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1. INTRODUCTION

The belief that art should be taught by art specialists at the elementary school level is both popular and controversial among art educators. Some argue that art is so different from other areas of the curriculum that a specialist is required to teach it adequately: Art involves visual images and icons rather than the verbal and mathematical symbol systems that dominate the rest of the curriculum; art education requires divergent thinking rather than the convergent thinking emphasized in more rigid rule-governed subjects such as spelling, arithmetic, grammar, and even much of the study of social sciences such as history and geography. The argument in favor of elementary art specialists stresses the fact that elementary classroom teachers have studied reading, writing, and mathematics from kindergarten through high school and have gained the proficiencies in those systems required for graduation from high school and college. But their knowledge of art is typically severely limited as a result of a poor or nonexistent art education through elementary and secondary school and a lack of art requirements for high school graduation or for college entrance.\(^1\)

In addition to these logical arguments are the more territorial reasons for insisting on art specialists. Art educators at all levels are naturally interested in keeping their jobs and in promoting the growth of art education in general. Although most elementary schools in the United States do not employ art specialists, some do; and the art teachers who hold those jobs generally have their hands full with the teaching of large numbers of children and do not welcome a point of view that might erode their already tenuous positions on the school faculty. College art education programs would have fewer major students if there were no positions for art specialists in the elementary schools, and this would eventually affect the numbers in graduate programs as well. The professional art education associations would have fewer potential members for the elementary division of the organization if everyone agreed that art should be taught by elementary classroom teachers. Art is too special, this argument states, to trust its teaching to nonspecialists who lack the background, the interest, or the understanding to do a good job.

On the other side of the issue are those who point out that the number of elementary art specialists is insignificant in relation to the entire number of K-6 classrooms in the country. Certified art teachers have the major responsibility for art instruction in less than 20 percent of the elementary schools in the United States.\(^2\) Some say that, in the interests of the millions of children who receive no art instruction, the field of art education must abandon the notion that specialists are required to teach art and concentrate on assisting classroom teachers to provide worthwhile instruction in art. Proponents of this position point out the logical difficulty in requiring specialists for art teaching, as the same argument can be made for other subjects such as music, physical education, computer education, and even science education. Where, they ask, does the list of specialists stop? Perhaps it is better not to allow the camel to place its nose in the tent and to eliminate all subject matter specialists at the elementary level. The economic effect of the requirement to hire art teachers and other subject matter specialists can be severe in a school district that is suffering from declining student populations, declining revenues, and rising costs.


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 54.
Economics aside, those who would opt for elementary art education as a responsibility of the classroom teacher argue that art is more likely to become an integral part of the regular curriculum when it is taught like other subjects. They say that by insisting that art education is different from all other education, art educators succeed only in removing it from the concern of classroom teachers and from a regular place in the curriculum. Art educators must realize that the word "precious," which describes their feeling about art in the school, means "of great value and highly esteemed," but it also means "of high price, or excessively refined: affected." The word "special" in relation to art education can mean "held in particular esteem," but it also means "distinguished by some unusual quality." By emphasizing the mystique of "specialness" and "preciousness," they argue, art educators can make art education so different, so unusual, so affected that it is outside the realm of understanding by regular educators, including teachers, principals, and superintendents.

The arguments on both sides of this issue contain grains of truth among the weaknesses and fallacies that each perpetuates. Nevertheless, the issue exists in every school district where a commitment to art education is taken seriously. This case study describes a school district that has addressed these conflicts by utilizing the expertise of both knowledgeable art educators and experienced classroom teachers.
2. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Independent School District 270, Hopkins, Minnesota, is located in a suburban area west of Minneapolis. The district attendance area (approximately 30 square miles) includes portions of five suburban communities in addition to all of the small community of Hopkins, which contributes only 20 percent of the total student population. The approximately 6900 students who attend the six elementary schools, two junior high schools, and one high school are predominantly from well-to-do suburban households, although there are students from lower economic groups and a few from very wealthy families. There are only a few minority students, most of whom are of Asian extraction.

The Hopkins district merged with another school district in 1979 after a period of years of student population declines in both districts that made some type of consolidation necessary. In the process of enrollment declines and merger several schools were closed, including three that now serve as community centers and administration offices under the aegis of the present Hopkins district.

The nine schools in the district are well built, attractive schools scattered around the attendance area among residential neighborhoods, shopping centers, and park areas, near some of the region's numerous lakes.

In terms of its location, size, community, budget, organization, facilities, and student population, Independent School District 270 is probably very much like numerous small, suburban school districts scattered across the United States. With respect to its programs of art education, however, the Hopkins School District is quite different, indeed. The primary subject of this study is the development and implementation of the K-6 art curriculum and the current preparations to extend the curriculum upward into the junior high school and eventually into the high school art program.\(^3\)

---

\(^3\)For further information concerning the Hopkins art curriculum, contact Ms. Carol Sirrine, Fine Arts Chairperson, Hopkins School District, 1001 Highway 7, Hopkins, Minnesota 55343.
3. A MANDATE FOR ART EDUCATION

In 1977, Carol Sirrine was an experienced second grade teacher in the Hopkins schools with a strong background in music (certified K-12) and an interest in art. She had recently returned from a Fulbright exchange to England, which had influenced her thinking about elementary education: "I knew from experiences there that art could be a lot different from what I was teaching here. Even in my teacher training I knew that I wasn't getting what I wanted the children to know. A lot of it seemed like gimmicky kinds of things to turn kids on, with nothing about the historical content or what art had to offer as a discipline."

Others shared Carol's perceptions that the district's art program at that time was somehow inadequate. Some of the district's teachers and parents insisted that art should not be neglected in the elementary schools. Several of the high school and junior high school art teachers were also vocal regarding the need for art instruction at the elementary level. Some parents expressed to school board members their views regarding the need for a sound art program in the district. One parent who spoke convincingly in favor of an elementary art curriculum at a school meeting later became a member of the school board and supported the moves to develop the current art curriculum.
The Hopkins Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Arthur Bruning, came to this district from Illinois about five years before the initiation of the elementary art curriculum. One of his observations at that time was that there were many cultural opportunities in the Twin Cities area, but little evidence of regular art education in the schools. Although his academic background was not arts oriented, Dr. Bruning supported the strengthening of that aspect on the basis of his belief in a balanced educational program for children, including education in the fine arts. The climate of support within the community and the school district was evidently favorable to the initiation of a strong program of art education.

At this point, beginning in 1978, a series of related events took place that led, in a somewhat indirect fashion, to the development of the Hopkins art curriculum. During that year a young woman who had graduated from Hopkins High School and who was a university student was hired as a teacher's aide at one of the elementary schools. She was a student in an individualized study university degree program and had taken course work in art and in art education. She soon became involved in teaching art to the elementary students and, after carefully documenting the students' progress, she made a presentation to the Hopkins School Board. Board members were impressed with the results that she documented and encouraged her to share her ideas with the classroom teachers.

Later, that aide taught an in-service course to about 15 elementary teachers. One of the teachers in this 40-hour course was Carol Sirrine. In this instance, as in all approved in-service courses for the district, teachers could opt to receive pay or district in-service credits. The teachers who took this course were motivated by it and evidently gave it good ratings in the required written evaluation. As a result, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Dr. Frank Brendemuehl, authorized an eight-hour mini-course in art to be attended by all elementary principals and teachers. This course assured that all of the district personnel were at least aware of art education and of the apparent support for it from the district administration.

"At this point," relates Dr. Brendemuehl, "we decided we needed district leadership. We had district chairpersons in mathematics, social studies, language arts, reading, and science, so we opened a position for the fine arts as well." All of these positions were half-time, with the other half spent as classroom teachers or in other assignments. About 50 people applied for this fine arts position when it was created in 1979, and the person selected was Carol Sirrine, on the basis of her music education K-12 certification, her years of successful teaching as a certified elementary classroom teacher, her knowledge of the district, and her experience and interests in dance and art.

The decision was made to provide a curriculum that could be implemented by classroom teachers. Brendemuehl comments, "We thought we needed to have a developmentally sequenced art curriculum and we didn't think we could provide that by hiring art specialists because of economics. It was an economic decision as much as anything to move toward a classroom delivered curriculum." Carol Sirrine agrees, but adds,

I think it's really both economics and philosophy. It's philosophy because every curriculum area up to this point, with the exception of music, has been in the hands of the generalist, and what we found with music in the hands of the specialist has been that classroom teachers have relinquished their responsibility.

During the year that the fine arts position was created, the elementary teacher's aide and a classroom teacher had been hired to begin writing an art curriculum. Ms. Sirrine, upon becoming the fine arts chairperson, became the leader of that enterprise. She decided to survey the field to learn what was already available that the district might adopt:
We went to other districts, we went here, we went there. I went to St. Louis and worked with an art supervisor and looked at his program and looked at the CEMREL things. It didn’t look like we were going to get anything that would really fit our situation here.4

Carol Sirrine had previously taken a course with Dr. Margaret DiBlasio at the University of Minnesota. She learned that Dr. DiBlasio was offering a course on art curriculum and Carol formulated the idea of getting some people who were interested in writing curriculum to go to the university and take the course, and for a group project to write a curriculum. This innovative idea was set in motion and Carol, the aide, two elementary teachers who were interested in art, and a secondary art teacher enrolled in the course.

The Hopkins group went through the course and, with Professor DiBlasio’s cooperation, set out to create an art curriculum as a group project. However, as Carol explains, “It became really apparent that none of us had the theoretical basis to develop a conceptual art framework.” She went to Dr. Brendemuehl at this point and reported her perceptions regarding the difficulties that the Hopkins group was encountering. The result was that Margaret DiBlasio was invited to serve as a consultant to assist with the task of curriculum development. This is the point of origin for the art curriculum that is currently taught in every elementary classroom in Independent School District 270. After more than ten years (according to Frank Brendemuehl) of experimenting and searching for a way to bring art into the regular educational program of the district, the necessary combination of enthusiasm and expertise was achieved and the creation of an art curriculum was imminent.

4These and other comments are from interviews with Ms. Sirrine, recorded and printed with her permission.
4. THE ART PROGRAM

Art education is now a regular part of general education in the Hopkins schools. Beginning with kindergarten, children receive art instruction each week through grade six. This instruction follows the art curriculum provided for each grade level and it is delivered by regular classroom teachers with the support of the district's elementary art specialist, who divides her time among the six elementary schools. At the junior high school level, students, in conformity with state guidelines, are required to take the equivalent of 12 weeks of art instruction during grade seven and six weeks of art instruction during grade eight. Some elective art is available to eighth and ninth grade students and the entire high school art program is elective.

ELEMENTARY ART EDUCATION

In the Hopkins schools the issue regarding art instruction as the responsibility of classroom teachers versus art specialists has been resolved by what might be considered a compromise. Classroom teachers are expected to teach art on a regular weekly basis and their responsibility to do so is made clear to them by their principals and by messages from the superintendent's office. The teachers are given a great deal of professional support in art education, however, in the form of the detailed curriculum materials and in the person of Nancy Pauly, the elementary art consultant. At Hopkins, content for instruction is determined and organized by expert professionals and is written into a series of art lessons for each grade level, K through 6. The lessons are written in specific detail for the classroom teachers, who are assumed to lack extensive educational background in art education.

Classroom teachers are asked to teach the lessons for their particular grade in sequence and include the specified concepts and activities. It is not considered sufficient for teachers to attend to the art activities exclusive of the terminology and concepts associated with the activities. Art lessons in the lower grades provide foundational skills and concepts needed for subsequent lessons. The curriculum is intentionally prescriptive in order to maintain the benefits of the sequential organization. In addition to the detailed lesson plans for their grade levels, the teachers participate in a thorough series of in-service meetings, conducted by Nancy Pauly, during which they receive additional artistic background related to the curriculum. Here the teachers have an opportunity to discuss specific art lessons and problems they might have encountered in teaching them.

Most of the teachers seem to be comfortable with the curriculum, given this level of support and their increasing familiarity and experience with the lessons after having taught them several times. They have an additional source of support, however, as Nancy visits each school on a regular schedule and often teaches lessons for individual teachers in their classrooms. The purpose of Nancy's teaching is to provide demonstrations for the classroom teachers and to provide a model for the implementation of particular lessons. Teachers can request her services for a lesson that might be difficult for them, but are expected to try it on their own the next time.

The Getty research team (myself and two assistants) visited several classrooms at various grade levels to observe Nancy and the demonstration process: In one third grade classroom I observed 30 boys and girls working on papier-mâché puppets. Child art was in evidence
around the room. Hanging from the ceiling in a colorful display were fish of many sizes and shapes constructed of colored paper and clear plastic. Self portraits of all the children, done in crayons, were displayed on one wall. These were the results of lessons from the art curriculum. The teacher in this classroom apparently enjoyed teaching art, as additional children’s art products that were not part of the curriculum were in evidence. Geometric designs of triangles rendered in crayons with simple color schemes were displayed next to an array of cut-paper designs also composed of triangles.

The children in the room were animated, smiling, and having a good time painting their puppets. Nancy Pauly instructed the children regarding the mixing of colors and techniques for application of the paint. She taught them about complements (a review). The classroom teacher was involved with the lesson as she moved about the room assisting the children and occasionally reinforcing some of Nancy’s points. At the conclusion of the class period the two adults directed the children for the cleanup of materials and the storing of the puppets until the next art period. The classroom teacher will continue the project on another day without Nancy’s assistance but was apparently grateful for Nancy’s help during this stage of the process.

In another classroom, this one in fourth grade, the art activity had to do with crayon drawings of bicycles and the concept for focus was negative space. Ms. Pauly discussed the bicycle drawings that the children had done under the direction of their regular teacher, and she talked to them about the use of watercolor over the wax crayon drawings in a crayon resist technique. The teacher prepared a color wheel and examples of transparent washes that she and Nancy used to instruct the children. Some of the students commented on the color transparencies in Nancy’s plaid blouse. The children in this class were also cooperative and seemed to enjoy the painting activity a great deal. Ms. Pauly and the regular teacher circulated around the room assisting individual children, many of whom seemed to miss the point of the task, which was to relate their painting to the shapes in the crayon drawing. Some almost obliterated the drawing with heavy paint applications. One of the nice things about teaching art is that the level of children’s understanding of concepts, skills, and techniques is often immediately observable.

The failure of quite a few children to understand the intended lesson objective raises again the issue of the adequacy of classroom teachers to teach art. Is the regular teacher able to recognize that the children failed to understand and perform the intended task? If she recognizes this is she able to analyze the problem and provide remedial instruction? Nancy deals with this problem regularly and comments that some of the teachers have difficulty with children’s divergent responses to art assignments. Some of the teachers do very well, but others have difficulty with follow-up after Nancy introduces a lesson.

In the fifth grade classroom that Nancy visited next, the teacher was sitting at her desk in front of the classroom, reading aloud a story about hunting ducks on a frosty morning. Frosty mornings and duck hunting are very common in Minnesota during the autumn months. The teacher was expecting Pauly, welcomed her, and turned the class over to her for the scheduled art lesson. This one was about Surrealism, and Nancy discussed the meaning of that term with the children, who sat at their desks. She showed prints of paintings by Magritte and Miro, mentioning their names and eliciting comments from the students who seemed to be very much interested. The teacher sat at her desk, apparently grading papers.

Nancy showed the reproduction of Chagall’s I and the Village and asked the children to consider why the artist painted this way. Comments from the students were perceptive: “Maybe his life was all jumbled up,” and “Maybe he had visions like that when he was young.”
They seemed to understand and accept the imaginative quality of Chagall's painting. Nancy was supportive of the students' comments and complimented one girl for her "good eye" for noticing color. The teacher was now working with a student at her desk, apparently on a reading assignment. Nancy showed the Magritte painting with a dove image and asked, "Can you remember who did this?" Students remembered the image and discussed interpretations.

The activity for this lesson required that children do drawings from their imaginations. Nancy had them lay their heads on their desks and close their eyes. She reviewed some of the points from the discussion of Surrealism and asked them to use their imaginations to "think of a dream." After a while they were given pencils and cray-pas with which to do their drawings. At this point Pauly had an appointment in another classroom. The teacher allowed the children to work on their imaginary drawings as she picked up the book on her desk and resumed reading the story about duck hunting.

As I moved on to another classroom, one of the teachers that I had met during an earlier visit insisted that I see the drawings made by his third grade students. The drawings were nicely done and mounted on construction paper and displayed on the bulletin board above the book shelves. He enthusiastically commented, "These kids have a lot of talent," and "This art program is very good."

These particular classroom visits were selected and are reported here as examples of the elementary art specialist's relationships with classroom teachers as she provides in-service support for the implementation of the art curriculum. Nancy Pauly's observations about the success of the Hopkins art curriculum coincide with the observations made by my research assistants and myself. She comments on the variability of the quality of art instruction as approximating a normal curve. A few teachers seem uninterested and even incompetent to teach art while others are tremendously enthusiastic and able and extend the curriculum far beyond what is explicitly written. The large majority of teachers are somewhere in between, doing a sound job of art teaching within their limitations as nonspecialists in art. As our research team visited classrooms to observe art lessons from the curriculum taught by regular teachers, without assistance from the elementary art specialist, we were generally favorably impressed with the quality of instruction and learning that we saw. From our observations of students as they worked on art projects and participated in class discussions, we were convinced that the Hopkins students were making educationally important gains as a result of the art program.

This conclusion was supported by some of the junior high school art teachers who indicated that they could already see the effects of the elementary curriculum in the seventh grade students, even though they have had only two years rather than the full seven years of the art curriculum. The new junior high students are more knowledgeable of art terminology and of basic concepts, such as color theory for mixing paints. Although there is not yet an evaluation program in the district to measure student learning in art, my assistants and I were curious to gain some indication of what students are gleaming from their art instruction. We received permission to administer a questionnaire to a randomly selected sample of fourth grade and sixth grade students. This was almost identical to the questionnaire that was administered to several groups of students in the Milwaukee schools. Several of the questions were identical to items on the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Art. Also included were attitude items similar to some in the Eisner Art Attitude Inventory.

---

5National Assessment of Educational Progress, Art and Young Americans, 1974–75: Results from the Second National Art Assessment, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado, 1981.

On the attitude questions the mean response of all 97 students in the fourth grade who participated was 3.52, which comes out midway between "uncertain" and "agree" on a five-point scale, with "strongly agree" designated as five (see Table 1). This is a positive response above a neutral 3.0 score. The students responded most positively to the statements: "I like to draw" (4.17); "I like to paint" (3.95); "I like to look at sculpture" (3.80); and "I like to learn about art from other times and places" (3.74). They were uncertain about the statements: "Science is more important than art" (3.32); and "It is possible to become well-educated without studying art" (2.86). The students generally agreed that "Almost everyone can learn to enjoy art" (3.88).

On the information items, the fourth graders scored highest on the items that required a knowledge of the primary colors (88.7 percent correct), result of mixing colors (84.5 percent), definition of "shape" (89.7 percent), and definition of the term "architect" (85.6 percent). All of the information items were presented in a multiple-choice format with a correct response and three distractors, similar to the NAEP items. Twelve of the 25 items required responses to works of art shown with slides. Five were NAEP items with national norms for ages 13 and 17 years. The Hopkins fourth grade students were 10 years old on the average. Table 2 compares percentages on the five NAEP questions.

The Hopkins fourth graders scored higher on every item than the national sample of 13-year-old students, and their mean score on the five items is almost identical to the NAEP high school seniors (0.36) difference. These figures suggest that the Hopkins children are progressing well with respect to art information of this type. Knowledgeable art educators have registered their disappointment with the generally low scores by American students on the NAEP test. The NAEP norms for age groups are not held up as goals toward which to strive. Nevertheless, it is encouraging to see a group of ten-year-old children match the high school score on even this small sample of items. When we consider that the Hopkins students have had the benefit of a systematic art curriculum for only two years, we are led to anticipate the considerable progress that children might make after seven years of participation in a well-founded and carefully articulated art curriculum. The scores of the Hopkins sixth grade students provide more support for such optimism.

The Hopkins sixth graders (random sample of 103 students) scored slightly lower than the fourth graders on the attitude items (3.41), but still registered a generally positive response (see Table 3). They reacted most positively to the statements: "I like to draw" (4.32), "I like to paint" (3.86), and "I enjoy making cartoons" (3.77), all art production items. They also responded positively to the statements: "I like to look at sculpture" (3.57) and "I enjoy learning about artists" (3.52), which are related more to the critical and historical domains. They registered the least positive attitudes toward the statements: "It is possible to become well-educated without studying art" (2.52) and "Science is more important than art" (2.95, scoring reversed for negative items). Although they appear to be unsure of the educational value of art, the sixth grade students in Hopkins registered mild agreement (3.50) with the statement: "All students should take art in school."

On the 25 information items, the Hopkins 12-year-old students scored highest on items that required knowledge of the primary colors (90.3 percent correct), color mixing (81.6 percent), and definitions of the terms "shape" (95.1 percent), "architect" (91.3 percent), and "perspective" (75.7 percent). A surprising 84.5 percent identified Da Vinci as the artist who painted the Mona Lisa and 65 percent identified a Pollock painting as an example of Abstract Expressionism. Table 4 displays the Hopkins sixth grade students' scores on the five NAEP.

---

7Chapman, Instant Art, p. 65.
Table 1
HOPKINS GRADE 4 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES (N = 97)

Part 1 (Items 1-15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like to draw.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I like to paint.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy making cartoons.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like to look at interesting buildings.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I enjoy learning about artists.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like to look at paintings.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to look at sculpture.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy talking about art.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I like to learn about art from other times and places.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Almost anyone can learn to enjoy art.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Artists are usually strange people.*</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Science is more important than art.*</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All students should take art in school.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Looking at art is boring.*</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is possible to become well-educated without studying art.*</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score 3.53

Score: 5 = strongly agree
        4 = agree
        3 = uncertain
        2 = disagree
        1 = strongly disagree

*Reverse score for these items.

Part 2 (Items 16-40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Task on Multiple Choice Format</th>
<th>% Correct Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Identify primary colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Identify secondary colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Identify complementary colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Result of mixing red and blue.</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Definition of term “value” in painting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Definition of term “shape.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Definition of term “proportion.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Definition of term “contrast.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Definition of term “aerial or atmosphere perspective.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Definition of term “style.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Definition of term “architect.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Definition of term “perspective.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Definition of term “hue.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Identify artist from slide of work by Van Gogh.</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Identify country where Van Gogh painted the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Identify Gothic style from slide of Notre Dame Cathedral.</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Identify pointed arch structure from slide of Notre Dame.</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Identify flying buttresses from slide of Notre Dame.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Identify slide of Dali work as Surrealism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Identify slide of Monet work as Impressionism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Identify slide of Picasso work as Cubism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Identify slide of Pollock work as Abstract Expressionism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Identify slide of Seurat work as Pointillism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Identify slide of Mona Lisa as from Renaissance period.</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Identify slide of Mona Lisa as work of Da Vinci.</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score 44.33
items and with the national age group scores and the Hopkins fourth grade (10-year-old) students.

The sixth grade Hopkins students scored considerably higher on these items than their schoolmates in the fourth grade. They scored three times higher than the NAEP 13-year-olds and nearly doubled the scores of the NAEP 17-year-old students. It is important to point out that no tests of statistical significance were attempted and that these five items do not constitute an adequate test that would be representative of the breadth that we recognize as essential for sound art education. We simply wanted to see how students in programs that have been identified as promising would perform on some of the items for which we have national norms and which were available for our use. Rather than drawing conclusions from the comparisons of students’ scores, we present the data as support for our observations of the Hopkins program of art education.

Because the regular elementary classroom teachers are central to the implementation of the Hopkins K-6 art curriculum, my research assistants and I decided that we needed to know more about how these teachers regarded and carried out their responsibilities as art teachers. We devised a questionnaire of 22 items that could be completed within about 15 minutes. The Hopkins administrators and teachers were very cooperative and allowed us to administer the questionnaires at regular faculty meetings of the six elementary schools. Teachers participated on a voluntary and anonymous basis and, as far as we know, all teachers who attended the faculty meetings responded to the questionnaires.

From the responses of 103 teachers from the six Hopkins elementary schools (see Table 5), we learned that 94 percent who have a copy of the art curriculum for their grade level in their classrooms. The 6 percent who indicated that they did not have the curriculum can be accounted for as teachers who do not teach art, such as physical education, reading, and music specialists. The Hopkins teachers indicated that they teach art an average of about 69 minutes per week and 80 percent indicated that they use the art curriculum document “often.” The same percentage indicated that they teach the district’s goals and objectives for art “often.”

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task on Multiple-Choice Format</th>
<th>10 year Hopkins</th>
<th>13 year NAEP</th>
<th>17 year NAEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify slide of Dali work as Surrealism</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify slide of Monet work as Impressionism</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify slide of Picasso work as Cubism</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify slide of Mona Lisa as from Renaissance Period</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Gothic style from slide of Notre Dame Cathedral</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percent correct</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>28.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
HOPKINS GRADE 6 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES (N = 103)

Part 1 (Items 1–15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like to draw.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I like to paint.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy making cartoons.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like to look at interesting buildings.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I enjoy learning about artists.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like to look at paintings.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to look at sculpture.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy talking about art.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I like to learn about art from other times and places.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Almost anyone can learn to enjoy art.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Artists are usually strange people.*</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Science is more important than art.*</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All students should take art in school.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Looking at art is boring.*</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is possible to become well-educated without studying art.*</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score 3.41

Score: 5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

*Reverse score for these items.

Part 2 (Items 16–40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Task on Multiple Choice Format</th>
<th>% Correct Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Identify primary colors.</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Identify secondary colors.</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Identify complementary colors.</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Result of mixing red and blue.</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Definition of term “value” in painting.</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Definition of term “shape.”</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Definition of term “proportion.”</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Definition of term “contrast.”</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Definition of term “aerial or atmosphere perspective.”</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Definition of term “style.”</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Definition of term “architect.”</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Definition of term “perspective.”</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Identify artist from slide of work by Van Gogh.</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Identify country where Van Gogh painted the work.</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Identify Gothic style from slide of Notre Dame Cathedral.</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Identify pointed arch structure from slide of Notre Dame.</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Identify flying buttresses from slide of Notre Dame.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Dali work as Surrealism.</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Monet work as Impressionism.</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Picasso work as Cubism.</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Pollock work as Abstract Expressionism.</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Seurat work as Pointillism.</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Mona Lisa as from Renaissance period.</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Identify slide of Mona Lisa as work of Da Vinci.</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score 51.69
During our conversations with teachers in Hopkins and Milwaukee, we observed that our questions referring to teaching in the critical and historical domains were not always well understood. Some teachers indicated to us that they were not attending to these areas, but through classroom visits we sometimes observed that they were, indeed, providing their students with historical information as well as discussion of art works. For this reason the questionnaire items were constructed with explicit attention to teacher’s classroom behaviors. For example, the Hopkins teachers indicated that they display art prints often (32 percent) or occasionally (57 percent); 84 percent show art slides or filmstrips (15 percent often, 69 percent occasionally) to the students, and about the same proportions discuss art and artists with their students. In response to the statement, “I teach my students to describe and analyze works of art,” 83 percent indicated that they do this either often (16 percent) or occasionally (67 percent). These figures represent a fairly strong emphasis on teaching activities that are conducive to the fostering of learning in the critical and historical domains. Although teachers are more involved with directing their students in the making of art (67 percent often, 29 percent occasionally), more than 80 percent of them also display and discuss art and teach their students some of the skills of criticism.

When we asked the Hopkins teachers which areas of the school curriculum they felt best and least well prepared to teach, we received a somewhat surprising result. Typically, elementary teachers are least confident in the so-called specialty areas of art, music, and physical education. The Hopkins teachers said they felt best prepared to teach reading (83 percent), mathematics (71 percent), and language arts (56 percent), with art (34 percent) and social studies (35 percent) virtually tied for fourth place. They indicated their lack of confidence to teach science (only 19 percent said they felt best prepared), music (11 percent), and physical education (8 percent).

A similar pattern resulted when the teachers were asked to designate the areas in the curriculum that they felt least prepared to teach. Music (73 percent), physical education (68

| Table 4 |

| COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGES, HOPKINS SIXTH GRADE WITH NAEP AND HOPKINS FOURTH GRADE |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Task on Multiple-Choice | Percent Correct Responses |
| | 10 year Hopkins | 12 year Hopkins | 13 year NAEP | 17 year NAEP |
| Identify slide of Dalí work as Surrealism. | 16.5 | 42.7 | 9.6 | 15.3 |
| Identify slide of Monet work as Impressionism. | 27.8 | 30.1 | 10.5 | 20.5 |
| Identify slide of Picasso work as Cubism. | 32.0 | 48.5 | 12.0 | 14.9 |
| Identify slide of Mona Lisa as from Renaissance Period. | 38.1 | 51.5 | 25.0 | 55.0 |
| Identify style from slide of Notre Dame Cathedral. | 24.7 | 46.6 | 24.2 | 34.2 |
| Average percent correct | 27.62 | 51.69 | 16.26 | 28.18 |
percent), and science (45 percent), received the highest responses, with art following at 38 percent. This means that about a third of the teachers placed art as one of three subjects that they felt best prepared to teach and a slightly higher proportion felt that it was one of three subjects that they are least able to teach. These responses suggest that the Hopkins approach, with a prescriptive curriculum and the support of an art specialist, tends to increase teachers' confidence in their ability to teach art.

Several questionnaire items elicited responses to statements about art education. In response to the statement: "I believe that art is basic in education," 97 percent of the Hopkins elementary teachers either agreed (45 percent) or strongly agreed (52 percent). All but one person agreed (37 percent) or strongly agreed (62 percent) with the statement: "Art is a regular part of the curriculum in my school." Teachers gave similar positive responses to items regarding administrative support for art and the willingness of teachers to follow the district's art curriculum. From these responses the elementary teachers apparently have a positive attitude toward art, the art curriculum, and their own implementation of the art curriculum. Fewer teachers agreed (33 percent) or strongly agreed (10 percent) that "the status of the art program is as high as that of any other subject in the district's curriculum." Given the amount of time that is devoted to art instruction, in the minds of the teachers art is among the second rank of subjects for study.

Another interesting finding from the questionnaire is the general agreement (19 percent strongly agreed, 55 percent agreed) to the statement: "In the long run, concepts learned about the visual and cultural heritage will be just as valuable to students as anything they gain from art-making activities." Only 11 percent disagreed with this statement and 15 percent were uncertain. Other items reported above indicate that the teachers continue the long tradition of student art-making in their classrooms, but they also value the learning that can occur in the critical and cultural or historical domains. In general the questionnaire results suggest that the teachers support the art curriculum and agree with its direction.

SECONDARY ART EDUCATION

Art education at the junior high and senior high school levels in Hopkins is similar to what is found in many school districts around the United States. Junior high school students are required to take art for 12 weeks in grade seven, six weeks in grade eight (with another six weeks optional), and art is elective (in six week blocks) for ninth grade students. There is no written art curriculum at the junior high level and teachers are fairly free to teach what they consider is most important. The approach is different from the elementary art program in several ways.

At the junior high school level the individual art teacher, a professionally educated and certified art specialist, rather than the art curriculum, determines what is taught. Teacher autonomy with respect to the art curriculum is almost complete. The four teachers who direct the program at this level probably share many values and work together within each of the two junior high schools.

Another difference between the elementary and junior high art programs is the degree of emphasis on art production, which is stronger in grades 7-9. The approach to art education at the junior high school level in Hopkins is more typical of the traditional emphasis on art media and production that has dominated the field for several decades in this country. The elementary curriculum places much more emphasis on the critical and historical domains. The junior high art program is not based on a conception of sequence, which would be difficult to achieve
### Table 5

**HOPKINS ELEMENTARY TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES**

6 Elementary Schools  
103 Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. I have a copy of the art curriculum for my grade level in my classroom. | Yes 94%  
No 6% |
| 2. On the average over the year, I teach art in my classroom about 69 minutes per week. |                     |
| 3. I use the district art curriculum guide.                          | 80 %  
13 %  
2 %  
5 % |
| 4. I teach the goals and objectives for art outlined in the district guide. | 79  
12  
3  
6 |
| 5. I display or show art prints to my students.                      | 32  
57  
11  
0 |
| 6. I show art slides or filmstrips to my students.                    | 15  
69  
11  
5 |
| 7. I discuss works of art and artists with my students.              | 20  
63  
15  
2 |
| 8. I teach my students to describe and analyze works of art.         | 16  
67  
14  
3 |
| 9. I direct my students in the making of art objects.                | 67  
29  
3  
1 |

10. Which three areas of the curriculum do you feel **best** prepared to teach?

- 83% reading  
- 56% language arts  
- 35% social studies  
- 11% music  
- 71% mathematics  
- 19% science  
- 34% art  
- 8% physical education

11. Which three areas of the curriculum do you feel **least** prepared to teach?

- 1% reading  
- 10% language arts  
- 13% social studies  
- 73% music  
- 5% mathematics  
- 45% science  
- 38% art  
- 68% physical education

12. When it comes to teaching art I worry about (mark all that apply):

- *25%* allocating time for it in the week  
- *18%* managing materials  
- *8%* answering student's questions  
- *25%* my own knowledge of art and their works  
- *24%* my own experience with artist's materials  

*percent of all responses*
Table 5—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I believe that art is basic in education.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My students know the names of quite a few artists.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Art is a regular part of the curriculum in my school.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I don't have as much time for art in my classroom as I had several years ago.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Other curriculum priorities cause me to teach art less often than in previous years.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I personally believe that the status of the art program is as high as that of any other subject in the district curriculum.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In the long run, concepts learned about the visual and cultural heritage will be just as valuable to students as anything they gain from art-making activities.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I actually have little desire to follow our district's art curriculum.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I think that the art program in this district receives an unusually high degree of support from the central administration.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I think that the art curriculum guides in this district are probably among the very best in the country.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unless the teachers reached some type of formal agreement regarding goals, content, and art media.

The strength of the current junior high school art program lies in the professional backgrounds and experience of the art teachers, all of whom have taught in the district for years. A junior high curriculum that is an extension of the elementary art curriculum has been written, but it is not yet available to the junior high art teachers and principals. The response of the art specialists to the new junior high art curriculum to this point has lacked enthusiasm. The divergence of approach to art education between the elementary and junior high schools is the most likely cause for this lack of acceptance. A discussion of these factors will be found in Section 6 below.

The high school art program is directed by two art specialists at the district’s only high school. Following is the list of art courses offered at Hopkins High School:

**Fine Arts**

- Beginning Drawing and Painting I
- Beginning Drawing and Painting II
- Advanced Drawing and Painting I
- Advanced Drawing and Painting II
- Sculpture I
- Sculpture II
- Advanced Sculpture
- Art Appreciation

**Commercial Art**

- Graphic Design
- Illustration
- Theatrical Design

**Crafts**

- Ceramics I
- Advanced Ceramics
- Jewelry I
- Advanced Jewelry

The emphasis in the high school is also on studio art production. The art appreciation course is an attempt to provide focused instruction in the critical and historical domains, but it is not offered frequently, because large enrollments are required to maintain teaching positions in elective departments such as art. Students expect to make art using the various modes and media of which the course titles are descriptive. The notion of an elective class that requires academic rigor in the use of written and spoken language and that requires the mastery of knowledge and concepts is not a well accepted idea in most high schools.

Because no art is required of high school students, the art teachers are forced to cater to the preferences of the students and to entice them into their courses in order to maintain the enrollments that will assure the teachers’ continued employment. One teacher comments, “I’m at a point in my career where I feel I can’t teach the way I want to teach.” He is a successful exhibiting artist and his students have been outstanding in gaining recognition (e.g., Scholastic
Art Awards) for their artwork. He has tried to teach art history and criticism by offering the art appreciation course, but enrollments have been small. He believes that the art program could improve in the directions mentioned above, but this would take time and the support of the administration when class enrollments are not up to par. This art teacher has been in his current teaching position for only a few years and he has the least seniority, so his job is in the greatest peril. Because of his interest in curriculum issues and his professional background, he was hired by the district to work on writing the new junior high art curriculum.

ART ADMINISTRATION

The era of art administration began in Hopkins with the hiring of Carol Sirrine as Fine Arts Chairperson in 1979. She is a half-time administrator similar to the district's other content coordinators, and she has responsibility over music and dance (movement) as well as the visual arts. A so-called half-time position as an art administrator can easily take much more than 50 percent of one's time. Carol Sirrine's record suggests that she has given generously beyond half-time. The following list of goals provides a description of her job and suggests the level of vigor and the vision that she brings to the position. Not included with this list are the detailed "action plan" and the list of target dates by which each task is to be accomplished.\textsuperscript{8}

\textit{Goals, 1982–83}:

1. To develop a curriculum document for visual arts 7–12.
2. To develop a community awareness of the Fine Arts program in Hopkins.
3. To become familiar with individuals and their needs in the music/art departments.
4. To build support and understanding of the Hopkins Fine Arts program with community arts resources and artists.

In addition to identifying and writing tasks that need to be done, Carol achieves most of what she sets for goals very close to the dates that she sets for completion.

An important aspect of Carol Sirrine's job is her supervision of the elementary art consultant, a position created at her request to assist with the implementation of the newly developed art curriculum in 1980. Nancy Pauly is the only person to have held the art specialist position, so time will have to pass in order to ascertain what parts of the two positions are factors of the personalities that hold them.

The position of elementary art consultant in the Hopkins district is of special interest for this study. Two factors appear to be essential for the success of art instruction by regular classroom teachers: one is the detailed curriculum and the other is the in-service support of the art specialist. The primary responsibility of the art specialist is to assist teachers to implement the art curriculum.

Teachers can request assistance from Nancy for particular lessons. Eventually each teacher must become essentially independent of special assistance beyond what is part of the art consultant's regular schedule.

Another task for the consultant is to orient new teachers (very few each year) and teachers who are changing grade level assignment to the use of the art curriculum. This is accomplished very much like the original in-service training of all teachers, but on a smaller basis.

\textsuperscript{8}Harry Green, "Walter Smith: The Forgotten Man," \textit{Art Education}, Vol. 19, No. 1, January 1966.

\textsuperscript{9}Intra-district communications of Ms. Sirrine are included in this report with her permission.
Perhaps the most important aspect of the elementary art specialist role in the Hopkins district is the conformity of the job to the realities found in the schools. The first reality that is true in Hopkins and throughout much of the country is that art instruction is the responsibility of classroom teachers. The second reality is that these teachers, regardless of the quality and specificity of the art curriculum, require professional support for the art instruction that they perform. Hopkins demonstrates the efficient use of the art specialist (her salary is paid 1/6 from each school's budget) who supports and directs art instruction for all children in grades K through 6. This is very different and considerably less costly than hiring art specialists who travel from school to school with the traditional "art on a cart," or art specialists with art rooms in each school. And, although classroom teachers lack the artistic background and knowledge of the specialist, they do understand instruction and they know their students. Under the conditions described above, the classroom teachers are able in my estimation to provide their students with a worthwhile program of art instruction.

This finding should not be construed as a recommendation that all art instruction at the elementary level should be accomplished by classroom teachers. Rather it should suggest the potential effectiveness of sound art curriculum at the elementary level, not only for classroom teachers, but for art specialists as well. The accomplishment of a regular program of art instruction in the Hopkins schools should encourage districts that have no art programs to attempt similar implementations. This is, in fact, occurring in Minnesota, where at least three other districts have requested assistance and permission to replicate the Hopkins art program using the Hopkins curriculum. At least two other nearby school districts are attempting to develop similar curricula for their own use.
5. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ELEMENTARY ART CURRICULUM

THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

The team of writers who developed the Hopkins curriculum produced seven documents, one for each grade, K-6. The curriculum documents contain lessons with specific instructions for teachers and the content for each grade is correlated with the other grades in a vertical sequence. Content from the critical, historical, and productive domains are included at each level. Activities and concepts are organized according to children's developmental characteristics.

A large proportion of the elementary schools in the United States have no art curriculum, in the form of either written documents or as actual programs of instruction. In these schools art obviously is not regarded as a subject that warrants precious time in the school day on a regular basis. In the view of those who value art and the insights and life enrichments that are available through art, children in schools without do not receive a balanced education.

Another group of schools offers their students activities that are labeled “art” but that have little, if any, relationship to the disciplines of art history, art criticism, or art production. In these schools it is assumed that when children manipulate crayons, colored papers, and tempera paints, they are engaging in art education. This of course is not necessarily true any more than children who are allowed to play with test tubes and beakers are automatically engaged in science education. As Efland has pointed out, many of the “school art” activities that have been devised by clever adults have little if any relationship to the real world of art. These so-called art activities are too often mindless gimmicks that do little more for children than engage their attention and provide a respite from the rigors of learning to read, write, and figure.

This type of activity probably does little harm except that justifiable educational activities are displaced from limited school time as a result. The real damage is done when educators and parents regard such ersatz activities as art education. When school decisionmakers need to make budget cuts they rightly regard these trivial activities as nonessential and remove them from the curriculum.

A smaller proportion of elementary schools use written art curriculum guides, which usually provide a general plan for instruction but do not provide actual lessons that teachers can apply directly in their classes. The quality and efficacy of these guides vary widely, as do curriculum materials in other fields of education. Some elementary art guides are little more than lists of art media and modes that teachers might use in their classrooms. Others provide a series of suggested activities with little attention to their relationships to one another or to any organizing themes.

11Chapman, Instant Art, p. 41.
Beyond the nonprogram, the ersatz program, and the ineffective art guides are a small number of carefully and soundly devised art curriculum guides that provide teachers with valuable direction. A few school districts in the country have been using such art guides for decades and some have continued to revise and update their art curricula. Although some of these documents are intelligently organized and well written, few attend to the critical and historical domains in anywhere near the detail that they provide for art production. Many are strongly, if not exclusively, oriented toward art education as art production. In this context the Hopkins curriculum is unique because it has a written art curriculum. The well-organized, sequential development of the curriculum places it further out of the ordinary, and its balanced attention to the three domains of art learning make it even more rare.

The Hopkins elementary art curriculum is a recent application of theory in the field of art education. The process of its development began in the spring of 1980 when the district hired Dr. Margaret DiBlasio to work with a team to write the curriculum. The team of writers consisted of Carol Sirrine, whose background is in music and elementary education; an elementary teacher with an interest in art; the aide who had sparked the process with her presentation to the school board; and Nancy Pauly, a graduate student in art education at the University of Minnesota. Dr. DiBlasio brought to the project a theoretical understanding of art education and curriculum development. Her background includes extensive experience as an art teacher and as an artist, a strong background in philosophy, and a Ph.D. in art education from Ohio State University where she worked under Manuel Barkan. She referred during the development of the Hopkins curriculum to the basic work in art curriculum by Barkan, Chapman, and Kern that was done during the early years of CEMREL (Central Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory). Professor DiBlasio, or Maggie, as everyone in the project called her, was also familiar with the Ohio State elementary art document published the same year as the CEMREL Guidelines and containing many of the same ideas about curriculum development.

The Hopkins team worked together for several weeks and by May 1980 they had developed the theoretical and conceptual framework for the curriculum. Carol Sirrine describes the process:

And after meeting after meeting after meeting we finally got a framework... I have three huge manila folders of work that we went through... identifying not only the themes and the subject matter that we wanted to work with, but the artists we wanted to study, where they fit, what was appropriate for third graders, and what was appropriate for sixth graders.

The decision had been made at this point that the curriculum would present the content of the disciplines of art, art history, and art criticism, although not using the domains as the organizational categories. The emphasis of the curriculum would be on a balance among these domains with a thematic organization. Dr. DiBlasio explains:

The content needed to be organized around something that we thought would have follow-through. I didn’t want to use the labels “producing art,” “art history” and “art criticism,” because these are not appropriate terms for primary grade teachers to employ. I don’t think it’s effective to talk about art criticism, for example, when you are dealing with young children. You can engage in descriptive activities, but it didn’t seem to make much sense to have the teachers or the children think about these activities as criticism or history.

Having developed the initial framework for the curriculum to their satisfaction, the group prepared to present the framework to the Hopkins elementary teachers. The purpose of the

---

15 Manuel Barkan, Laura Chapman, and Evan Kern, Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education, CEMREL (Central Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory), St. Louis, 1970.

16 These and other comments are from interviews with Dr. DiBlasio, recorded and printed with her permission.
meeting was to explain the framework and ask for volunteers to pilot the curriculum in each grade level at each school beginning the following autumn when school started. Maggie spoke to the faculties of the six elementary schools for about 90 minutes during an in-service day. The elementary teachers evidently were motivated by the presentation as about 50 volunteered to pilot the new curriculum during the 1980-81 school year. According to Carol Sirrine, “we did manage to get seven volunteers, from every elementary school, from each grade level, that were willing to pilot the new curriculum.”

The astonishing aspect of this meeting is that there was at that time not even one lesson written for the art curriculum. The district, Carol, Maggie, Frank Brendemuehl, and the writing team had gone far out on the limb to promise the enthusiastic teachers something that was not yet in existence. “But,” Carol relates, “we believed in ourselves and we were really on a high, I think, because we had gotten this framework together.” The experiences of this group of curriculum developers suggest that the enterprise of creating an instructional program for this district and these children and teachers was carried out with a sense of purpose and exhilaration.

As soon as school ended at the first week of June, the group began to write. The pace was fast, if not frantic, but the groundwork had been laid and all of the writers had participated in the development of the framework so they understood the framework and each other. Carol describes this time:

Every lesson that we wrote we shared with the entire group. So, we were writing, and once we had finished a unit we got together and critiqued it as a group. And then we went back to our little cubicles and wrote and wrote and wrote. Well, this was July, and I’ve never been so harried because you had to go back and check the framework to make sure that everything was covered. . . . We would sit and haggle, but it finally got to the point where it was printable.

Dr. DiBlasio edited all of the lessons before they were ready for printing—a mammoth job. None of the sixth grade materials were completed during that summer, but all the other six grades were ready and the curriculum was in place when school started.

At this point Carol Sirrine began to perceive the extent of the implementation task and her own inexperience with such things as art materials and the technical aspects of art education. She took her concerns to Dr. Brendemuehl and suggested that they needed art specialists in each school. When Brendemuehl rejected this idea on the basis of cost, Carol suggested that they hire one person as a teacher educator who could also teach art to children. They agreed to consider the idea and Carol wrote a job description that incorporated all the things that she thought she couldn’t do. The job description was approved and posted and applicants were interviewed. The person selected for the art specialist was Nancy Pauly, an experienced certified art teacher who had been on the writing team during the entire process.

IMPLEMENTATION: THE FIRST YEAR

With the curriculum ready for its pilot trial in the classrooms, preparations were made to provide the necessary in-service education for the elementary teachers who would teach the lessons. In opting for art education as the responsibility of regular classroom teachers, the Hopkins administration recognized the necessity not only for a sufficiently detailed and prescriptive curriculum, but also for a thorough program to assist teachers to learn to implement the curriculum. The lessons learned in the 1960s and 1970s by educators who attempted to implement the national mathematics, science, and social studies curricula were evidently not lost on
the Hopkins people. Unless teachers understand the goals and logical organization of the curriculum and unless they believe in its validity and efficacy, they are not likely to teach it with intelligence and enthusiasm.

Professor DiBlasio continued her close association with the process by serving in an inservice capacity. By this time she had gained an appreciation for the Hopkins approach to the new art curriculum:

When I first agreed to do it (develop curriculum) I didn't appreciate the potential of the project because I had yet to discover the nature of the school district's commitment. Before long I realized that this district was unique in that they had in place—in my estimation—an excellent format not only for developing materials, but also for implementing them. Even before I met the superintendent and the curriculum consultant I sensed that a businesslike attitude prevailed. This attitude was one of getting things done efficiently and ensuring that implementation had been completed.

The in-service for the 54 teachers who had volunteered to pilot the art curriculum consisted of two-hour sessions every six weeks. The sessions were scheduled after school hours and teachers were paid to attend. Dr. DiBlasio conducted the sessions assisted by Nancy Pauly; Carol Sirrine also attended many of the meetings.

The sessions were organized around each of the four thematic units of the curriculum and were presented to teachers according to grade level. The combination of four units and six grades resulted in a total of 24 in-service sessions.

An important aspect of the in-service process dealt with changing the teachers' conceptions of art education. Because the curriculum was content-based and sequentially organized, the selection of lessons and lesson activities was not arbitrary. Maggie DiBlasio describes the working sessions:

Our concern was that the teachers sometimes might skip the first part of the lesson. Perhaps the teachers might feel that they didn't have time to do everything or, sensing the students' eagerness to get involved with the materials, without using this experience to build concepts or reinforce ideas. Inservicing became a time of really talking through the whole process with teachers, of reorienting them to a different set of expectations concerning how an art class can be conducted. Most of all, the teachers needed to appreciate the value—the long term value—of talking to students in this way, in order to build concepts. We also had to convince the teachers of the need to teach sequentially, to use every lesson rather than to select at random.

It became evident through this type of probing and questioning that some of the teachers were encountering difficulties with this approach to teaching art. Nevertheless, most seemed genuinely interested and willing to try new ways.

A very effective aspect of the Hopkins implementation model was the plan to use the pilot teachers as implementation leaders for their grade levels in their own buildings the following year. The knowledge that they would assist their colleagues next year motivated the teachers to "get it right" the first time. The role of implementation leader co-opted these teachers as proponents of the art curriculum. Many of the pilot teachers conducted in-service instruction in their schools during the second year of the implementation process. Another very positive result of the first year of in-service meetings was that Nancy Pauly, whose major responsibility was to provide in-service support for teachers, gained valuable experience. She identified the problems, the most prevalent questions, and the lessons that caused the most difficulty.
THE SECOND YEAR

At the first art in-service meeting in the fall of 1981, Carol Sirrine and Nancy Pauly gave an overview of the art curriculum, showed slides from some of the lessons, and showed examples of student work that had been produced during the pilot year. The six secondary art teachers were invited to this meeting and were introduced to the elementary teachers. They expressed their interest in receiving better (art) educated students from the elementary schools. The plan for four in-service sessions with Nancy for each teacher during the year was outlined at the end of this first session.

Teachers had been prepared in several ways for the new art curriculum they would be expected to teach. The art curriculum project was well-known in the district, and all teachers had participated in at least eight hours of in-service art instruction. They all had heard Dr. DiBlasio outline the curriculum framework and they all had contact with one of the pilot teachers at their own grade level. All of this preparation was exemplary, but it doesn’t explain the teachers’ motivation to take on a new responsibility in addition to the already heavy load of keeping records, teaching reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science, evaluating and reporting pupil progress, working with mainstreamed special students, and all of the other concerns of the classroom teacher.

Elementary students work at an art activity directed by their classroom teacher, with support from Ms. Pauly, art consultant.
It appears that many of the teachers were sufficiently interested and motivated to welcome the new program, but it is doubtful that full implementation would have been accomplished without the strong support of the administration. In the spring of 1981, Dr. Brendemuehl's office informed all teachers of the completion of the new curriculum and the expectation that all children would receive art instruction. The administration’s direction that the art curriculum would be taught was consistent with their stance in other subject areas. The practice in Hopkins is that curriculum is developed and approved, implemented, and evaluated, with what Maggie DiBlasio referred to as the district’s “businesslike attitude.” The six elementary building principals are attuned to this approach and work with top administration in this direction.

THE ELEMENTARY ART CURRICULUM

The intellectual roots of at least part of the Hopkins curriculum framework go back to the CEMREL Guidelines document published in 1970. This 600-plus page volume was the result of Phase I of the Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program directed by Manuel Barkan of the Ohio State University, and was written “to produce guidelines for curriculum development in aesthetic education which would be applicable to grades K-12 and which would give particular attention to substantive and methodological problems.” This project was most influential in launching the aesthetic education movement that was very prominent especially during the decade of the 1970s. The CEMREL Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program was Phase II of the project that Barkan initiated. It was intended to “produce curriculum materials for aesthetic education based on these guidelines” as well as to conduct “field trials and dissemination of the curriculum materials.”
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Many of the ideas from the *Guidelines* are not appropriate for application in a curriculum that deals with art as a discipline, but several portions are useful. The aesthetic education model focused on aesthetic experience and juxtaposed several arts in units of instruction to "demonstrate that all the arts are potential sources of aesthetic experience." Dr. DiBlasio did not follow that for the Hopkins framework, but other basic assumptions were accepted. For example, the simple but seemingly revolutionary notion that "curriculum development requires shaping and arranging a group of basic components—GOALS, CONTENT, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, AND ACTIVITIES"—is apparent in the Hopkins curriculum.

Perhaps even more helpful for the Hopkins writers were the *Guidelines for Planning Art Instruction in the Elementary Schools of Ohio*, also published in 1970. The Ohio guide was one of the early curriculum documents that made explicit the art discipline orientation to art education advocated by Eisner and Smith. The Ohio guide states that "the subject matter of the field of art itself has become an increasingly important source for the goals of art education," and points out that "the conception of art activities has been broadened to include art criticism and art history as well as studio production." All of these sources in the literature are examples of the movement in art education away from the child-centered approach of Lowenfeld and others to the content or discipline-based stance that has been adopted by the Getty Trust. The criteria for the selection of the Hopkins curriculum for this study originate in these same sources.

The general description in the front of the Hopkins art curriculum lists the major goals of art education as "personal development, artistic heritage, and art in society," and describes "expression in art and response to art" as the two basic modes of participation. Expression involves "discovering ideas through personal experience, transforming ideas to create art and working with media to make art." Response involves "perceiving and describing works of art, interpreting works of art, and judging works of art." These ideas are the most directly related to the CEMREL and Ohio publications from which the Hopkins curriculum devolves. Based on theory in the professional literature of art education and other relevant academic fields, the Hopkins curriculum is an original and innovative document in its own right, in which theory is translated to practice for a specific educational setting.

The Hopkins curriculum is organized on four themes taught in order each year from kindergarten through grade six. The first is "This Is My World," which is based on the notion that artists get their ideas for art by observing their environment and experiencing the things in their own world. Maggie DiBlasio explains that the purpose of the unit is "to teach kids how to get ideas for their personal visual expression. We take themes from their own personal life or from their school life to motivate them."

The second unit for each grade is "Learning to Look." DiBlasio mentions such authors

---
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as Feldman\textsuperscript{29} and Lanier\textsuperscript{30} with respect to the idea of "visual literacy," as well as Gibson\textsuperscript{31} and McFee\textsuperscript{32} as sources for this unit. Maggie explains the unit:

Preconditions affect how we attend to our phenomenal environment; children need to be predisposed before they can go out and find and discover. Building predispositions is a modeling sort of activity: you talk about; you direct attention; you focus; you give reasons for attending to things. Eventually the children begin to develop habits of attending to things.

The third unit is directed toward the theme "Art Is All Around Us." The focus of this unit, according to DiBlasio, is intended to be upon art history. The idea is for the children to look at the world of art in a cultural context as well as in the museum masterpieces. DiBlasio comments:

The entire curriculum introduces students to a number of visual images and exemplars. For the primary level, unit three focuses on the study of images of art concentrating on social values, function, and geographical groupings. Experiences planned for the unit enable students to see relationships between their own expressive efforts and the adult world of art.

The plan is to follow the perceptual emphasis of the second unit with opportunities to apply those learnings to exemplars of quality art. She is not satisfied that the unit is as effective as it might be and intends to improve the content and scholarship in the unit.

Skill development in art production is emphasized in the fourth unit, entitled "I Use Artist's Materials." Each of the four units provides art activities for the students, but this unit develops the productive aspect in greater depth. Productive activities are utilized in the first three units to develop concepts within the unit themes.

Assuming that the curriculum delivers the intentions of each of these units and teachers are able to implement them, each student at each grade level will experience six weeks of art instruction emphasizing each of the four themes, or 24 weeks of planned art instruction each year. During the units, children will observe their environment as a source for art expression, attend to visual and aesthetic phenomena from an artistic point of view, gain experience with the historical and cultural aspects of art through viewing art objects, and develop technical and expressive skills in their own art production. Because the school year includes additional weeks, the curriculum suggests a culminating project for the children entitled "This Is My Show," which encourages the development of an art display that would review and consolidate the learning accomplished during the year.

Each unit of the curriculum is organized under headings that can be monitored for scope from unit to unit and from year to year. For example, it is not difficult to follow the content of the curriculum across grade levels under the headings of "function" or "vocabulary" to discover what is presented at each level, how the content relates to that in the next level, and how comprehensively the content represents the concept or heading across the curriculum. The major headings for each unit are:

\begin{itemize}
  \item SUBJECT MATTER
  \item ART FORM
  \item VISUAL QUALITIES
  \item MATERIALS
  \item TECHNICAL SKILLS/PROCESS FUNCTION
\end{itemize}

STYLE
VISUAL RESOURCES/ARTISTS AND THEIR WORKS
VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT
NOTES TO THE TEACHER

Each Hopkins elementary teacher receives a curriculum booklet approximately 100 pages in length with about 24 lessons. Each grade level booklet contains, first of all, an overview of the year's program on a two page chart. A unit overview is presented before the individual lesson plans. The lesson plans briefly list the appropriate information under each of the headings listed above, then provide detailed information for the teacher under the heading of "procedure." Following is an example from Grade 1, Unit 3, "Art Is All Around Us: American Indians' Useful Art," Activity 1, I Look at Useful Art of the American Indians:

1. Say to the students:
   "Today we are going to look at some slides. The first four slides are of containers. The containers are useful pots made by American Indians." Ask the following questions for each pot. (Slides 1–4):
   a. "Do you see any human or animal figures? What are they?"
   b. "What is the overall shape of the pot?"
   c. "What shapes do you see on the pot?" (round, square, triangular, rectangular)
   d. "What kind of lines do you see on the pot?" (jagged, smooth, curved, dark, light, thin, thick, straight, zig-zag)
   e. "How do you think the texture would feel if you touched this pot?" (rough, smooth, soft, hard, raised, lowered, etc.)

2. Say to the students:
   "Now we will look at three slides of weaving."

3. Show Slide 5. Say to the students:
   "This slide shows an American Indian artist making a different kind of useful art. Can you tell what she is making? This woman is weaving a blanket using wool yarn. She weaves the yarn in and out of the strings that you can see in the slide. The wooden frame that she is working on is called a loom. She had to carefully plan the design of the blanket before she began weaving. You can see that the top part of the blanket is finished. What kinds of lines do you see? What kinds of shapes do you see on the completed portion of the blanket? Weaving a blanket like this is hard work. It will take a long time to complete the blanket."

4. Show the next slide. (Slide 6) Have the students identify the kinds of lines, shapes, colors that are in the blanket.
   Say to the students:
   "If you could have this blanket, what would you do with it?"
5. Show Slide 7.

"This American Indian Weaving is called a Button Blanket. Why do you think it is called that? The figure in the center of the blanket is made out of small shells. What do you think the figure is?" (Tell the students the figure represents a bear.) Have the students identify the lines, shapes, and colors of the blanket. What kind of mood do you think the bear is in? Can you make the same expression on your face?"


"This is a slide of two women artists making useful art. What are they weaving? (baskets) "Where else can you see an example of weaving?" Have the students select a woven object in the slide. Discuss what its use might be. Repeat this process several times.

7. (Optional) Show Slides 9, 10, 11 and have the students identify their uses.

*Slide 9*—Klikitat basket

*Slide 10*—Potawatomi beaded moccasins

*Slide 11*—Arapaho ghost dance shirt

8. You could suggest that the children draw the pots or weaving that they liked in their sketchbooks. Sketchbooks can be used after viewing movies or filmstrips in science or social studies, too. Having a child recall and record visual information should help him/her remember it better and attend to more details in the future.

The level of detail provided for the teacher is indicative of the intent to implement the curriculum through regular classroom teachers. The in-service assistance available to the teachers is often essential when the lesson requires some background in art content. The availability of an art specialist on a regular schedule and by request is an integral aspect of the curriculum. As Maggie says, "We did some of the things that the document itself didn't do in the in-servicing of teachers." As prescriptive as this curriculum is, it is not intended to be "teacher proof." It is based on the assumption that the classroom teacher can deliver it, but it also recognizes the limitations of most elementary teachers with respect to art content.

The Hopkins curriculum is organized in consideration of children's cognitive development from kindergarten to the upper elementary grades. The writing of Jean Piaget is one source that guided Dr. DiBlasio in building age-related sequence into the curriculum.53 According to Piaget's theory and much related research, the abstract level of thinking is not generally achieved until the "formal operations" stage around eleven years of age (sixth grade). Most of elementary school education occurs during the stage of "concrete operations" (7–11 years of age) with kindergarten and first grade occurring during the "preoperational" period (2–7 years of age). An example of the application of Piaget's theory can be seen in the way the concept "abstract" is handled in the curriculum. Instructional activities deal with "subject matter" as opposed to "theme," as the former is seen as concrete and the latter as abstract. DiBlasio explains her reasoning:

---

Young children can talk about happiness, for example, but for them happiness is concretized in individual experiences, not summarized in an abstraction. I advised the writers in constructing art lessons at the primary level not to introduce the concept of theme, but to remain at the level of concrete subject matter. We need to wait until the children have reached the formal operations stage. Then children can deal with the abstracted notion of a theme, such as "happiness" or "peace"; they can then attempt to translate an abstract theme into a visual form.

Another example has to do with the "functions of art" category. The functions are not introduced per se in an individual unit, but are introduced concretely through particular works of art that serve these functions—e.g., commemorative, decorative, or useful. Art historical content is also introduced concretely by exposing students to works of art and artists' lives from different periods and cultures. Analytical thinking necessary to criticism in general and to conceptualizing artistic style is not introduced until the fourth grade. Before that, responding activities are exclusively discriminative and descriptive. In Maggie's words:

We don't introduce style until the fourth grade because this involves analysis, and a younger child would be confused by attempts at analysis. A child can learn the names of styles at the primary level, although this amounts to collecting vocabulary words. To understand how the complexity of the style is developed would require analysis. I maintain, on the basis of Piaget's model of developmental psychology, that analysis can take place only when the child reaches the conceptual understanding (formal operations) level of abstraction.

These examples are indicative of the care and thought that have gone into the development of the Hopkins curriculum in general. Attention has been paid to what the children who progress through the curriculum will learn and know about the functions of art, about artistic style, and about the sensuous qualities of art. The curriculum is organized so that children can gain understandings appropriate to their cognitive abilities and can build upon those understandings during subsequent months and years of art instruction.

Two observations discussed by Bruner in his Essays for the Left Hand appear to apply to the intentions of the Hopkins curriculum. The first is that "it is sentimentalism to assume that the teaching of life can be fitted always to the child's interests."34 This applies to the selection of subject matter content in the curriculum that is determined by the knowledgeable adult writers to be followed by the classroom teacher and received by the students. This thinking tends to align with a philosophical position that emphasizes what is to be experienced in a world external to the learner. Reality is not created only in experience, but also resides outside the learner. The curriculum developer can, therefore, legitimately make decisions regarding curriculum content based on professional expertise and knowledge of the subject matter, rather than relying on the child to discover what is of worth to be learned.

Nevertheless, as Bruner points out, the child is to be given careful attention and consideration in the planning of the child's education: "Insofar as possible, a method of instruction should have the objective of leading the child to discover for himself."35 In the Hopkins curriculum these ideas coalesce in the notion that, in DiBlasio’s words, “there is, after all, a larger world outside children’s consciousness and it is the function of the teacher to help the child form concepts which have reference in that world.” This view requires expert adult guidance, which, in the case of the Hopkins art program, is provided to a great extent by the prescriptive curriculum.
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6. EXTENSION OF THE CURRICULUM UPWARD

Now that the elementary art curriculum has been developed, piloted, revised, and fully implemented for two full years, work has begun to extend the art curriculum upward into the junior high school. The impetus for this undertaking comes from the district administration with the support of the fine arts chairperson, the elementary arts coordinator, and some of the secondary art teachers. Some questions have already been raised in the process of developing the junior high school curriculum having to do with conceptions of art education, the role of the art teacher, and teacher autonomy.

The dominant role model for art educators for the past several decades has been the producing artist. The literature is replete with references to the artist/teacher, and the placement of the artist role first is not arbitrary. The producing fine artist has been the role model for the teacher, and the teacher is expected to be a producing artist as a role model for the student. This approach is consistent with the dominance of art production in art education to the exclusion of attention to the critical and historical domains.

Although there is no typical context that describes the professional backgrounds of all art teachers, several factors in the development of art education are sufficiently pervasive to provide some insights that will apply in many cases. For example, it is likely that secondary art teachers have a strong emphasis in art studio production, probably in drawing, painting, and sculpture, as well as in other modes of art making. Many graduated from departments of art and had only a required minimum of association with courses in professional education. Some graduated from small programs of art education with no professional art educators on the faculty; in these cases they completed the student-teaching requirement under the direction of a professor from a department or college of education who probably had little background in art. Typically, the secondary art teacher has a few courses in art history and very little, if any, formal education in aesthetics and art criticism.

This profile implies some attitudes that art teachers might develop with respect to studio art; aspects of education such as curriculum, instruction, and evaluation; and with respect to teaching in the critical and historical domains. Even more influential than the college art curriculum, however, is the effect of the studio mystique and the charismatic aura that has been developed around the role of the artist, especially the "fine artist." The following profile of values that are sometimes communicated to art students at the college level is probably not typical of any one art department, but some combination of the beliefs and attitudes expressed will be found in many.

First, a value that one would expect to find in an art studio is a strong commitment to art. Researchers report that the only other students besides artists with a corresponding strength of values in relation to their major studies are those studying for the ministry. The strong commitment to aesthetic values by art students is attended by a corresponding lesser concern for economic and social values.

36Chapman, Instant Art, p. 89.
In some art studios or departments can be found a belief in the predominant value of art, placing the pursuit of artistic excellence as the highest value, superseding other commitments. In this environment the student is taught that an overwhelming dedication to art is required and that sacrifice of lesser values is necessary for success in art. This attitude is well-known also in the other arts such as music, theatre, and literature. The artist has what might be considered a “special calling,” almost in the order of a religious commitment, and must at all costs remain true to that calling. For example, Harold Rosenberg wrote of the Abstract Expressionists, “Based on the phenomenon of conversion the new movement is, with the majority of the painters, essentially a religious movement.”

Very often a high premium is placed on a strong individualism, which is associated with creativity and personal expression. One view of the artist’s goal is “to express one’s self aesthetically at the highest human level.” This expression means that the artist is “giving and projecting his point of view, his personal and unique feeling, thinking and perceiving” to produce a work of art. Because the person is a unique individual, adherence to a personal viewpoint is essential for creative art production. According to this view of the artist, “If we truly do our ‘own thing,’ it will be original and unique just as the person, himself, is unique.” The artist as a strong individualist was especially pervasive during the heyday of Abstract Expressionism during the 1940s, 1950s, and the early 1960s. Few artistic movements have dominated the art scene so thoroughly as Abstract Expressionism during those years and public education was undoubtedly influenced as many art teachers were educated in college departments of art that were immersed in that style. A strong ego and a persistent individualism were necessary for the artist to maintain. Hans Hofmann advised, “Everyone should be as different as possible. There is nothing that is common to all of us (artists) except our creative urge.” The non-objective painter or sculptor looked inward to his or her own thoughts and emotions for artistic subject matter rather than outward to the phenomenal world. In the words of painter Barnett Newman, “Instead of making cathedrals out of Christ, man or ‘life,’ we are making it out of ourselves, out of our own feelings.”

The artist who followed this approach relied on his or her own unique individuality and could not afford to be conventional. Therefore, nonconformity was often a strong value promulgated in college art studios that bought into this artistic genre. Thus, it became popular for artists to reject commonly accepted standards for speech, dress, and social behavior, to name a few. As Motherwell commented, “one might almost legitimately receive the impression that abstract artists don’t like anything but the act of painting.”

This view of the artist as individualist and rebel (innovator) with a predominant commitment to the artistic endeavor pervaded many art departments and often resulted in an environment that was not supportive of artistic neophytes or dilettantes. Only those art-major students who were willing to “pay the price” were considered worthy of serious attention. Non-art majors were tolerated in this environment, but often were confused by a lack of clear instruction in art fundamentals. In many cases art education students were considered almost the same as non-art majors, causing some to disguise their major when entering studio classes in
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order to receive respectful consideration.\textsuperscript{46} For these future secondary and elementary school teachers the message was clear that art values greatly supersede any considerations about educational issues. It was common for college studio instructors and professors to repudiate their roles as art educators because the overt admission that they gain their livelihood from the teaching function in an accredited, perhaps bureaucratic, institution detracts from the image of nonconformist individualist.

Barnett Newman asserted that "undoubtedly the first man was an artist,"\textsuperscript{47} and the correlate of his assertion that "the artist precedes the historian" typifies the attitude held by many artists and expressed to their historian colleagues in departments of art. The college art education student usually takes some coursework in art history, but the primary position of the artist is asserted and maintained: Historians are those who write about what artists do.

Furthermore, during the era of Abstract Expressionism, much of the artistic tradition and heritage was rejected. Newman, for example, stated: "We are freeing ourselves of the impediments of memory, association, nostalgia, legend, myth, or what have you, that have been the devices of Western European painting."\textsuperscript{48} When the knowledge of the past is viewed as an "impediment," it is unlikely that students will place high value on the study of the past.

The Abstract Expressionist's viewpoint, with its inward perspective, also discouraged the development of art criticism as an important aspect of art learning in some college art departments. Adolph Gottlieb and Mark Rothko, in their 1943 response to a \textit{New York Times} art critic, stated: "We do not intend to defend our pictures. They make their own defense. We consider them clear statements. . . . No possible set of notes can explain our paintings. Their explanation must come out of a consummated experience between picture and onlooker."\textsuperscript{49} The critic as an intermediary between the viewer and the work of art was thus rejected, and the notion was advanced that talk about art was of little value. This notion persisted in many art departments even though art critics Clement Greenberg and Harold Rosenberg were influential in the popularization of the style.

The art teacher who holds some of the values described above will have philosophical grounds for resisting a curriculum that rejects those deeply held values. The art educator who believes in the primacy of making art in relation to the study of art history and the development of the skills of criticism and appreciation will probably have some trouble accepting the notion of an art program that institutes a parity among the three domains. The art educator who holds the self-image of the individualist-artist will probably reject the idea of specific curriculum content that is intended for all students and that is to be taught in sequence.

The art educator who holds strong values for nonconformity will probably resist the institutionalization of the art program in place of the approach that centers on the artist-teacher as role model for the students. Although we did not examine the beliefs and backgrounds of the secondary art teachers in Hopkins, it is likely that some of the values described above are held by some, and it is possible that these values are influential with respect to implementation of the new art curriculum that has been developed for the junior high schools. Some of these values were expressed in interviews with the art teachers. For example, one teacher commented on the central role of the artist.

\textsuperscript{46} Chapman, \textit{Instant Art}, p. 91.
The artist is what art is. It's not galleries; I mean, galleries have nothing to do with it, it's the artist. Artists are visual, exciting, flamboyant people and without that tremendous energy you don't have artists. Ninety-nine percent of what I teach is the extending of energy and if you have enough energy to work, art will follow.

In another statement from an interview, the role model of the artist-teacher is evident:

I always consider that I'm the artist, I'm their model, and kids get to respect me as their art model and they'll learn more from me. There's nothing that they don't see in demonstrations; and I don't bring in films of somebody throwing pots. I throw pots for them, I paint for them, I draw for them, so everything is live and in color.

The question in Hopkins as in any similar situation is how secondary art specialists, especially those with years of experience who are asked to change their teaching approach, will relate to a new curriculum.

The key people who developed the elementary art curriculum, Dr. Margaret DiBlasio, Carol Sirrine, and Nancy Pauly, were the major actors in the writing of the junior high curriculum along with one of the high school art teachers. A basic document used for the development of the curriculum was “Some Essential Learner Outcomes” (SELO), a product of the Minnesota State Department of Education. The SELO publication provides learning objectives in the three domains as well as general curriculum guidance. Dr. DiBlasio also worked extensively on that document as it was developed by art educators in the state under the direction of the state art consultant.

The curriculum is organized in a format that includes specific objectives, time allocation for parts of the lesson, instructional strategies, materials required for the lesson, and instructional resources. One of the six-week units that is intended for all seventh graders is on “Design,” and it is structured to build on learning fostered by the elementary curriculum. Other units on drawing, painting, and printmaking have been developed. None of the junior high units are available at the time of this writing.

When the materials have been printed and made available to the junior high school art teachers, they will need to be pilot tested as were the elementary lessons. At this point the process has met with less enthusiasm than was the case at the elementary level. Some teachers have expressed reservations at meetings held during the process of development and some resistance to the new curriculum has been noted. The curriculum emphasis is fairly strong in the productive domain in deference to the studio orientation of the teachers who will use it. Unfortunately for purposes of this report, results of this attempt to extend a sequential art curriculum upward from elementary school to the junior high school will not be known for some time. As the Virginia Beach study of this research project suggests, art specialists can thrive within the constraints of curriculum structure. How the process is accomplished in Hopkins and how long it takes remains to be seen. Judging from the success at the elementary level and the competency and enthusiasm of those who will participate in the process, I am optimistic that the goal of a unified curriculum in art from kindergarten through junior high will be accomplished.

---

50Some Essential Learner Outcomes in Art, Minnesota State Department of Education, 1980.
7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Hopkins story seems disarmingly simple, as if it should have happened many times in many places for many years. It is the story of a small community and a small school district that decided they wanted a program of regular art instruction in the elementary schools. They undertook the task as if it were any other subject in the curriculum—as if that was the way art should be considered. The administration created a half-time fine arts chairperson position just the same as the mathematics and social studies positions. The administration, including the chairperson, decided that if they wanted art instruction they should have a curriculum so the teachers would know what to teach.

They hired an expert in art curriculum development, worked hard, and wrote an art curriculum that provided sequential learning in the three domains of history, criticism, and production. They decided that they should teach the teachers what to do with the curriculum so they held in-service meetings, just as with other subjects that required in-service support. They hired an art specialist to work with the teachers and help them, and then they asked the teachers to teach art to all of the elementary children in the district. The teachers are teaching art as well as reading, mathematics, and the other subjects in the curriculum. The children are learning about art every week. The fine arts chairperson, the elementary art consultant, and the district evaluator are working on ways to assess student learning in art similar to evaluation efforts in other areas of the school curriculum.

Can such a straightforward story inform the field of art education? Isn’t this actually a very typical example of art education in a small school district? The answers to these questions, in reverse order are no, the Hopkins art program is not at all typical and yes, the Hopkins story can inform the field of art education. As the report points out, any district with a regular elementary art program is unusual; the Hopkins program is even more unusual because it has a sequential art curriculum that balances instruction across the three domains of art learning. Perhaps the innovation in Hopkins is the development of something that art educators have been suggesting and advocating for years. When the Hopkins educators accepted the notion that art was essential to a balanced education, and the suggestion that it should be a balanced, discipline-based approach, they evidently saw no reason why they couldn’t achieve that in their district. So they did.

Of course, nothing in education is quite that simple. For example, the association with Dr. Margaret DiBlasio, who had the necessary expertise for the task, was perhaps a propitious coincidence. Without her participation the project would undoubtedly have had different results. There were also numerous complications and barriers all through the process, which was by no means an easy or simple one. More problems remain at the elementary level and at the secondary level as the implementation process continues. Nevertheless, I was impressed throughout the months over which this study was conducted with the informed optimism of the Hopkins people who did this job. They seemed to have a clear image in their minds about how their district was managed and what they could accomplish.

Several aspects of this story might be of interest to art educators. The issue of who shall teach art in the schools is informed by this study. Contrary to the beliefs and values of many art educators, classroom teachers are doing a credible job of art instruction in this district. I have pointed out repeatedly, however, the essential role of the prescriptive art curriculum to their success, and the equally vital role of the art specialist whose job it is to support the teachers.
A related issue is the efficacy of the written curriculum that is more than a guide to teaching practice; it is prescriptive, and each lesson is integral to the carefully developed sequence. Many art educators object to such a curriculum because of the restraints it places on teachers, especially art teachers. For years art educators at the college level have attempted to teach prospective art teachers the fundamentals of curriculum development because art teachers, unlike those of most other school subjects, are expected to develop their own curricula as well as to teach and evaluate. However, any who have seriously attempted to develop a curriculum that is more than a series of unrelated studio projects know that this is a very complex, tough job. It takes time, energy, knowledge, and perseverance, as the Hopkins study illustrates. Regardless of their teaching skills and artistic abilities, most art teachers are not prepared to develop comprehensive art curricula, especially when attention to the critical and historical domains is required. Yet, we have gone a large step further in many teacher education programs and we have attempted to teach prospective elementary teachers with virtually no art background how to develop art curriculum for their future students. And we hope that they can learn this in one required course in art education.

If the Hopkins district is an example, perhaps explicitly written art curricula should be utilized more in teacher education programs with art specialists and especially with prospective elementary teachers. Rather than spending the limited hours in art education courses attempting to develop an art curriculum, the college students might better learn what a well-planned art curriculum looks like and what it is like to teach lessons from the curriculum.

Art educators might also be interested in a changing role for the elementary art specialist: that of curriculum implementation and support professional for elementary teachers who are responsible for art instruction. This role, also, is unacceptable to many art educators. However, it is difficult to dispute that many elementary art specialists teach so many children, sometimes in two or more schools, that they can't hope to learn all of their students' names. And art is taught to each student much less frequently than once a week in many situations. The elementary art specialist's role, exemplified in Hopkins, allows the specialist to direct and influence the art education of many children through her associations with the classroom teachers and the school principals. The range of her influence and the scope of her responsibility are much greater than those of the itinerant elementary art teacher.

Finally, the extension of the Hopkins art curriculum to secondary grades has raised several questions. Although the junior high school curriculum is not ready for trial implementation at this writing, anticipation of it has uncovered some sensitive issues. These questions and issues are more fundamental even than competing approaches to art education. They deal with basic conceptions of the artist and values that are conveyed regarding the role of the artist. Although some of these values might serve the artist, they have negative effects in other settings, most particularly with respect to education. In his series of Mellon lectures, Jacques Barzun spoke of "Art the Destroyer," and analyzed art with respect to both "its value and its drawbacks for life."\(^{51}\) Perhaps it is time to recognize negative as well as positive values that are conveyed to prospective art educators in departments of art and to analyze them in relation to the education function. For example, the term artist-teacher is in some ways a juxtaposition of contradictory concepts and an invitation for the dysfunction of both roles.

As the field of art education continues to advocate the utilization of the role models of artist, art historian, art critic, and aesthetician as foundations for education, further analysis of the compatibility among values expressed within these disciplines and those required within

---

public education is needed. Art educators, with personal commitments both to art and to the educational enterprise, might benefit from learning more about possible contradictions between art and education.

Table 6  
SUMMARY DATA FOR STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-3.91</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 &amp; 6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50.34</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(male)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 &amp; 6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(male)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire Reliability — Part 2 (26 Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unequal Length Spearman-Brown</th>
<th>Guttman Split-half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.6482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.5314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.5521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.7063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.5970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>