schools regard it as a problem. Similarly, schools seemed unaware of the arts organizations' need for more information about schools.

Schools, however, are aware of the communication challenges they present to AOs and admit that teachers can be difficult to reach and often have time for only a very brief chat when they are able to talk. Teachers do not have their own work phones and therefore have difficulty making calls even when they do have a few free minutes, and they do not always receive their phone messages. In addition, teachers do not have easy access to e-mail. This lack of a basic means of communication is a major impediment to the development of more fully developed partnerships. Some interviewees at the schools noted that arts organization staff also can be difficult to reach and that schools sometimes do not know the appropriate person to contact at an organization for answers to questions about the organization's arts education programs.

From the Perspective of Local District Arts Advisors

Local district arts administrators noted the same sorts of challenges as those cited by schools and arts organizations. Those most commonly mentioned by LDAAs are lack of good information on what programs are available (cited by four of the ten LDAAs we interviewed), lack of funding (cited by three), lack of time for planning and scheduling programs (cited by four), and lack of programming that meets school needs (also cited by four). LDAAs identified these challenges as obstacles that they encounter personally in helping schools to work with AOs and as obstacles that schools also struggle to overcome.

LDAAs perceived that schools are unaware of what arts education programs are available and how those programs can enhance their arts instruction. Like the schools, some LDAAs said that they felt overwhelmed by the number of programs offered by various organizations and expressed difficulty in trying to sort through and evaluate all of them. A few LDAAs noted the difficulty in assessing school needs and then finding an arts organization that can meet those needs. Two aspects of scheduling were mentioned by LDAAs as being obstacles to partnerships. The work schedules of teachers and AO staff leave only a small window of time for them to connect. Teachers have little free time until around 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and arts organization staff generally work until 5 o'clock (at least this was the perception of one LDAA). LDAAs also noted that many workshops and professional development opportunities for teachers are offered in the summer, but teachers at year-round schools may not be able to attend those programs. Summer program schedules may also conflict with a school's budget cycle because some schools are unable to pay for programs that are scheduled during the summer season. One LDAA mentioned that this situation is particularly true for the prototype schools because of the timing of their supplemental funding.

Summary

More than half of the schools said that arts organizations are not accommodating their needs. Those we interviewed at the schools feel that this is true for two reasons: Arts programs are often not appro-

priate to the age and grade of the students, and they are not linked to the school's curriculum. Because arts organizations did not mention this problem, they seem to be unaware of these expectations of their school partners. However, the key similarity in the perception of arts organizations, schools, and local district arts advisors is that lack of money and time is a major challenge to partnering.

Facilitators

Many of the facilitators identified by both arts organizations and school staff are the same as those identified in previous arts partnership research (e.g., Seidel, Eppel, Martiniello, 2001; Dreeszen, 2002). As stated earlier, the features of arts partnerships that facilitate their success and effectiveness include (1) shared goals with an emphasis on the needs of students and schools; (2) ongoing communication and relationship building; (3) program documentation, evaluation, and quality improvement; (4) effective leadership; and (5) adequate funding, resources, and support achieved through broad ownership of and investment in the partnership's goals and programs. Consistent with the findings on arts partnership challenges, the schools' ideas of what constitute facilitators of arts partnerships clearly differ from those of the arts organizations. Table 6.3 lists the facilitators mentioned by arts organizations and Table 6.4 lists those mentioned by schools.

From the Perspective of Arts Organizations

The facilitator most frequently reported by arts organizations (38 percent of the sample) is the development of a working relationship with individuals at the schools; communication with schools is a related facilitator noted by AOs (29 percent of sample). Arts organizations reported that their being able to develop a working relationship with school staff would facilitate a fuller understanding of a school's needs, but responses from those we interviewed at the schools revealed that schools do not seem to be interested in facilitating part-

Table 6.3
Arts Partnership Facilitators Mentioned by Arts Organizations

Working Relationships with School Staff	<p>Thirteen Organizations (38% of sample)</p> <p>Making relationships at the school Developing a rapport with teachers Developing a symbiotic relationship Personal contacts have proven to be very important</p>
Teacher Commitment and Enthusiasm	<p>Eleven Organizations (32% of sample)</p> <p>It is important that teachers have a certain level of commitment Teacher buy-in Enthusiasm and eagerness to learn on the part of the teacher makes everything run well When teachers are interested</p>
Communication	<p>Ten Organizations (29% of sample)</p> <p>Keeping communication lines open with the school When teachers communicate effectively with arts organization staff Very clear communication Communication, in the sense of getting the word out and letting schools know about what the arts organization does</p>
Professionalism and Expertise of Arts Organization Staff and Artists	<p>Nine Organizations (26% of sample)</p> <p>Having a charismatic teacher/choreographer is critical High content knowledge of the presenters Patience, perseverance, vision, commitment, determination Quality of the artists</p>
Support from School Leadership	<p>Seven Organizations (21% of sample)</p> <p>Strong site leadership Success depends on the principal and the principal's support for the arts Principal's support through time and resources</p>

NOTES: The sample included 34 arts organizations. Statements are verbatim excerpts from interviews with arts organization staff.

nerships in this way. Schools *do* want to communicate with arts organizations, but in an efficient and strategic manner consistent with the simple transaction model in which the AO acts primarily in a service capacity.

Table 6.4
Arts Partnership Facilitators Mentioned by Schools

Grade-Appropriate and School-Appropriate Programs	<p style="text-align: center;">Eight Schools (73% of sample)</p> <hr/> <p>It would be great if arts organizations could find ways to work within teachers' constraints Arts organizations should ensure that lessons are grade-level appropriate Programs that seem to be most interesting are ones that are tied to what we're doing, e.g., math, language, ESL standards Getting suggestions about pre-work and post-work would be helpful</p>
Financial Assistance	<p style="text-align: center;">Seven schools (64% of sample)</p> <hr/> <p>Waiving fees or cutting fees Money for the arts organizations Cost-effective programs</p>
Increased Dissemination of Information	<p style="text-align: center;">Seven schools (64% of sample)</p> <hr/> <p>We have to have knowledge of what each organization can do, and we don't have the time to contact each one individually If arts organizations want to be more involved with schools, they need to get the information out Getting information directly to teachers is important</p>
Greater Accessibility to Arts Organization Staff	<p style="text-align: center;">Six schools (55% of sample)</p> <hr/> <p>It would be great if arts organizations could come out here Maybe arts organizations could give us easier access, e.g., set aside appointments for prototype schools Offer more programs and activities; demand is greater than supply at this point</p>
Point of Contact	<p style="text-align: center;">Six Schools (55% of sample)</p> <hr/> <p>Someone willing and eager to make contacts An out-of-classroom person to coordinate the program Having one person to deal with</p>
Greater School Involvement	<p style="text-align: center;">Four schools (36% of sample)</p> <hr/> <p>Ensure that the whole school can participate, or at least a whole grade level It's better to do activities as a group—make them for everybody</p>

Table 6.4—Continued

Helpful Arts Organization Staff	Four schools (36% of sample) People available to answer questions, willingly and not sarcastically Enthusiasm Responsiveness
Greater Parental Involvement	Three Schools (27% of sample) More interaction with parents and events for the whole family Culminating events or performances for parents are really good
Transportation Assistance	Three Schools (27% of sample) Providing buses Having transportation

NOTES: The sample included 11 schools. Statements are verbatim excerpts from interviews with teachers, cadre chairs, and principals.

Teacher commitment is the second most frequently reported facilitator noted by AO respondents (32 percent). Teachers who have a strong interest in arts education and in providing supplemental programming to students can help arts organizations to work with the schools, particularly because teachers are AOs' usual school contact points. Not surprisingly, teachers interested in furthering their own learning about the arts are reported to be especially helpful in facilitating arts partnerships. The support of principals through their leadership was identified by 21 percent of arts organizations as an important facilitator.

Finally, arts organizations (26 percent) identified certain characteristics of their own staff as facilitators to partnerships, although arts organizations focus more on the quality of an artist's work and the extent of an artist's knowledge, whereas schools are more interested in artists' responsiveness to their needs.

From the Perspective of Schools

The facilitator most commonly mentioned by schools (73 percent) is the availability of school-appropriate arts programs that are also grade appropriate, integrated with the curriculum, and work within the constraints under which teachers and schools operate. But school-

appropriate programs were not mentioned by arts organizations as a top facilitator. This discrepancy in opinions on the significance of school- and grade-appropriate programs reinforces our observation that the importance of programming that meets schools' needs is not being clearly communicated to arts organizations.

Sixty-four percent of schools identified financial assistance as a key facilitator. They cited greater funding for arts organizations as well as for schools. Schools expressed the need for more funding to purchase programming and to pay arts organizations for the organizations' services, and schools also expressed the need for arts organizations to waive or lower the cost of their programming. As mentioned earlier, more than half of the arts organizations in our sample offered free programming, but few schools seemed to be aware of it. Related to funding is the importance of transportation assistance, which was specifically noted by a few schools (27 percent).

Most schools (64 percent) also emphasized the need for arts organizations to disseminate information on their programs to schools and especially to teachers directly. Although arts organizations generally take the lead in getting information about their programs to the schools, typically by mailing brochures or flyers, the schools' expressed need for more information reflects their dissatisfaction with this means of contact. The direct-mail method that AOs use results in a lot of disparate information that usually never reaches teachers, is often regarded as being more promotional than informative, and does not provide the information that schools need to make informed program selections. Although not noted specifically as a facilitator, some arts organization respondents suggested that a directory of arts organizations and artists who are working with schools should be created. (As of this writing, LAUSD was in the process of compiling such a directory.)

In a similar vein, a majority of schools (55 percent) reported that having easier access to arts organization staff, and in particular helpful and responsive staff (cited by 36 percent), facilitates partnerships with AOs by allowing school staff to ask questions and gather information about arts organizations and their programs. To increase their access to AO staff, school respondents suggested that arts orga-

nizations should pay a visit to the schools or schedule appointments for the schools to contact the organizations. Arts organization respondents said they are interested in helping schools gain more personalized access and suggested that program information be exchanged through informal mixers with school staff or at school open houses. Rather than trying to develop relationships with multiple arts organization staff, the majority of schools (55 percent) suggested that a designated “point person” could act as a liaison between schools that are interested in accessing arts programs and arts organizations that are providing them. This point person could be someone at an arts organization, or an individual identified by a coalition of arts organizations to act as a centralized source of additional information, or someone affiliated with the schools. Local district arts advisors are intended to act as liaisons between the schools and the arts organizations, but, as discussed in Chapter Five, the demand for this kind of support far surpasses the current capacity of the LDAAs.

Schools also identified facilitators that would serve to broaden ownership of and investment in an arts partnership’s goals and programs. Creating greater school-wide involvement was mentioned by 36 percent of the schools and reflects a general concern with student equity and extending arts programming to as many students as possible. Greater parental involvement primarily through parents’ attendance at arts events was suggested by 27 percent of the school respondents.

From the Perspective of Local District Arts Advisors

LDAAs provided many suggestions for facilitating partnerships between schools and arts organizations. Many of the suggestions focused on ways to enable arts organizations to better understand schools’ needs and for schools and LDAAs to better understand what AOs can offer to schools. LDAAs suggested that arts organization staff should visit schools to observe classes and teachers in action in order to learn directly about schools’ needs regarding arts curricula, instructional materials, and teacher training. Many of the LDAAs’ other suggestions were aimed at ways that they could serve as repositories of more in-depth information about arts organizations and

what those organizations have to offer the schools. Some LDAAs suggested that they should be allowed to attend the AOs' programs for free so that they can assess the programs firsthand and gain a deeper understanding of how the programs can meet educational goals. Also suggested were professional development programs for local district arts advisors, which would enable LDAAs to develop knowledge and skills in areas in which they are information resources for schools and to assess which organizations and programs may be appropriate for particular schools. LDAAs also noted that they wanted the opportunity to visit schools in person to establish closer contacts with school staff, to better understand the specific needs of schools, and to help schools find appropriate arts programs.

Absent from the Interview Responses: The Need for Program Evaluation

Neither the schools, nor the arts organizations, nor the LDAAs explicitly mentioned program documentation, program evaluation, or continuous program improvement as arts partnership facilitators. Although the majority of arts organizations (53 percent) reported conducting their own program evaluations, it is not clear how these evaluations link to the facilitation of arts partnerships or contribute to assessing school needs. Sixty-eight percent of AOs reported that they use evaluations in program improvement, but it may be that the improvement is focused on an area other than one the schools would choose. We did not ask arts organizations for detailed information on the questions they ask in the evaluation forms they send to their clients, but if such questions did focus on whether programming is meeting a school's needs, such as integration with curriculum, grade appropriateness, and responsiveness to other needs, they may enable the program evaluation to be more directly linked to facilitating AOs' work with schools.

Summary

Not surprisingly, given the difference in their diagnosis of the obstacles to good partnerships, schools and arts organizations emphasize different factors as facilitators of those partnerships. Schools claimed

that the most important facilitator is the availability of grade-appropriate arts programs that are integrated with the curriculum and work within the constraints that schools and teachers face. But such programs are not a priority of the arts organizations we interviewed. This discrepancy in priorities demonstrates that the need for this programming is not being clearly communicated to arts organizations.

Arts organizations said that developing a working relationship with an individual at each school is most important to building good partnerships. School staff, however, do not seem to be as interested in building relationships as they are in receiving information that will help them to improve the efficiency of the transaction and select the best available programs. Better dissemination of information about arts organizations' programs is a facilitator cited by most schools (64 percent). Both schools and arts organizations highlighted communication and accessibility as being critical facilitators.

It is interesting to note that while some arts organizations find resistance to arts education among teaching staffs, nearly a third of AOs view teacher enthusiasm as being central to a constructive partnership with schools. School staff did not mention teacher enthusiasm as a facilitating factor, although they did note the importance of helpful arts organization staff (perhaps the counterpart for enthusiastic teachers).

The facilitators suggested by local district arts advisors focused on providing a more efficient means of evaluating and disseminating information, perhaps through the LDAAs acting as a bridge between schools and arts organizations. None of the LDAAs suggested that teachers should have to focus on relationship building or should be asked to sort through all the information on all the arts programs that are offered. What was clearly illustrated by all three groups we interviewed is the need for better understanding on the part of both schools and arts organizations of how to best access and work with each other and the importance of a point person who could act as a liaison between the schools and the AOs.

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Policy Implications

Conclusions

The arts partnerships in our sample are typically simple transactions that are more focused on providing students with exposure to the arts than on increasing students' knowledge or skills in the arts. The arts organizations act as vendors of arts programs that usually provide a one-time arts experience purchased by the schools.

We also found that the provider-consumer partnership model is not working very effectively for either partner and is therefore falling short of meeting the needs of both students and teachers. Although arts organizations and schools are focused on developing students, schools are looking for grade-appropriate programs that can be linked to and integrated with the schools' curricula and work within the constraints under which schools and teachers operate. But providing such programs is not an explicit goal of the arts organizations we interviewed. This discrepancy in stated goals demonstrates that AOs are unaware that schools have a strong need for grade-appropriate programs integrated with curricula. Alternatively, it may demonstrate that AOs do not know enough about schools' curricula and educational goals to effectively address this need.

Schools were equally concerned with developing teachers and looking to have arts partnerships provide professional development for teachers. Although more than half of the arts organizations we interviewed have programs that provide professional development, arts organizations placed little emphasis on developing teachers as a goal of partnering with schools. This was especially surprising consid-

ering their acute awareness of the negative impact of teacher resistance on arts partnerships and the importance of teacher commitment and support for the arts in facilitating partnerships. Aside from development of students, the partnering goals most commonly cited by arts organizations are building an audience for their work and promoting the arts more generally—goals that are not shared by the schools.

Interaction between schools and arts organizations, a key to successful partnerships, is minimal. For example, the arts organizations develop programs without input from the schools. Schools select from such programs, often using brochures mailed by the arts organization and little else to make their selections. Almost no communication takes place among school staff about the selection of programs, and none of the interviewees reported having a systematic decision-making process for selecting programs. Local district arts advisors, who are in a position to provide guidance in selection and evaluation of programs, are rarely consulted by either schools or arts organizations. Even after selecting a program, schools and arts organizations seldom communicate except to resolve logistical issues, such as scheduling or transportation. Neither the arts organizations nor the schools provide more than minimal orientation to each other's organizational structures and cultures or preparation for involvement with each other's organizations.

Funding rose to the top of the list for both arts organizations and schools as a major partnership challenge. Arts organizations are looking to schools to help bolster their income. Schools, even the relatively well-funded APS schools, are looking to arts organizations as a cost-effective way to supplement arts education. For schools, running a close second to the challenge of insufficient funding is lack of instructional time. Although some arts organizations (21 percent) seem to be aware that schools face this challenge, it was much farther down their list.

Thirty-eight percent of arts organizations said that developing relationships with individuals at each school was most important to building good partnerships. In contrast, the responses from school staff suggest that most of them prefer the simple provider-consumer

transactions versus the more-involved joint-venture type of partnership (see Chapter Two) because the simple transactions require little effort to arrange and maintain. School staff do not seem to be as interested in building relationships as much as they are in receiving information that will help them improve their selection of programs and the efficiency of the transaction. Better dissemination of information about arts organizations' programs is a partnership facilitator cited by a majority of the schools (64 percent). Both schools and arts organizations highlighted communication and accessibility as being critically important facilitators.

Recommendations

Although the arts education field has been promoting the formation of joint partnerships with arts organizations, and some in the field (e.g., Dreezen, 2002) have suggested that these partnerships are increasing in complexity, our study suggests that arts partnership programming continues to be provided most frequently in the context of a simple transaction. Facilitators suggested by schools and arts organizations are focused primarily on improving the effectiveness of partnerships within the simple-transaction model. Considering the persistent demands on a teacher's and principal's time, it seems likely that many partnerships between a school and an arts organization will continue to be simple transactions.

Joint ventures may provide greater potential educational impact, but simple transactions still have the potential to provide effective arts education and training for teachers, principals, and students and can contribute significantly to the implementation and long-term sustainability of arts education in schools. This potential can be realized only if schools and arts organizations can find other ways, in lieu of building close working relationships between school staff and arts organization staff, to establish the key elements of successful partnerships: shared goals, understanding of each other's organizational structures and needs, programs that address the needs and constraints

of both partners, a broad base of support and ownership, and program evaluation.

In light of our findings, our recommendations focus on how schools and arts organizations can improve partnerships within the framework of a provider-consumer relationship (i.e., the simple transaction model) rather than on how to get existing arts partnerships between schools and arts organizations to evolve into more-complex joint ventures. Although our findings are based on a small sample, they nonetheless offer some useful recommendations for improving arts partnerships. The following recommended guidelines will help assure that the programs developed within the provider-consumer framework can address the needs of both schools and arts organizations more effectively.

Build Partnerships That Address the Broader Goals and Needs of Schools and Arts Organizations

As we stated earlier, the simple transaction model is fundamentally based on the school as a consumer and the arts organization as a vendor or service provider. This model assumes that AOs have a valuable service they can provide to schools. AOs who participated in our study offer a variety of programs including professional development and training for teachers; off-site programs (e.g., performances, visits to museums) and workshops for students; on-site programs (e.g., artists-in-residence, artists' visits to classrooms, performances using school facilities); and teacher and administrative support in developing standards-based curriculum, student assessments, and supplemental classroom materials.

A simple-transaction partnership model also assumes that schools have something to offer to AOs. The literature on arts education partnerships (e.g., Dreeszen, 2002; Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, 2001; Lind and Lindsley, 2003) has emphasized the importance of making student learning and the needs of schools central to the partnership. The needs of AOs generally are not the explicit focus of arts partnerships, and some observers (e.g., Seidel, Eppel, and Martiniello, 2001) have noted that AOs should place the needs of students and schools above their own needs when working with

schools. However, as others have noted, AOs often pursue partnerships primarily to increase visibility for the arts and as a strategy for audience building for their organizations (Dreeszen, 2002; McCarthy and Jinnett, 2001; Remer, 1996).

We know from our study that AOs are interested in greater visibility, increased funding for their organization, audience building, and promoting the arts more broadly. As noted in a RAND study of the performing arts (McCarthy et al., 2001), arts organizations are using a variety of strategies to thrive in an increasingly competitive market, and nonprofit organizations must contend with significant financial pressures. Renz and Lawrence (1998) found that while foundations are donating more money to arts organizations, those foundations increasingly expect that their grants will provide greater public access to the arts, and they increasingly demand that arts organizations demonstrate the broader social benefits of their programs. Not only can schools directly provide some much-needed funding for arts organizations, they can also provide an opportunity for arts organizations to demonstrate their positive impact on the school's community and thereby increase an arts organization's success in acquiring other forms of funding. For example, an arts program that demonstrates a measurable contribution to student learning and teacher development is more likely to gain support from the local community, funders, and other schools than a program that provides simply exposure to the arts.

By working with schools, AOs also gain access to current audiences (i.e., teachers, administrators, and parents) and future audiences (i.e., students), which promotes support for the arts more broadly. Yet, interviews with schools revealed that arts advocacy and helping arts organizations to build an audience for their work are not explicit goals of schools. This finding is consistent with the message from the literature that arts partnerships need to center on student learning. However, this perspective ignores an important tenet of any partnership—that the goals and needs of both partners are important. It also ignores the broader context in which arts education programs can be successful and sustainable.

Students' future participation in the arts (through program attendance and hands-on participation) and public support for arts education are founded on the educational experiences provided to students now. Arts education and experience with the arts as a child have been strongly associated with increased participation in the arts as an adult (Bergoni and Smith, 1996; Orend and Keegan, 1996), even when one controls for the effect of educational level (i.e., higher levels of education are associated with a greater likelihood of participation in and support for the arts). Without broad public support of arts education and recognition of the contribution that arts education makes to the social and economic well-being of the population, it is doubtful that arts education will prevail as a core component of the U.S. public school system. Broad support for the arts by key stakeholder groups within the schools (e.g., students, teachers, principals, and parents) is a necessary component of arts education's longer-term viability. The potential of arts education partnerships to transform public education and establish the arts as a core subject will not be realized unless schools and arts organizations understand how their goals interconnect.

Focus on Teachers

A pronounced difference between the goals of arts organizations and the goals of schools is that arts organizations did not mention teacher development as an important goal in working with schools. This finding is surprising considering that half the AOs we interviewed provide professional development for teachers. Professional development is also an area in which schools seem to become more involved in the planning process than they do with other types of arts programs (e.g., performances, museum visits). Arts organizations commonly noted that one of the challenges in working with schools is the lack of support from teachers, but that a key facilitator of working with schools is the teacher's commitment to learning about the arts. Again, this argues for greater attention being paid to developing teachers' knowledge and learning of the arts. Even teachers who do not pursue professional development in the arts can become part of the broader ownership base for implementing arts education in

schools (e.g., one of the teachers we interviewed suggested that arts organizations should offer free or discounted tickets to their events or venues). Encouraging teachers to participate in the arts can help to address their skepticism or disinterest in arts education and the arts in general.

Teachers are critical to student learning both directly (they provide the arts instruction) and indirectly (by demonstrating their interest in and support for the arts). Schools recognize the importance of training teachers to teach the arts and to be comfortable with incorporating the arts in their instruction. Schools also recognize that it is important to make teachers more aware of the arts and enthusiastic about the inclusion of the arts in public education. Because the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act seem to be forcing teachers to increase their instructional time for math, reading, and science, the time available for teaching the arts may decrease.

One solution to this problem is to integrate the arts into other curricula. At the elementary level, where schools rarely have arts specialists, it is especially important to provide training for teachers that enables them to be comfortable with and skilled in arts instruction. Professional development is clearly a top-priority need that AOs would do well to focus on. Given the limited resources for arts education, both schools and AOs should invest in developing teachers now. Unlike investing in students, who will eventually leave a school, investing in teachers enables the benefits from that investment to be passed on to other students, to other key stakeholders in arts education (other teachers, principals, parents, community members), and potentially to other schools (when teachers change jobs). Teacher education and training in arts education can significantly contribute to the near-term implementation and long-term sustainability of arts education in public schools.

Use the Process of Program Selection to Improve Available Programming

Within a simple transaction model, schools can shape the programming that is offered to them through their evaluation and selection of that programming. It is essential for schools to provide information

to arts organizations about their needs during the “purchasing” phase and in their feedback on programs. It is important for schools to first assess their own needs and then establish a clear set of criteria and a system for evaluating programs. To support this process, schools should set up a simple, systematic system for collecting information on arts programs that have the schools’ needs in mind. Many schools across the country are trying to create curricula that support educational standards in the arts and to integrate those curricula with other demands on an already full school schedule. If schools clearly communicate their need for arts education programs that are linked to their curricula or that offer ways to be integrated with other subject matter, arts organizations will produce more programs that are linked to or integrated with the curricula, which will greatly increase schools’ perceived value of external programming and may increase the amount of available funding for these programs.

Provide Comprehensive and User-Friendly Information

It is apparent from the feedback from schools and arts organizations that even basic information on each other’s organizational structures and goals would be a helpful first step toward shared understanding of each others’ needs and constraints and toward more-effective development and utilization of arts education programs. Arts organizations should distribute detailed information on their available programming, including which programs can be tailored, which are linked to a common curriculum such as Open Court, which can be integrated with other school subjects, what skills or knowledge the programs will build, what ages or grades the programs can serve, and program costs.

Information provided to schools also needs to be packaged so that it is easy to use and understand. It is challenging for schools to collect and maintain the various mailings they receive from arts organizations and use that material to make good choices. Free programming, in particular, needs to be highlighted for schools that are already short on resources. Information that enables schools to evaluate programs would also be helpful. For example, a central repository of information on programming that includes school reviews and inde-

pendent ratings on whether programs meet educational standards would be especially useful. That information should also include key contact points that schools can use to get their questions answered. A searchable website would be an ideal tool for enabling schools to submit reviews of programs, raise questions, and share information. A website would also provide additional visibility for AOs and encourage the development of programming that meets school needs.

Although a directory of information on arts organizations offering K–12 arts education programs is available (*Greater Los Angeles Arts Resource Directory*), none of our school respondents mentioned it as part of their process for selecting arts organizations, perhaps because it lacks the sort of extensive information that schools need to choose programs. It also lacks the ease of a searchable web-based directory; it would take quite a bit of time to sort through the more than 400 entries in the directory.

Although arts organizations may seem to be likely candidates for establishing such a directory, it is LAUSD in fact, that has taken some steps toward doing just that. Since we completed our interviews, VAPA has set up a system for including arts organizations in a directory of VAPA-approved programs called the *Arts Pack*. AOs submit evidence of their standards-based instruction and, if approved, their program information may be included in the directory.¹ Although it is not yet a web-based system, the *Arts Pack* should help schools to at least narrow their selections and to have some indication of whether a program is standards based or fits with their needs.

Arts organizations also need centralized data on schools. Information on school funding and facilities, school curricula, criteria for selecting programs, school schedules, organizational structures, and points of contact would help AOs to target programming to where there is the greatest need or where there is funding. To create a directory that is easy for AOs to use, a standardized template could be used that schools would fill in with the pertinent information; that information could then be assembled and published to the web. It

¹ Information about the *Arts Pack* is based on personal communication with VAPA staff in fall 2003.

would be best to coordinate assembly of the information at the local district or LAUSD level. As of this writing, we are unaware of any comprehensive directory that includes information this detailed. However, arts organizations can get some of this information—including names, addresses, and phone numbers of all schools, and descriptive information about the student population—from various websites. The LAUSD website (<http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us> under the Arts Education link) provides a list of the local district arts advisors and their contact information and information on other staff working for the Arts Education Branch of LAUSD.

Orient Arts Organization Staff to Schools

None of the AOs reported attending any kind of school orientation, although a few mentioned being invited to a district-level VAPA meeting. AO administrators and artists who work with schools need orientation at both the district and school level. They need a broad understanding of what the district and schools are trying to achieve and an understanding of the goals of teachers and principals within this context.

Some of the teachers we interviewed suggested that site visits by arts organization staff would help organizations to understand what schools need in terms of arts education and would help AOs to appreciate the schools' organizational challenges. In general, the staff at arts organizations do not include credentialed teachers or artists who have had advanced education; therefore, those individuals are not necessarily familiar with an academic approach to learning of the arts, much less the subtleties of a school's culture, organization, needs, and limitations. Just a single in-person classroom observation can provide significant insights for arts organization staff and is a logical place to begin to understand the teaching profession.

Written materials can also be helpful. For example, a recent guide by Lind and Lindsley (2003) provides an excellent compendium of relevant information about schools and teaching the arts in schools, including information on classroom teachers, developmental stages, and age-appropriate activities for students; what is meant by the terms "arts content standards" and "program evaluation"; and the

roles of teachers, administrators, and artists when working together in the classroom.

Facilitate Access to Key Points of Contact at Arts Organizations

Written information is sometimes not enough to provide schools with the answers and insights needed to plan or select a program. A more dynamic exchange of information is sometimes required. Teachers did not express as much interest in building relationships as did the respondents at arts organizations, but teachers do want an efficient means to (1) obtain information on what programs are available, (2) help them make informed decisions in selecting programs, and (3) more generally understand what arts organizations can do to help them implement arts education in their classroom. Arts organizations have the opportunity to offer such help through arts fairs and other such functions; however, school respondents said that arts fairs present an overwhelming amount of undifferentiated information—feedback that was similar to what was said about brochure mailings. Points of contact at arts organizations who have been identified as being knowledgeable about available programs and responsive to school needs may encourage teachers to contact AOs to access supplementary information. Providing set days and times around a teacher’s schedule when the point of contact will be available would also be helpful.

Arts organizations could also collectively establish an arts education “hotline” for schools to call to discuss their needs and be certain to reach someone who is able and willing to help them. Ideally, this kind of service would work in conjunction with a centralized database or directory of information on AOs and their program offerings, such as discussed earlier.

Enhance the Brokering Role for Local District Arts Advisors

Both schools and arts organizations tend to be highly diverse and decentralized. The local district arts advisors have the potential to act as information hubs and become invaluable links between schools and arts organizations. The existence of LDAAAs has been acknowledged as being critical to the successful implementation of district-level arts

education programs (Longley, 1999). The LDAAs in our sample were keenly aware of their potential contributions in many areas (i.e., instructional support for teachers and schools, planning of professional development programs, facilitating in-classroom observations by AOs, and brokering information between AOs and schools). LDAAs are also very aware of the need for standards-based instruction, have the best knowledge of what kinds of programming can meet those instructional standards, and know what it takes to make an instructional program work in the classroom.

Despite having the requisite breadth and depth of relevant knowledge, local district arts advisors are rarely involved in helping schools assess their needs or evaluate programs, which would be a natural role for LDAAs to play. Furthermore, arts organizations contact LDAAs only infrequently and, when they do, it is mainly to disseminate information on arts programs and not to obtain substantive information on program design.

The arts advisors in the LAUSD school district, who each serve thousands of students in some 60 to 80 schools, are tackling many important tasks. Although the demand for an enhanced brokering role for LDAAs is high, the resources to dedicate LDAAs to this role are clearly limited. Finding alternative ways to meet the demand for additional brokering resources may be difficult, although the demand for this brokering function may lessen as opportunities for interactive communication (e.g. web-based resources) between schools and arts organizations are implemented. LDAAs may also be in a good position to help develop AO-school relationships that are more similar to joint ventures. In fact, a joint venture between LDAAs and directors of local arts organizations with the goal of finding ways to communicate and address the needs of both schools and arts organizations would contribute greatly to the implementation of arts education in schools.

Policy Implications

Although joint ventures may continue to be regarded as the optimal partnership model for enhancing arts education in public schools, for many schools and arts organizations the simple transaction model—in which schools are consumers who select from a menu of programs provided by arts organizations—is likely to persist considering the many challenges to forming more-complex relationships. The most significant policy implication of this study is that schools must assume responsibility for creating a coherent, standards-based arts curriculum and become better-informed consumers of arts programs that promote that curriculum, rather than counting on the evolution of more-collaborative partnerships to carry out this task. The five core goals of LAUSD’s ten-year plan, listed in Chapter Two, are designed to work synergistically to achieve the implementation of a substantive, sequential arts curriculum for all K–12 students. The designers of the plan recognized the importance of local arts organizations in helping the district to achieve this ambitious outcome, although only in conjunction with significant school-based investment that provides for centralized development and coordination of an arts education curriculum and teacher training.

Improving the effectiveness of simple arts partnerships is an important step in this process. As our analysis suggests, teachers and principals need to become smarter consumers of programming that is appropriate for students at various stages of the arts curriculum, and arts organizations need to become better suppliers and marketers of programs that schools can easily fit into their curriculum. Both schools and arts organizations need to work together to make teacher training in the arts central to their programming, which will enable schools to build the capacity to design coherent programs in the arts. Centralized and user-friendly information for both schools and arts organizations is also essential to improving current partnerships. Such information can help schools to evaluate and select appropriate programs and can help arts organizations to address the needs of schools and meet the demand for certain types of programming.

But the key to making such partnerships serve the needs of students is to move programs away from arts-exposure-only experiences toward becoming integrated components of a more coherent and sustained substantive arts curriculum in the schools, as the LAUSD Arts Education Plan recognizes. Even the most efficient arts partnerships of the simple transaction type will offer only isolated arts experiences to students unless those experiences are integrated into a sequential arts education curriculum.

Although national and state standards in the arts have been established to help schools implement an arts curriculum, and although the No Child Left Behind Act identifies the arts as part of the core public school curriculum, schools are not being held accountable for arts instruction. As a result, the arts have been losing ground in the battle for funding and instructional time. The LAUSD ten-year Arts Education Plan is intended to change this trend by providing significant resources to district schools over the long term for arts education. If arts partnerships between LAUSD schools and community arts organizations can develop in ways that are more responsive to each partners' needs and goals, they can play a key role in the success of the LAUSD plan. In turn, these partnerships may offer a model for arts organizations and schools around the country to work together to establish the arts as core subjects in the education of all students, ensuring future support for arts education and the arts more broadly.

Bibliography

- Arts Education Partnership, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, and National Endowment for the Arts, *Strengthening State-Level Arts Education Partnerships*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership, 2000 (available at <http://aep-arts.org/PDF%20Files/Strengthening%20Partnerships.pdf> as of April 2003).
- Bergoni, Louis, and Julia Smith, *Effects of Arts Education on Participation in the Arts*, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1996.
- Burnafor, Gail, with Marie McCarthy, ed., "Rethinking Professional Development: 'Action Research' to Build Collaborative Arts Programming," 2001 Fowler Colloquium Papers, College Park, Md.: University Libraries, University of Maryland, 2001 (available at <http://www.lib.umd.edu/PAL/SCPA/fowlercolloq2001paper3.html> as of April 2004).
- Burton, Judith, Robert Horowitz, and Hal Abeles, "Learning In and Through the Arts: Curriculum Implications," in Edward Fiske, ed., *Champions of Change: The Impact of the Arts on Learning*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership and President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, 1999.
- California Arts Council, *2001 Public Opinion Survey*, Sacramento, Calif.: CAC, 2001 (available at http://www.cac.ca.gov/library/publications/publication_files/Public_Opinion_Survey.pdf as of May 2004).
- California Department of Education, *Challenge Standards for Student Success in Visual and Performing Arts*, Sacramento: California Department of Education, 1998.

- Catterall, James S., Richard Chapleau, and John Iwanaga, "Involvement in the Arts and Human Development: General Involvement and Intensive Involvement in Music and Theater Arts," in Edward Fiske, ed., *Champions of Change: The Impact of the Arts on Learning*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership and the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, 1999.
- Catterall, James S., and Lynn Waldorf, "Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education Summary Evaluation," in Edward Fiske, ed., *Champions of Change: The Impact of the Arts on Learning*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership and the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, 1999.
- Deasy, Richard J., ed., *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership and National Endowment of the Arts, 2002.
- Dreeszen, Craig, *Intersections II: Community Arts and Education Collaboratives*, 2nd ed., Amherst, Mass.: The Arts Extension Service, 2002.
- Dreeszen, Craig, *Building and Sustaining Partnerships*, Amherst, Mass.: The Arts Extension Service, 1990.
- Dreeszen, Craig, and Richard Deasy, *Learning Partnerships: Improving Learning in Schools with Arts Partners in the Community*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership, 1999.
- Dreeszen, Craig, with Marie McCarthy, ed., "Trends in Arts Education Collaborations," 2001 Fowler Colloquium Papers, College Park, Md.: University Libraries, University of Maryland, 2001 (available at <http://www.lib.umd.edu/PAL/SCPA/fowlercolloq2001paper1.html> as of April 2004).
- Fiske, Edward, ed., *Champions of Change: The Impact of the Arts on Learning*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership and the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, 1999.
- Greater Los Angeles Arts Resource Directory and Arts & Education Guide*, 5th ed., Los Angeles: Arts Resources and Technical Services, 2000.
- Hirzy, Ellen Cochran, ed., *True Needs True Partners, Museums and Schools Transforming Education*, Washington, D.C.: Institute of Museum Services, 1996.

- Horowitz, Rob, *Summary of Large-Scale Arts Partnership Evaluations*, Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership, 2004 (available at www.aep-arts.org as of March 2004).
- Improving America's Schools Act of 1994*, H.R. 6, 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1994.
- LAUSD, Office of Communications, "Elementary Reading Plan," Fact Sheet, March 2003 (available at http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us/newLAUSDnet/pdf/FACTSHEET_elementaryreading.pdf as of May 2004).
- Lind, Vicki R., and Elizabeth Lindsley, *Creative Collaboration: Teachers and Artists in the Classroom, Pre-K–Grade 12*, San Bernardino, Calif.: California Alliance for Arts Education and the San Bernardino City Unified School District, 2003.
- Longley, Laura, ed., *Gaining the Arts Advantage*, Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the Arts Education Partnership, 1999 (available at http://www.pcah.gov/gaa/study_findings.html as of April 2004).
- Los Angeles Unified School District Arts Education Plan 1999–2009*, Los Angeles: LAUSD Board of Education, June 1999.
- McCarthy, Kevin F., Arthur C. Brooks, Julia Lowell, and Laura Zakaras, *The Performing Arts in a New Era*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, MR-1367-PCT, 2001.
- McCarthy, Kevin F., and Kimberly Jinnett, *A New Framework for Building Participation in the Arts*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, MR-1323, 2001.
- Myers, David, "Excellence in Arts Teaching and Learning: A Collaborative Responsibility of Maturing Partnerships," 2001 Fowler Colloquium Papers, College Park, Md.: University Libraries, University of Maryland, 2001 (available at <http://www.lib.umd.edu/PAL/SCPA/fowlercolloq2001paper2.html> as of April 2004).
- Myers, David, *Beyond Traditional Partnerships Among Orchestras, Schools, and Communities*, Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1996.

- National Center for Education Statistics, *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, NCES 95-082, 1995.
- National Endowment for the Arts, *Local Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts*, Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1992.
- Orend, Richard J., and Carol Keegan, *Education and Arts Participation: A Study of Arts Socialization and Current Arts-Related Activities Using 1982 and 1992 SPPA Data*, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1996.
- Persky, H. R., B. A. Sandene, and J. M. Askew, *The NAEP 1997 Arts Report Card: Eighth-Grade Findings from the National Assessment of Educational Progress*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999.
- Remer, Jane, *Building Effective Arts Partnerships with Schools and Your Community*, New York: ACA Books, American Council for the Arts, 1996.
- Renz, Loren, and Steven Lawrence, *Arts Funding: An Update on Foundation Trends*, 3rd ed., New York: The Foundation Center, 1998.
- Seidel, Steve, Meredith Eppel, and Maria Martiniello, *Arts Survive: A Study of Sustainability in Arts Education Partnerships*, Cambridge, Mass.: The President and Fellows of Harvard College on Behalf of Project Zero, 2001.
- Stecher, Brian M., Laura S. Hamilton, and Gabriella Gonzalez, *Working Smarter to Leave No Child Behind: Practical Insights for School Leaders*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, WP-138-EDU, 2003.
- United Arts, ed., Museums Without Walls, *Arts in Focus: Los Angeles Countywide Survey*, commissioned by Arts Education Task Force of Arts for LA, Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Arts Commission, 2001.
- Von Zastrow, Claus, and Helen Janc, *Academic Atrophy: The Conditions of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools*, Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 2004 (available at www.c-b-e.org/cbe_principal_Report.pdf from link in Americans for the Arts webpage [www.americansforthearts.org] as of March 2004).