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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Overview

In 2006, Sabol conducted an intensive study of “needs, issues, and concerns” related to art educators’ professional development. He framed the importance of teacher professional development amid exponential increases in human knowledge across disciplines and domains:

Knowledge and skills teachers needed to support their teaching five or ten years ago are vastly different from what teachers need in schools today. Educators at all instructional levels and in all instructional settings have been challenged to keep pace with these changes. Never has the gap between these demands and the actual knowledge and skills of educators been greater. (Sabol, 2006, p. 13)

More than a decade has passed since Sabol’s report was issued, and his assertion remains relevant and true. Today, art teachers are caught up in an education system in a state of flux. Since the 2002 enactment of No Child Left Behind, state departments of education and school
districts have directed inordinate focus on preparing teachers and students for success on standardized tests, resulting in the prioritization of teacher professional development designed to aid student mastery of testable facts and the centralization of tested subjects within school cultures (Allison, 2013; Buchanan, Harlan, Bruce, & Edwards, 2016; Sabol, 2006, 2010, 2013). Art teachers have reported the impact on their professional learning. A 2012 report by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Center for Educational Statistics on the state of K-12 art education in public schools found that the percentage of visual arts specialists who participated in professional development that connected the visual arts with other subjects was lower in 2009–10 (69%) than in 1999–2000 (79%). In 2009–10, only 56 percent of arts educators participated in professional development that aimed to increase their knowledge about visual arts, compared to 73 percent of educators in 1999–2000. (Sabol, 2013, p. 38)

More recently, counter movements and narratives have emerged in response to “testing culture” in K-12 schools. These alternative imaginings of K-12 school culture centralize the processes of student creativity, critical thinking, and other 21st century skills—along with the disciplines, subjects, and professional development experiences that are intrinsically predisposed to model and support them (Allison, 2013; Buchanan, Harlan, Bruce, & Edwards, 2016; Foley & Trinkley, 2014; Jones, 2014). While these new models for teaching, learning, and teacher professional development are gaining proponents and converts with each new exposure and supporting research study, the testing culture paradigm is deeply entrenched within the public school apparatus of the United States. As such, the onus for pedagogical trailblazing may fall upon alternate, educational institutions outside of the formal K-12 system—like museums, universities, and non-profit foundations. A compelling example of such efforts is found in the work of the Columbus Museum of Art’s (CMA’s) education department staff, who were able to successfully effect change first within the museum’s institutional vision and framework, and next
in issues of art education and schooling within their community. The museum’s major teacher professional development program, the Teaching for Creativity Institute (TFCI), represents one approach the CMA’s staff pursued to intentionally impact art education within its community.

The most effective educators are often passionate and curious lifelong learners whose continued growth can be fostered by access to high quality, relevant professional development opportunities. Continued research into such models has the potential to provide insight into how a variety of arts education institutions and organizations can cooperate to improve issues of praxis within the field, the quality of student learning, teacher satisfaction and morale, and public opinion about the value and relevance of the arts in everyday life.

**Purpose & Justification**

Art education pedagogy ideally responds to socio-cultural needs while also reflecting and shaping socio-cultural attitudes. Its place and purpose, like the cultures and societies in which it is embedded, evolve. To maintain cultural relevance, art education practitioners across arts institutions must keep up-to-date with contemporary pedagogy, interpret it and apply it to their knowledge of the communities in which they are situated. However, Gude (2013) points out that while art education scholars have theorized multiple approaches to best connect students with the radically evolving ways and means of making meaning and art today, when she scans popular contemporary curricular resources, “many of the projects are eerily similar to those I saw in magazines as a young teacher in the 1970s” (p.6). Her observation calls up several crucial questions; why is this happening, what are possible implications, and how can the field make steps to remedy the situation? Possible responses to these questions can be approached through an overarching exploration of contemporary professional development (PD) for art educators.
Sabol (2006) reported that art teachers identified technology, curriculum development, studio skills, and assessment as the most frequent and desired topic areas for their PD experiences. Additional anecdotal and first-hand experience with many classroom art teachers suggested that when they sought out elective PD opportunities, they looked for those that focused on building studio skills since they had practical application for student instruction and satisfied personal drives for making art. From Sabol’s research and my observations, I began to infer that art teachers were opting for PD in areas connected to pragmatic strategies and techniques rather than those focused on the theory or philosophies that serve as foundations for practice. Was this happening because of teacher preference, the selection of PD opportunities available to them, or some combination of these factors? I continued to wonder, what implications might the PD choices of arts educators have on classroom instruction, the future of arts education pedagogy, and arts advocacy if art teachers became increasingly disconnected from the theory underlying their practice? Who are the facilitators of art teacher PD and what types of experiences are they offering? What models for arts education PD support lifelong learning in both theory and practice?

As a museum educator, I became a facilitator of PD experiences and was challenged to weigh the factors and influences that guide their form and content. The museum was frequently approached by local schools and districts to create PD programs (mostly half-day or after-school workshops) for art teachers. As with most museums and especially with their education departments, we operated under a mission to best serve the needs of our schools and community. We created K-12 curriculum guides, school tours, and teacher PD programs in response to agendas set by well-intentioned school and district administrators, even if these programs didn’t
necessarily align with the personal or collective pedagogical values of the education department. The administrators were, in turn, reacting to mandates outlined in state and federal policy.

Drawing from research that correlated their quality and impact with student achievement levels (and eventually leading to fixation on standardized test scores), laws such as the No Child Left Behind Act and initiatives like Race to the Top stressed the importance of teacher training and PD (U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, 2002, 2009, 2010). With mandates and incentives in place, school buildings and districts sought to revamp and revitalize their teacher PD programs. In the process, many prioritized high quality, content-specific offerings for teachers in tested subjects (e.g., math and reading) and inadvertently disregarded similar support for teachers of non-tested areas, especially “specials” teachers in art, music, and physical education (Allison, 2013; Battersby & Verdi, 2013; Jones, 2014; Sabol, 2006, 2010). In addition to possible implications regarding inequitable supports and teacher quality and performance, the marginalization of art teachers by their buildings and districts can magnify feelings of isolation and lead to low morale (Allison, 2013; Sabol, 2006; Whelihan, 2015).

Content specific PD programs for art teachers offered by museums and other alternative, educational institutions outside of the formal K-12 system began to fill the void left by schools and districts and took on renewed value. Notably, the development of such programs also coincided with significant paradigmatic shifts within museum ideologies and art museum education (Buffington, 2007; Burchenal & Lasser, 2007; Ebitz, 2007; Liu, 2007). Some resultant museum programs maintained adherence to standards-based and cross-curricular learning intended to support higher student test scores in other subject areas. These types of programs responded to the needs of school districts working to improve their school report card statuses while also maintaining high attendance and participation numbers for museums. However, they
did not necessarily meet the needs or professional goals of the art teachers who participated in them, or represent institutional, departmental, or personal ideas about the importance and possibilities of art education.

Other museum programs chose to capitalize on the freedoms afforded to art museums as institutions outside of and not beholden to standards and testing in the same way that traditional K-12 schools are. These museums offered new, alternative models for art education and teacher PD that pushed the pedagogical envelope of ideas about the most relevant and valuable aspects of art education (Jones, 2014).

For the purposes of this research study, the workings of the intensive summer session of the Columbus Museum of Art’s 2015 TFCI served as a basis for analyzing the role that teacher PD played in its efforts to catalyze school reform by cultivating creativity-driven arts education pedagogy. By investigating the TFCI’s structure and design, facilitator-participant relationships, I hoped to uncover potential areas for consideration that might be of use to future designers of PD experiences and art teachers who are mapping out their future PD plans. What markers of quality, supports, and challenges suggest ways facilitators and participants can collaborate to enrich art education PD engagement and outcomes throughout the 21st century?

**Primary Research Questions**

This research initiative was guided by the following questions: 1) How does the CMA’s shift from focusing on content and technique to creativity, imagination, and critical thinking manifest in its current core teacher PD program, the TFCI, and 2) How does this program contribute to the ability of a midsize, Midwestern art museum to catalyze authentic measures of school reform within its community, specifically in the realm of arts education?
Definitions of Terms

This case study relies on a working knowledge of terminology related to theories and styles of learning and education (to be explored in greater depth during the following chapter).

Professional Development (PD). Classifications of teachers’ PD endeavors can be described across a variety of spectrums; from self-initiated to mandated (by schools and districts), individual to collaborative, passive to interactive, based on generalized education theory or highly specific, subject-related content. Sabol (2006) remarks on the breadth of possible definitions for teacher professional development, which “has been called, among other things, in-service training, leadership development, continuing education, professional improvement plans, and staff development” (p. 13). Sabol (2006) also offers a paraphrased version of Guskey’s (2000) definition as “processes and activities designed to enhance professional knowledge, skills and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students” (p. 13) along with Guskey’s three defining characteristics of effective professional development; “it is (a) intentional, (b) ongoing, and (c) systemic” (Gusky, 2000, as cited in Sabol, 2006, p. 16).

Similarly, Melber and Cox (2005) refer to PD as “any educational activity that attempts to help teachers improve instruction” (p.104). Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, and Orphanos (2009) define it as “a product of both externally-provided and job-embedded activities that increase teachers’ knowledge and change their instructional practice in ways that support student learning” (p.1) and present three categories of teacher PD activities; *formal* (e.g., university courses; workshops, and conferences), *job-embedded* (e.g., school-based professional learning communities, peer observation and mentoring), and *induction programs* for beginning teachers (e.g., mentorships, targeted seminars) (Wei et al., p. 30). For the purposes of this
research, PD refers to all activities undertaken by educators to improve content, instructional, and pedagogical knowledge and practice in an effort to best support student learning.

**Constructivist Learning Theory.** The Columbus Museum of Art’s mission and programs (including the TFCI) are rooted in constructivist learning theory, as are many progressive museums and non-traditional models of K-12 schooling, such as Montessori and Reggio Emilia-inspired. Constructivist Learning Theory is an experiential theory of learning, the founding of which is largely attributed to developmental psychologist Jean Piaget, although its roots trace back to the work of John Dewey and earlier education theorists. It posits that learners construct their own knowledge through their observations of and interactions with the world. In this model of education, knowledge is not passed from teacher to student, but rather created through meaningful experiences and the interpretations of the learner (Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Falk & Dierking, 2013; Efland, 2004; Hein, 1998).

**Formal, Nonformal, and Informal Education.** Differences and overlap in cultures of learning in museums and traditional schools also factor into the study. Formal, non-formal, and informal education frameworks provide one useful means for exploring the implications and subtleties of learning at each site. Formal education is characterized by extrinsically motivated learning experiences that typically take place within the confines of a formal, institutional setting (e.g., a K-12 school or university) and are directed by an agenda set by an “expert” teacher or leader (Hein, 1998; Wells, Butler, & Koke, 2013). Nonformal education experiences are mediated by a teacher/leader/mentor, but are directed by the intrinsic motivations and topics of inquiry as identified and shared by members of the learning group (Hein, 1998; Wells, Butler, & Koke, 2013). These experiences may take place in schools, museums, or any variety of settings. Informal educational experiences are completely, intrinsically motivated and pursued by the
learner without outside instigation. These experiences can take place in any setting and during
everyday situations (Hein, 1998; Wells, Butler, & Koke, 2013).

**Inquiry-Based Learning.** Inquiry-based learning is a constructivist learning model that
involves a group of learners actively investigating and taking ownership of a contextually
situated question or topic with the support (rather than direction) of a teacher/facilitator. The
learning process develops within a culture of community and respect; learners and facilitators
work, sometimes as a group and at times individually, to co-construct meaning by researching
and examining the question/issue from a variety of perspectives (Buchanan, S., Harlan, M.A.,
Bruce, C. & Edwards, S., 2016; Cranston, 2016). By testing and contesting, defining and refining
emergent ideas, “(L)earners attend to and sort through complex issues and problems from
multiple perspectives, and draw conclusions in order to construct knowledge for themselves and
others” (Buchanan et al., p. 27). Inquiry-based learning can be implemented across a progressive
continuum (Banchi & Bell, 2008) and has relevance for both K-12 instruction and teacher
professional development (Cranston, 2016).

**Transformative Learning.** This constructivist learning theory is characterized by a
learner’s questioning of his or her core beliefs and assumptions about the world, and subsequent
ability to adopt new ways of thinking as a result of reflective practice and new experiences
(Lind, 2007; Mezirow, 1997; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013). Transformative learning theory is
one useful framework for analyzing the workings of PD initiatives, particularly with regard to
participants’ exposures and responses to disorienting dilemmas (“situations that challenge
preconceived ideas”) and reflective practice (Lind, 2007, p.4).
Assumptions & Limitations

Preliminary research led me to hold several preconceptions about the TFCI and its working. Such assumptions included beliefs that the TFCI might demonstrate a) best practices for teacher professional development and adult learning, b) content in alignment with postmodern art education pedagogies, and c) responsiveness to issues and concerns relevant to Columbus area schools.

Additional assumptions and limitations are demonstrated by participant demographics and the case study’s setting. Firstly, by nature of their registration, the teachers who signed up to participate in the CMA’s Teaching for Creativity summer institute already demonstrated interest in the pedagogical foundations upon which the program is structured. Some teachers had prior experience with the TFCI and/or other CMA teacher PD workshops. Teachers who have previously participated in the summer institute will likely reflect familiarity and considerable alignment with the institutes fundamental pedagogical beliefs and practices. Also, while the institute is open to teachers of all content areas as well as administrators, my aim was to examine the beliefs and experiences of visual arts teachers. Secondly, while trends in museum dynamics increasingly show education departments moving from a position of curatorial support to one of a shared centrality (Buffington, 2007; Ebitz, 2007; Villeneuve, 2007), the degree to which the Columbus Museum of Art’s education department was able to take on roles of institutional leadership and establish institution-wide vision remains rare. Small and mid-size museums may have an institutional advantage over larger organizations in securing the necessary administrative and collegial buy-in to effectively model and advance similarly scaled campaigns of vision and message. Smaller staff size and potential reductions in bureaucratic red tape allowed them to engage in more experimentation and risk-taking with director, board, and collegial support.
Similar conclusions may be surmised about the Columbus Museum of Art’s ability to secure authentic buy-in from the administration of participating school districts, and the openness of schools and school districts to support classrooms teachers who seek to implement new initiatives and fresh pedagogies.

Finally, the experiences of teachers participating in Teaching for Creativity do not end with the four-day summer institute experience. The summer institute is perhaps the most intensive part of the program, but teachers maintain contact with each other and museum educators, meeting as fellowship community several times over the course of the upcoming school year. While beyond the scope of this research proposal, a more complete and/or complementary study would follow and trace the teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and practices and the collaborative learning community through the extended fellowship experience.

**Personal Narrative and Acknowledgment of Bias**

Corbin and Strauss (2008) describe personal and professional experience as one key source for possible research problems. My interest in this research area developed out of personal experiences as both a K-12 visual arts teacher in an urban public school district and an art museum educator at a mid-sized modern and contemporary art museum. Years of accumulated observations, casual conversations, and pilot study research during graduate school began to suggest that many arts educators (myself included) felt under-informed about contemporary pedagogy and its place in their practice despite their participation in PD and continuing education experiences. With each job, I made PD a high, personal priority. I maintained active memberships in professional organizations, read journals and blogs, participated on curriculum and assessment writing teams, sought out collegial networking meetups, and attended and presented at conferences and workshops whenever possible.
However, the realities, responsibilities, and demands of each job (compounded with those from daily life outside of work) limited the depth and frequency of such endeavors. I never felt that I was able to take a deep enough dive into these materials—to reflect on them and unpack them in such a way that I could meaningfully apply them to my regular practice.

When I moved from classroom teaching to museum education, I was often approached by local schools and districts with requests for programming PD experiences for art teachers. I had mixed feelings and experiences about doing so under the frameworks requested. I was often uncomfortable assuming an implied position of knowledge-based authority and/or sometimes found my personal teaching philosophies at odds with the subjects and contents the requestors asked us to cover. Also, I did not have the time or resources to thoroughly research both the requested content and the most effective methods of delivery in any great depth. In other words, the quality of the PD experiences I helped create was mixed, at best. The beliefs and opinions I constructed from my own experiences as both a participant, planner, and facilitator of teacher PD will color my research, interpretation, and reporting choices.

Finally, I must acknowledge that I have a nearly 10 year professional and friendly history with the Columbus Museum of Art’s education staff and have been an avid supporter of their transformational work within the institution. I planned to remain as neutral as possible in my role as researcher during the data collection and analysis processes, but must acknowledge that my existing relationship with the Columbus Museum of Art and its education department also inevitably impacted this research.

CHAPTER I Summary

The state of PD for arts educators has major implications regarding teacher quality and confidence, classroom practice, and the ideas that drive the future and public perceptions of the
field. One challenge facing contemporary art educators’ PD is its de-emphasis and marginalization in public schools tasked with meeting benchmarks in subject areas targeted for high-stakes testing legislation and incentives. A second concern relates to the tendency of art teachers to favor practical (e.g., studio techniques and application of technology) rather than theoretical topics when they seek out supplemental PD offerings. Organizations outside of the formal K-12 education system (such as art museums and universities) have the potential to create PD initiatives that utilize their unique educational assets, better support teachers, and address these challenges.

This research study aimed to analyze the role that teacher training initiatives have played in a midsize, Midwestern art museum’s efforts to shift arts education pedagogy as it is practiced in schools along with art teachers’ perceptions about art museums and the value of the arts within their shared community. By investigating how the structure and design of the Columbus Museum of Art’s (CMA’s) Teaching for Creativity Institute’s (TFCI) summer session affects the pedagogical beliefs and practices of participating art teachers, I hoped to establish a list of best practices and characteristics which could be applied to future, cross-institutional models of PD. Continued research into programs such as the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute may provide insight into PD models that enhance issues of praxis within the field, the quality of student learning, teacher satisfaction and morale, and public opinion about the value and relevance of the arts in everyday life. The following chapter, an examination and synthesis of the literature on professional development for K-12 teachers, and art teachers, in particular, provided a theoretical foundation for this study.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In order to contextualize this case study and better inform the direction of the research, this chapter presents a synthesis of literature on issues significant to professional development for visual arts educators. The review is organized into five major sections: 1) Teacher Professional Development as Linchpin for Pedagogical Shifts, 2) Flaws and Challenges in Prevailing Models of Teacher Professional Development, 3) Characteristics of High Quality Professional Development for Teachers, 4) Professional Development Challenges Specific to Art Educators, and 5) Art Museum and K-12 Schools: Cross-Institutional Models of Art Educators’ Professional Development. Much like the worlds of art museum and school arts, literature analysis proved these overarching topics to be both distinct and significantly overlapping. Subthemes of praxis, collaboration, and advocacy interconnect, intersect, and run parallel throughout each section. The concluding analysis offers implications for art teacher PD as it relates to student learning and advocacy for the field.

Teacher Professional Development as Linchpin for Pedagogical Shifts

Teacher PD has increasingly become the focus of an educational research agenda and state and federal policies designed to improve the quality of education for all K-12 students within the United States, especially for those living in under-funded, resource-challenged areas of high poverty (Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Borko, 2004; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, 2009; U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, 2010; Sabol, 2006; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013). This interest in teacher PD is being driven by two major factors. The first
stems from public concern with the general status of K-12 education in the United States and whether or not American teachers are adequately preparing students to maintain the United States’ status as a global economic and military super power (Bushaw & Calderon, 2014). The second stems from a growing body of existing research that indicates teacher quality and performance are significant variables for predicting student success in the classroom (Allison, 2013; Darling Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Gulamhussein, 2013; Grenier, 2010; Lind, 2007; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Gulamhussein (2013) stresses the need for continued attention on teacher training:

Research suggests that the paradigm of instruction needed to prepare students for college and 21st century careers is not the paradigm of instruction most teachers currently use in their practice. In other words, teacher learning is the linchpin between the present day and the new academic goals. (p. 6)

Unfortunately, research has also indicated that, despite substantial stakeholder investments of time and money at the local, state, and federal levels, the majority of PD options for teachers: remain generally ineffective; superficial in presentation of material; and fail to apply knowledge about how adults learn (Allison, 2013; Borko, 2004; Conway, Hibbard, Albert & Hourigan, 2005; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Grenier, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; Marcus, 2008; Sabol, 2006; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009).

**Flaws and Challenges in Prevailing Models of K-12 Teacher Professional Development**

The 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), more commonly known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the 2008 federal grant program Race to the Top set updated PD criteria and mandates to be overseen by states and local districts. However, studies of teacher practices and student learning outcomes suggest that the resultant
PD programs, however well-intentioned or constructed (in theory), are not improving teacher or student performance (Wei et al., 2009; Allison, 2013). Research has identified challenges to teacher PD participation and reasons for its failure to create meaningful or sustained change in teachers’ philosophy and practice.

**Limited Time and Financial Resources**

Research links PD contact hours with quality of teacher learning, and by association, how their learning trickles down to students’ learning. For example, PD experiences “of 14 hours or less showed no effects on student learning” (Wei et al., 2009, p. 34) while around 50 hours devoted to instruction and practice of a PD topic impacted teachers’ proficiency to a degree that would improve student achievement (Gulamhussein, 2013; Wei et al., 2009). Mezirow (2006) found that while transformational learning may involve “sudden major reorientations in habit of mind” it is more likely to be inspired by “a progressive sequence of insights resulting in changes in point of view and leading to a transformation in habit of mind” (p. 28). Even NCLB disqualified “one-day and short-term workshops and conferences” from meeting standards of high quality PD (Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Horrigan, 2005, p. 8).

These figures suggest that PD planners and participants must be willing to invest a substantial amount of time in PD activities, but time proves a rare and increasingly precious resource for most people (Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Lind, 2010; and Sabol, 2006). Thirty-four percent of teachers responding to the question “What Problems Have Hindered Your Professional Development?” from Sabol’s 2006 survey cited lack of time. Teachers reported feeling stretched thin and overscheduled because of everyday teaching, extracurricular, and departmental responsibilities combined with the time and attention necessary for meeting personal needs, family commitments, and other demands outside
of work (Sabol, 2006). When combined, research into effective PD and teacher burn-out present a strong case for increasing opportunities that are job-embedded in the sense of both time and place, two points to be further addressed in subsequent sections.

Limited financial resources can also pose a challenge for teachers seeking out formal teacher development programs (Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Sabol, 2006). Although teachers are required to participate in PD to maintain licensure in most states, costs associated with enrolling in university courses, conference and workshop registration fees, and transportation and lodging are usually paid for “out-of-pocket” without reimbursements to help off-set expenses. Teachers may want to participate in national conferences or teacher institutes, but find that their budgets do not allow it.

**Top-down Models, Administrative Support, and Issues of Agency**

A long-standing paradigm within the field of education disempowers classroom teachers by framing them as passive, less knowledgeable “technicians” in need of training by expert researchers/scholars (Giroux, 1988). This may ring especially true for teachers in “high needs, urban schools” who “face demoralization and a degraded professional culture on a daily basis” (Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013, p. 157). Prevailing “top-down” models of teacher PD—in which administrators select a topic and bring in outside “experts” to present during a “one-shot” workshop—reify and reflect such socio-cultural attitudes about teachers, who may, in turn, become professionally demoralized.

Allison (2013) points out that the content and format of teacher PD is “often decided at the state and district levels…designed, led, and/or assessed by individuals or groups that don’t know the teachers or the ethos of the district or the school” (p. 179). Perhaps unsurprisingly,
such top-down models of PD work best with efforts “to meet a district, state, or federal mandate” and “are not designed to address the unique needs of the art educator” (Charland, 2008, p. 34).

Despite multiple studies indicating that administrative support is crucial to teachers’ abilities to participate in high quality professional development (Conway, Hibbard, Albert & Hourigan, 2005), Sabol found that only 37% of 2,515 art teacher survey respondents reported that their administrators had directly asked them about professional development needs or goals (Sabol, 2006). Wei et al. (2009) cite research that found fewer than half of U.S. teachers “perceived that they had some influence over the content of their in-service professional development” (p. 59). Not only do such top-down models diminish teachers’ sense of professional agency, multiple studies show that they are ineffective in changing teacher practice or student learning (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Gulamhussein, 2013; Grenier, 2010; Lind, 2007; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013).

Bully, Coskie, Robinson, & Egawa (2006) found that "fewer than 10% of teachers actually implement instructional innovations following workshops or in service experiences" (as cited in Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013, p. 157). Gates notes that “despite research calling for sustained and participatory formats,” the top-down, one-shot workshop model continues to dominate teacher PD experiences (2010, p. 9). Consequently, PD content and delivery strategies often fail to authentically impact educators’ beliefs, attitudes, or practice (Darling Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Gulamhussein, 2013; Mezirow, 1997, 2000, 2006; Wei et. al, 2009) and may even negatively affect their willingness to embrace change (Zimmerman, 2006).

Experienced teachers who have weathered multiple attempts at school reform (which were either unsuccessful or abandoned) are likely to develop a wary skepticism around new “magic bullet” training programs (Hamblen, 1995). They may participate in professional
trainings, but continue to teach using strategies and content that experience and intuition tells them is best for student learning (Zimmerman, 2006), or increasingly, what will best prepare students for success on standardized tests. Alternately, Spelman and Rohlwing (2013) discuss what can happen if teachers are tasked with implementing multiple top-down school reform initiatives simultaneously using the “Christmas tree effect” metaphor that compares overwhelmed teachers to “the child at Christmas time,” not knowing “where to begin or how to juggle so many new programs” (p. 157). In response to challenges of access and effectiveness, education researchers have been investigating why the most prevailing models of teacher professional development are not meeting teachers’ needs, how diverse groups of teachers best learn, and what distinct markers of effective, high quality PD can be identified and replicated in the design of future PD offerings.

**Characteristics of High Quality Professional Development for Teachers**

In this research, PD is characterized as any activities undertaken by educators to improve their content, instructional, and pedagogical knowledge and practice in efforts to best support student learning. Defining what makes for high quality and effective PD requires further consideration. Lind (2007) cites a 1996 report published by the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education that describes quality teacher PD as “those that support teachers in meeting the needs of diverse learners; provide adequate time for practices that involve inquiry, reflection, and mentoring; are subject centered; and are rigorous, leading to long-term change” (p. 2). Spelman and Rohlwing add “lifelong, collaborative learning processes that support a job embedded, learner-centered approach” (2013, p. 156) to the list of characteristics. Multiple sources for this literature review suggest a list of high quality PD characteristics, as shown along with corresponding sources in Table 1. More in-depth discussions of select qualities follows.
Constructivist/Inquiry-Based and Transformational

Lind (2007) describes a shift in PD paradigms slowly gaining traction over the past few decades, marked by a move,

away from short-term teacher-training events where information is transmitted by an expert to a group of attentive listeners to a more constructivist model… based on the recognition that learning takes place over time and that active learning requires opportunities to link previous knowledge with new understandings. (p. 2)

Gulamhussein (2013) stresses that effective PD must involve and engage teachers as “both technicians in research-based practices, as well as intellectuals developing teaching innovations” (p. 4), and that “initial exposure to a concept should not be passive, but rather should engage teachers through varied approaches so they can participate actively in making sense of a new practice” (p. 3). Darling Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) stress that effective PD “involves teachers both as learners and as teachers and allows them to struggle with the uncertain ties that accompany each role.” To this end, they recommend “capacity-building policies” that “view knowledge as constructed by and with practitioners for use in their own contexts, rather than as something conveyed by policy makers as a single solution for top-down implementation” (p. 598). In other words, PD experiences for teachers must finally begin to reflect the constructivist, inquiry-based pedagogies they have long been encouraged to implement within their own K-12 classrooms (Allison, 2013; Borko, 2004; Cranston, 2016; Darling Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Falk & Dierking, 2012; Lind, 2011; Marcus, 2008).
Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of High Quality Professional Development</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist/Inquiry-based</td>
<td>Allison, 2013; Borko, 2004; Cranston, 2016; Conway et al., 2005; Darling Hammond &amp; McLauglin, 1995; Falk &amp; Dierking, 2013; Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; 2012; Lind, 2011; Marcus, 2008; Melber &amp; Cox, 2005; Mezirow, 2006; Spelman &amp; Rohlwing, 2013; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for active learning (i.e., is related to real-life classroom situations) and in classroom-focused</td>
<td>Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; NCLB, U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Silva, 2000; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps teachers link current art education research to classroom practice (Praxis)</td>
<td>NAEA Professional Standards, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows teachers how to accurately document their teaching progress</td>
<td>NAEA Professional Standards, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforms participants’ attitudes, beliefs, and practice</td>
<td>Borko, 2004; Cranston, 2016; Darling-Hammond &amp; McLaughlin, 1995; Gates, 2010; Lind, 2007; Mezirow, 2000, 2006; Spelman &amp; Rohlwing, 2013; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to reflect on self and practice</td>
<td>Darling Hammond &amp; McLaughlin, 1995; Lind, 2007; NAEA Professional Standards, 2009; Silva, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to clearly articulate their teaching philosophies</td>
<td>NAEA Professional Standards, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs over a span of time</td>
<td>Charland, 2008; Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; NCLB, U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Penuel et al., 2007; Spelman &amp; Rohlwing, 2013; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-embedded</td>
<td>Battersby &amp; Verdi, 2015; DuFour, 2004; DuFour &amp; Fullan, 2013; Graham, 2007; Spelman &amp; Rohlwing, 2013; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases teachers’ content knowledge of the subject(s) and/or grade level(s) they teach</td>
<td>Alison, 2013, Conway et al., 2005; Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; NCLB, U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Sabol, 2006; Wei et al., 2009; Whelihan, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates mentors</td>
<td>Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; NAEA Professional Standards, 2009; Penuel et al., 2007; Silva, 2000; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for and prompts collaboration</td>
<td>Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Melber &amp; Cox, 2005; Spelman &amp; Rohlwing, 2013; Wei et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constructivist and inquiry-based PD experiences might incorporate “‘sense-making’ activities” and facilitators “modeling the sought after practices and constructing opportunities for teachers to practice and reflect on the new strategies” (Wei et al., p. 2009). Research trends also find value in attempts at tailoring and/or scaffolding inquiry-based learning activities (Banchi &
Bell, 2008) and varying PD approaches for teachers based on career stages, degree of familiarity regarding particular topics or strategies, and/or current levels of general effectiveness (Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013). Teachers are encouraged to exercise informed professional judgments as they critically examine PD content and consider it in relation to personal beliefs, strengths, areas for improvement, and understanding of students’ needs (Cranston, 2016).

Constructivist, inquiry-based PD models are more likely to catalyze change, not only in participants’ practice, but in their beliefs and attitudes about student learning (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Lind, 2007; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013). Spelman and Rohlwing cite multiple works related to adult learning to elaborate on the subject:

Mezirow (2000) contended that unless learning is transformed through expanded awareness, critical reflection, validating discourse, and reflective action, adult learners would remain focused on merely accessing information. Informational learning centers on knowledge and skills—what a person knows. Transformational learning, however, seeks changes in the core assumptions, beliefs, and ways in which individuals make sense of learning experiences (Kegan, 1994, 2000). Kegan's (1994) constructive-developmental theory... posited that the systems by which individuals make meaning, grow and change over the course of a lifetime. This theory implies that individuals are unique in their ways of knowing and understanding experiences; these ways of knowing must be considered as the educational system designs professional development programs to support and challenge adult learners (Drago-Severson, 2011). (Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013, p. 156)

Mezirow (2006) identified two major elements crucial for transformational learning; 1) critical reflection on one’s personal assumptions and prior experiences around a topic or issue, as well as the topic or issue itself, and 2) conversation and discourse that either validate or refute their understandings and judgements. Reflection on self and personal practice and critical dialogue with colleagues may also then be understood as key components of effective PD experiences.
Reflective and Collaborative

Melber and Cox (2005) posit reflective and dialogic PD activities as empowering tools for teachers’ individual and collective intellectual growth, as they “shift the focus from teacher training, such as learning to parrot a particular curriculum word for word, to environments that promote teacher professionalism within a community of educators” (p. 58). This sentiment is portended by Darling Hammond and McLaughlin’s (1995) championing of PD experiences that spur teachers’ critical self-reflection on practice and pedagogy over top-down PD training models for skill and knowledge acquisition. NAEA’s *Professional Standards for Visual Arts Educators* (2009) echoes the need for PD experiences that not only provoke teachers’ self-reflection, but articulation of the beliefs and philosophies that arise as a result.

Silva (2000) studied the experiences and professional growth of six elementary school teachers who served as mentors to pre-service teachers within a professional development school (PDS) created through a university-public school partnership. Initially, mentor teachers saw the PDS as primarily benefitting the development and experiences of their pre-service interns rather than their own professional growth. However, over time, mentor teachers began to recognize the value of personal reflection (represented by journaling) and dialogue (as they discussed the rationale behind pedagogical decisions with preservice teachers) for their own teaching practice.

Gates (2010) endorses the constructive benefits of professional development rooted in discourse and collaboration, noting that,

> Collaborative inquiry creates dialogic, collaborative spaces, and encourages teachers to problematize and investigate their practice. Inquiry is an attractive model for PD in art education because it allows individuals and groups of educators to define and structure their own professional learning. (p. 13)

To optimize teacher buy-in, PD must include time for them to reflect upon and critically discuss the material and ideas covered, as well as the *process* of implementing them in practice. To this
point, Gulamhussein (2013) makes another case for the importance of collaborative PD in communities of inquiry while also exposing another key problem with the top-down model, in that it,

assumes the only challenge facing teachers is a lack of knowledge of effective teaching practices and when that knowledge gap is corrected, teachers will then be able to change. Research finds otherwise. It turns out teachers’ greatest challenge comes when they attempt to implement newly learned methods into the classroom. In all forms of learning a new skill, mere knowledge of it is never as difficult as its implementation. (p. 10)

“Implementation dip” research shows that regardless of the quality of PD presentations and training, most teachers will need to actively practice a skill or strategy across an average of 20 separate (and initially messy, clumsy, and unsuccessful) occasions to gain real proficiency in its application (Gulamhussein, 2013).

Teachers who work in school cultures of isolation instead of collaboration and/or beholden to high-stakes testing may decide that the potential consequences of personal and student failures likely to arise as they work out new strategies in the classroom (especially those based in radical pedagogical shifts) are too much to risk. “Crafting effective PD means confronting this reality and building a significant amount of support for teachers during the critical implementation phase in one’s actual classroom” (Gulamhussein, p. 12). If teachers create communities of inquiry, they are able to collectively problem-solve and support one another through struggles of mastery (Wei et al., 2009).

Transparent implementation of such models in schools might radically change school culture as they reinforce positive messages for students about collaborative learning, encouragement, and persistence through failure. Collaborative approaches to PD reflect the constructivist ideology necessary for the enculturation of teachers to new pedagogical paradigms and create collegial networks of inquiry and support. Changes in individual attitudes, beliefs, and
practices overlap to form a collective professional identity and shared goals for student learning, which in turn lead to an intentional culture of change in schools, institutions, and the field (Darling Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Gates, 2010; Wei et al., 2009).

**Ongoing and Job-embedded**

One-shot or stand-alone workshops remain a popular format for teacher professional development experiences. This format is relatively convenient in terms of time and financial requirements of participants and planners. However, as previously discussed, research indicates that such workshop models do not adequately allow teachers to meaningfully engage with the topics being covered and are unlikely to inspire any real or sustained change in teachers’ pedagogy (Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007; Wei et al., 2009). Effective models of teacher PD more than make up for their inconvenience when considering their improvement in outcomes. As Charland (2008) states, PD experiences that involve more substantial and ongoing contact hours help participants to, “push past initial or novice understandings of a subject or medium, and begin to explore the subtleties and complexities that turn a mere exercise into art, and a finite lesson into advanced exploration” (p. 36).

In the United States, the majority of work hours in the teacher school day are spent on instructional time and direct contact with students. Aside from a few designated “inservice” days throughout the school year, PD workshops, institutes, and trainings often take place outside of regular work days and hours. Wei et al. (2009) contrast this with European and Asian models of a typical teacher workday in which half of the time is spent teaching students and the other half in PD. The 2007 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Programme for International Student Assessment report that found more than 85% of schools in high-achieving nations, such as Finland, provide regular time for teacher collaboration and sharing (Wei et al.,
2009). This type of workday structure emphasizes and reinforces the notion of educators as both professional teachers and learners whose work continues beyond student instruction. U.S. education policy makers began to take note, creating regulations and grant initiatives such as Race to the Top which were intended to spur the allocation of time within the teacher workday to job-embedded PD activities. In response, many schools and districts began to embrace the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model.

PLCs are teams of teachers with an area of shared interest (e.g., content area, grade level focus) working together to improve student learning through outcome-focused initiatives that might include collective assessment and reflection on student work, curricular content, and instructional strategies (Battersby & Verdi, 2015; DuFour, 2004; DuFour & Fullan, 2013; Graham, 2007). PLCs epitomize the qualities of ongoing and job-embedded, as they meet in schools during a designated block of time in the work week. In addition to setting shared goals for student learning and improving PD outcomes, PLCs have the potential to reinforce paradigms of teachers as collaborative intellectuals rather than isolated technicians.

**Subject-specific with Mentor/Coaching Supports**

As previously discussed, PLCs organized around grade level and subject area allow peer teachers to help each other through initial attempts at implementing PD content within the context of their respective disciplines. Coaching and mentoring may serve as complementary supports to PLCs and teacher-based teams. Multiple studies found that teachers who had coaching supports following PD classes and workshops were much more likely to persist in applying newly learned skills to their classroom practice (Gulamhussein, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007; Wei et al., 2009). Coaching and mentoring PD models acknowledge that there are some professionals outside of the school or district whose research, experience, and expertise may
benefit teachers in their quest for professional growth (Gulamhussein, 2013). Such consultants can provide useful feedback, guidance, and resources to teachers as they implement specific PD strategies. Rather than echoing “top-down” PD models (an “expert” presents administrator-selected topics to teachers), coaches and mentors use their “expert knowledge” to help teachers achieve personally or collaboratively set performance levels and goals. Subject-specific coaching and mentorship models tend to be the most effective. As coach and teacher work through struggles of implementing new pedagogies within the context of a specific discipline, they begin with the advantages of a shared content-knowledge base and language.

High-quality teacher PD stipulates the need for experiences that enhance teachers’ subject- or content-specific knowledge across multiple models (Alison, 2013; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; Sabol, 2006; Wei et al., 2009; Whelihan, 2015). Provisions in NCLB and Race to the Top required that all teachers have access to PD in their specific academic content areas in order to improve their subject knowledge and student learning (Alison, 2013; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Lind, 2007). While PD around more generalized topics such as behavior management may be undoubtedly useful, Wei et al. (2009) cite a specific study by Saxe, Gearheart, and Nasir (2001) that found when teachers participated in ongoing, collaborative PD focused on instructional strategies and content knowledge, the impact on their students’ learning was most evident. Similarly, in a review of PD literature, Gulamhussein (2013) found that,

The content presented to teachers shouldn’t be generic, but instead specific to the discipline (for middle school and high school teachers) or grade-level (for elementary school teachers). Districts often provide staff-wide training on the first days of school, assuming all teachers can benefit equally from the presentation of generic concepts (such as classroom management). The truth is, while there may be a few general principles that apply to all teachers, these are 1) best understood and mediated with attention to how
those general principles manifest within the content a teacher teaches and 2) pale in comparison to useful concepts that are discipline-specific. (p. 17)

PD content may have broad relevance across grade levels and disciplines (e.g. critical and higher order thinking skills and routines, behavior management, and learning styles) but teachers are most likely to be persuaded to use and value the ideas presented if they are contextualized for specific subject areas. For example, a high school math teacher and an elementary art teacher may both need PD around student assessment, but a singular PD workshop on the topic is unlikely to effectively satisfy both of their needs. Unfortunately, many of the teacher PD policies and initiatives enacted over the past few decades to improve teacher training and quality have inadvertently increased the likelihood that the high school math teacher will receive such training while the elementary art teacher does not.

**Professional Development Challenges Specific to Art Educators**

Gaps in theory and practice have long plagued the field of education (Dewey, 1904; Dodds, 2004; Korthe gan, 2011; Oonk, 2009). As research on teacher PD grows, new questions and additional research needs are revealed. Just as research into high quality and effective teacher PD suggests the need for discipline-specific content, increased research on discipline-specific PD needs and challenges will be necessary for field improvements. For art teachers, the theory/practice gap stems in part from issues of practicality and access; teacher practitioners already overwhelmed by daily work-life demands who are not getting job-embedded, high quality, content-specific PD must seek out alternate opportunities, at minimum to maintain licensure. Researchers, scholars, and theorists may lay the groundwork for elevating the position of the arts within public consciousness, but limited access to these ideas and wariness for their typical modes of delivery can mean that widespread application of such theories and pedagogies by art teacher practitioners can take decades to establish (Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996;
Hobbs, 1997). Comparing current PD opportunities for art teachers with the characteristics of high quality, effective PD explored in the previous section highlights personal, structural, and philosophical challenges faced by art educators in their quest for professional learning.

**Isolation, Marginalization, and a Lack of Content-specific PD**

Ideally policy changes and initiatives improve PD and teacher quality across all subject areas and disciplines. For example, as previously mentioned, NCLB required that all teachers have access to PD in their specific academic content areas in order to improve their subject knowledge and student learning (Alison, 2013; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Lind, 2007). Many school-based PLCs align groups of teachers by grade level or content area to optimize teacher collaboration, goal setting for student achievement, and other outcomes. This can become problematic for art and other “specials” teachers (e.g., visual arts, music, and physical education) who teach all grade levels and may already feel isolated as the only teacher of his/her subject in their school (Gates, 2010; Lind, 2007; Whelihan, 2015). School administrators forming content-specific PLCs typically join specials teachers into makeshift teams, or assign them to teams of grade-level teachers or teachers in content areas designated as high testing priorities. Cohen-Evron (2002) describes Israeli public school art teachers’ feelings of isolation that could easily be transposed to experiences of American teachers. One teacher reported feeling that despite being a part of a team of classroom teachers in her building, “there is no point to talk about art or problems” because non-art teachers often do not share an understanding of art curriculum, assessment, or pedagogy (p. 84).

This is not to say that there is no place or value for interdisciplinary PD. Conway, Hibbard, Albert, and Hourigan (2005) “do not recommend this cross-curricular professional development in lieu of content-specific learning, but in addition to it” (p. 8). They reason that
cross-curricular PD can help promote understanding about arts education for teachers outside of the discipline while also strengthening the school community and instruction. The authors also note that “striking a balance between general professional development and much needed content specific professional development is a challenge” (p. 8). Gates (2010) concedes that many schools also create interdisciplinary PLCs to meet teachers’ PD needs, inspire collaboration, and address school-wide improvement goals. She adds that while art teachers’ shared knowledge of students, “creativity, knowledge of art materials, and the relative flexibility of an art teacher's curriculum” (p. 9) offer significant contributions to such teams, they do not adequately address issues of art teacher isolation.

The increased use of high-stakes, standardized testing as a primary means for evaluating students and teachers has inadvertently resulted in art teachers seeing their PD goals subordinated to tested subjects like language arts and math, even in activities and experiences designed to support interdisciplinary PD (Allison, 2013; Battersby & Verdi, 2013; Gates, 2010; Jones, 2014; Sabol, 2006, 2010, 2013; Whelihan, 2015). Art teachers may find themselves engaged in collaboration and collegial activities to support student learning, but in content areas outside of the arts (Allison, 2013; Balsey, 2013; Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Chapman, 2005; Lind, 2007; Penuel et al., 2007; Sabol, 2006, 2010, 2013). As an illustration of this point, a survey item from Sabol’s 2006 report on art teacher PD asked a representative cross-section of National Art Education Association (NAEA) members to share topics of past professional development experiences. This survey item yielded 1,905 responses and 101 topic variations. Among the respondents’ answers were “topics [that] had no apparent linkages to art education programming such as writing, language arts, literacy, reading programs, science education programs, and the Lewis and Clark Expedition” (p. 72). A later study of K-12 art education in public schools
conducted by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Center for Educational Statistics found that the percentage of elementary school art teachers who reported having access to and participating in arts-specific PD experiences have progressively and significantly decreased between the 1999-2000 and 2009-2010 school years (Sabol, 2013).

Further complicating matters, both NCLB and Race to the Top have required states to devise and implement systems for evaluating teachers, with one performance marker being the teacher’s continuous growth in content area knowledge and engagement with content-specific PD (Lind, 2007). Art teachers are being evaluated by the same standards as other content area teachers, but often are not provided with the same supports. The marginalization of meaningful, content-specific PD for art educators may impact whether or not they are valued as relevant and essential professionals by colleagues, administrators, and parents—and how the arts are valued and perceived within school communities and by the broader public (Allison, 2013; Balsey, 2013; Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Chapman, 2005; Gates, 2010; Lind, 2007; Penuel et al., 2007; Sabol, 2006, 2010). Continued advocacy efforts by NAEA, state and regional professional arts education organizations seek to combat these challenges. Despite NAEA’s proactive release of its own set of Professional Standards for arts educators (NAEA, 2009), the sidelining of arts education PD goals continues to confound art teachers who strive for growth and mastery in their content area. Ironically, art teachers who are able to access content-specific PD face other challenges stemming from the breadth of possible art education subjects and (sometimes conflicting) approaches to teaching.

**Competing and Complex Pedagogies and Theories**

Art teachers are expected to possess broad knowledge across a range of topics in addition to understanding how to apply such knowledge to teaching diverse groups of students.
Knowledge may be content-related (e.g., art history, art criticism, aesthetics, art media and technical skills), pedagogical (e.g., curriculum development, assessment, learning styles, philosophical approaches, instructional methods and strategies), based on classroom management (e.g., meeting the needs of specific student populations, behavior management, classroom organization), or centered on educational leadership and advocacy strategies.

Sabol’s (2006) study also compiled a list of 88 topics art teachers expressed interest in exploring during future PD experiences. Along with the previously mentioned 101 PD topics teachers reported having already investigated, these numbers illustrate the diversity of teacher PD needs (Gates, 2010), and the breadth of possible areas upon which art teachers might elect to concentrate. For both survey items, the four most common responses regarding PD topics related to curriculum, technology, studio skills, and assessment; rankings differed slightly for each item (Figure 2). PD topics related to research, theory, and pedagogy were mentioned with far less frequency for both survey questions (Table 2). Relatively, Brewer (1999) found that art teacher survey respondents overwhelmingly favored PD in studio classes over those in art education, aesthetics, art criticism, or art history.

Interpretations of this data suggests that in matters of pedagogy, art educators have interest and access to PD experiences designed to deepen their understanding of what to teach (curriculum and studio skills) as well as tools for helping them to teach and measure student performance (technology and assessment). The data also suggests PD based on topics related to why art education is important and how teachers can best teach to inspire deep student learning are less popular in terms of supply and demand. Results from Sabol’s (2006) study imply that the majority of art teachers do not prioritize investigations of art education research and theory. An exploration of potential reasons for this phenomenon follows.
Figure 2. Bar graph comparison of art educators’ top four responses to questions about past PD topics, and topics they would like to learn more about in future PD. Taken from Sabol, F. R. (2006). Professional development in art education: A study of needs, issues, and concerns of art educators. [National Art Education Association and National Art Education Foundation project report]. Retrieved from https://www.arteducators.org/research/sabol_pro_dev_report.pdf.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Topics your PD experiences have addressed</th>
<th>% Response of 1,905</th>
<th>Topics about which you would like to learn in PD</th>
<th>% Response of 1,790</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated/Interdisciplinary Learning</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism, multicultural education</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education theory, philosophy, ideology</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Not expressly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education research</td>
<td>Not expressly mentioned</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory, philosophy of art education</td>
<td>Not expressly mentioned</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-based classrooms</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Not expressly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher order thinking skills</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain-based research, learning</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual culture</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Literacy</td>
<td>Not expressly mentioned</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedagogical tensions: Studio and technical skills vs. critical thinking and theory.

Art teachers frequently request PD that is “hands-on.” Prior experiences have reinforced the notion that classes and workshops in studio skills and technology are, by nature, far more likely to provide an active, constructivist learning experience than those associated with theory. Theory- and research-based PD offerings are often accessed as journal articles, read-aloud papers, and/or PowerPoint presentations at conferences—many of which reflect the passive, top-down models previously critiqued.

Studio-based classes and workshops may also help teachers mediate tensions that arise from performing dual identities of artist and teacher. Art educators often find that teaching and responsibilities outside of work significantly compromise time for personal art-making—often the very activity that initially drew them to the profession. Studio classes fulfill PD requirements while nurturing the artistic identity of the educator (Gates, 2010). The popularity of such classes ensures their continued availability and may create a “chicken-or-the-egg” situation. If studio workshops are consistently better attended than those connected to theory and research, providers of art teacher PD may choose to focus on offering and improving hands-on studio classes. Increased availability, opportunity, and choices for studio-based PD means that more art teachers are likely to participate in studio-based PD.

Development of skills and techniques are undoubtedly valuable to arts educators and the students they teach. However, teachers who concentrate their PD on studio experiences over other relevant areas of pedagogy may inadvertently mirror this emphasis in their classroom practice and favor the development of students’ technical skills over the development of students’ ideas and critical thinking skills. Historically, art education (especially modernist and pre-Discipline-based Art Education programs) has privileged studio inquiry by allocating a
significant majority of class time to art-making over historical, critical, aesthetic inquiry (Hobbs, 1997; Hutchens & Suggs, 1997; Jones, 1997; MacDonald, 2006; McRorie, 1997; Walker, 1997; Wolcott & Gough-Dijulio, 1997). Complicating matters further, many of the studio-based inquiries introduced in K-12 classrooms consist of deeply entrenched, step-by-step lessons in media techniques or application of the elements and principles of design. Opportunities for studio explorations that better align with recent research and contemporary shifts in pedagogy toward inquiry-based and constructivist learning, choice-based art education, or open-ended project-models are less common. These approaches require high quality professional development around strategies for implementation and the theories on which they are based. An exploration of theories and art education paradigms that may serve as foundation and/or subject of art education PD follows.

**Postmodernist legacy and the weight of theory.** Postmodern (POMO) art education remains the last “named” theoretical movement in the field. Although the movement is now decades old and cultural theorists today make arguments regarding the post (ad infinitum) postmodern condition, POMO art education has retained its relevance and status as a shaper of worthy practice and ideology within the field and contemporary culture. Its emergence during the late 1980s and early 1990s marked a significant shift from the major art education pedagogies that preceded it, including the once predominant Discipline-based Art Education.

Discipline-based Art Education (DBAE) developed out of attempts to reframe K-12 art education as a complex, multifaceted endeavor, worthy of the same scholarly regard as other academic disciplines like math and science (Dobbs, 2004; Walling, 2000). In contrast to preceding art education paradigms that focused on preserving students’ innate propensities for creative self-expression, DBAE sought to shift the field’s student-centered focus to a subject-
centered, standardized, sequential, and testable one by emphasizing the study of art through four major disciplinary components; aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and studio production (Dobbs, 2004; Gaudelius & Speirs, 2002). The model was widely implemented throughout the United States, in large part due to a multifaceted PD blitz funded by the Getty Trust. This initial thrust of DBAE development and teacher training encompassed theoretical models, curriculum studies, preservice art education programs in universities, model programs and strategies for implementation disseminated through workshops and seminars for practicing teachers, and advocacy campaigns (Dobbs, 2004).

While the Trust was actively funding DBAE development, research, and teacher training it made measurable advancements toward its goals of universal adoption in K-12 public schools. However, leadership changes within the Getty Trust and Center led to the Center’s abrupt dissolution along with its funding and staffing support for DBAE. Drastic reduction of support resources and growing criticisms about DBAE’s ability to adequately address critical, multicultural issues resulted in a mixed legacy. Continued philosophical changes in the field, shaped largely by postmodern theory gave way to new ideas about the direction art education might take. Pedagogues and theorists in the field began to problematize modernist paradigms as they manifested in predominant art education models (including DBAE), and found that key tenets of postmodern philosophy could be applied to fresh approaches for socially transformative practice that eschewed aspirations of any one-size-fits most pedagogy (Anderson, 1997; Cary, 1998; Clark, 1996; Efland, 1995; Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996; Fehr, 1998; Gude, 2004, 2007; Hamblen, 1995; Hobbs, 1997; Jones, R.L., 1997; Marriner, 1999; May, 1995; McRorie, 1997; Neperud, 1995; Pearse, 1997; Richmond, 2009; Walker, 1997; Wolcott, 1997). This shift
in paradigm necessitated new approaches to art education PD, but also meant that updated approaches would lack the uniformity and cohesion that DBAE brought to such endeavors.

While a thorough exploration of POMO art education and the postmodern theory from which it arose is beyond the scope of this paper, Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr’s overview (Table 2) offers insight into some of its key tenets and how they might manifest in teaching practice. While the content and methods presented by Efland et al. do not represent exhaustive lists, even a cursory glance at Table 3 suggests an increase in content and complexity inherent in POMO approaches when compared with its predecessors which translates to increased complexity in art teacher PD designed to reflect them.

Neperud (1995) declares, “Postmodern art education questions accepted assumptions about the nature of art, children’s artistic development, and teaching practices” (p. 6) and offers as example that “traditional basic design and drawing disciplines are no longer regarded as the sole prerequisites for creative development” (p. 10). His work situates the need for POMO art education amid the fluid and ever-evolving nature of philosophy, culture, and art as they exist in our increasingly globalized, technological, information-saturated, 21st century world. New generations of (post) POMO scholars and educators continue to analyze, deconstruct, and contribute new understandings of POMO art education as it relates to 21st century life and the present and future states of the field. This new scholarship—which has yielded more recent pedagogical ideas such as Neo-Discipline-Based Art Education (Hamblen, 1997), art education for social justice (Garber, 2004), visual culture and literacy initiatives (Barrett, 2003; Duncum, 2010; Sturken, 2001), community-based arts education (Hutzel, K., Bastos, F.M.C. & Crosier, K., 2012), design-based education (Vande Zande, 2010), and Teaching for Artistic Behaviors (Hathaway, 2009)—suggests foundations being laid for a post-postmodern art education.
movement that adds to, rather than limits, the breadth of an underlying POMO theory. In turn, these expanded notions of what art education can be require an even greater breadth of high quality, specific PD offerings.

This paradoxical breadth and specificity of postmodernism (and its legacy) reveal a key criticism of the theory; postmodernism, in general and as applied to art education pedagogy, has proven difficult to pin down and impossible to conclusively define. Clark (1996) posits the theoretical “elasticity” of postmodernism and the “specialized terminologies” that developed as a result of its application within specialized fields as reasons it is difficult to distinguish or discuss.

Postmodernists challenged art world hierarchies that positioned culturally elite “art experts” as privileged keepers and bestowers of art-related knowledge, instead, recognizing the right and ability of all people to construct their own understandings about art, regardless of cultural background or previous experience. Ironically, the complex, philosophical (and frequently ambiguous and contradictory) foundations of postmodernism and its application to POMO pedagogy only served to heighten problems of theory obstructing real world applications (Clark, 1996; Efland, 1995). Efland (1995) acknowledges POMO approaches demand more and deeper knowledge:

First, there is the problem of the sheer plurality of the new art forms, each more challenging than the modernist styles of the early part of the century. Second, the newer criticism and theory attempting to explain this recent art are both complex and voluminous. Modernist art theory was grounded in expressionism and formalism; postmodern aesthetic theories, by contrast, are grounded in doctrines that stray into the sociology of art and the art world. (p. 37)

Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr (1996) add more pragmatic concerns to possible impediments to POMO practice, noting that rigorous adoption would require intensive in-service trainings. Further, interdisciplinary curricula featuring lessons and units based on POMO pedagogy are
likely to take more time to implement and complete than those based on DBAE or other approaches.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Nature of Art</th>
<th>Content &amp; Methods</th>
<th>Value of Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Art: 17th – 19th centuries</td>
<td>In the mimetic view, art is an imitation of nature.</td>
<td>Base teaching methods on copying from nature as in life drawing.</td>
<td>Values are found in the accuracy of representations. Art that imitates the good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of Design: early 20th century</td>
<td>In the formalist view, art is formal order or significant form.</td>
<td>Teach line and color through systematic exercises.</td>
<td>Values of art are aesthetic in nature, not social or moral. They are found in the quality of formal organization possessed by the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Self-Expression: early to mid-20th Century</td>
<td>Art is the original expression of a uniquely gifted individual artist.</td>
<td>Free the artist’s or the child’s imagination. Eliminate rules, don’t impose adult ideas.</td>
<td>Values of art are found in the originality or uniqueness of the artist’s personal expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art in Daily Living: 1930 – 1960</td>
<td>Art is an instrument that enhances the aesthetic qualities of an individual’s surroundings.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of art and design principles to problems of a visual aesthetic character.</td>
<td>Values are found in the enhanced quality of life provided by the intelligent application of design principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts as a Discipline: 1960 – 1990</td>
<td>Art as a concept is a problem that is the subject of artistic and scholarly inquiry.</td>
<td>Base activities on modes of inquiry used by artists and disciplined scholars.</td>
<td>Values are found in the increased understanding of art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Model of Postmodern Art Education Curriculum: 1990-Present*</td>
<td>Art is a form of cultural production whose point and purpose is to construct symbols of shared reality.</td>
<td>Recycle content and methods from modern and premodern forms of instruction. Feature the mini-narratives of various persons or groups not represented by the canon of master artists. Explain the effects of power in validating knowledge. Use arguments grounded in deconstruction to show that no point of view is privileged. Recognize that works of art are multiply coded within several symbol systems.</td>
<td>To promote deeper understandings of the social and cultural landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movements in 20th Century art education, adapted from Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996, pp. 68, 72.
Teachers who were trained under “a modernist perspective” that posits pedagogical change as “a moral imperative to correct inadequacies of the past” may view POMO pedagogy with either wary skepticism or short-lived optimism having witnessed how “in the give-and-take of program implementation, theoretical frameworks quickly lose their original clarity of focus” (Hamblen, 1995, p.44). They may be reluctant to invest the research, training, and reflection needed to fully realize POMO/post POMO practice, especially when factoring in feelings of being over-extended and over-scheduled in their personal and professional lives. Further, POMO art education is so multifaceted in nature that identifying any “clarity of focus” is extremely challenging. Its major paradigms are rooted in decentralization and contexts of time and place.

Gude (2013) remarks on the implications of the POMO on contemporary art education:

The possibilities for 21st-century art education cannot yet be fully known, envisioned, or articulated because the field is in the process of being re-imagined and revitalized. This is the contemporary research and development project of the field of art education being conducted by thousands of practitioners—art teachers, professors, community artists, teaching artists, and museum educators—in collaboration with their students and other community participants. New models, methods, objectives, contexts, and projects will be generated from a wide variety of cultural positions. (p. 7)

This collaborative work of re-envisioning twenty-first century art education extends to school districts, state and national professional associations, colleges, universities, arts centers, and museums—all sites of constantly shifting paradigms, themselves. Part of the process of generating the models, methods, objectives, contexts, and projects Gude references requires arts and education institutions to take on the challenging but necessary task of developing teacher PD imbued with contemporary extensions and re-interpretations of POMO pedagogies and legacies.

**K-12 Art Teacher Professional Development in Art Museums**

In her introduction to the 2007 NAEA publication *From Periphery to Center: Art Museum Education in the 21st Century*, editor Pat Villeneuve explains,
The title of this book represents our collective vision of art museum education as a critical, highly regarded function at the heart of the museum. Although museum education has developed as a field in the last 20 years, the vision is not yet a reality in many art museums. I have studied the sociology of professions, and I am convinced we can advance our position in the museum by demonstrating an informed, deliberate, reflective practice. As art museum educators, we need to be knowledgeable about art and education, we need to have an educational philosophy that gives coherence to the decisions we make, and we need to articulate that philosophy regularly. That will allow us to practice more effectively and create successful programs that will earn the respect of the museum administration and community. (p. 1)

“Periphery to Center” is both a description of real practice in contemporary art museum education and an expressed hope for continued shifts. Villeneuve specifically references the marginalization of education departments (as subsidiary to the scholarship, expertise, and mission of curatorial departments) within institutional museum structures. However, her message has relevance beyond this particular setting.

Advocacy efforts to counteract education policies and public perceptions of the arts as frivolous and irrelevant “extras” have long been integral work for both K-12 and art museum educators. Just as art educators continually strive to prove their value as an integral part of K-12 education, museums (especially coastal and Midwestern art museums without built-in audiences of tourists) have struggled with maintaining a place of value and relevance in their communities. “Art museums, in particular, have struggled to articulate and demonstrate their social impact beyond playing the role of guardians and authorities of culture” (Foley, 2014, p. 141). The disconcerting sense of occupying a peripheral space within a broader structure or entity may be mirrored in the art museum’s struggle to position itself as an essential and relevant part of its community rather than as a single-visit destination for cultural tourists (Foley & Trinkley, 2014). Traditionally, one of the ways museums have leveraged themselves as valued parts of their
communities is by developing strong relationships with and catering to the needs of local schools and teachers (Buffington, 2007).

If one were to substitute “art museums” for “K-12 schools” and “museum educators” with “art teachers” in Villeneuve’s quote, it becomes a statement regarding art education’s perpetual struggle against peripheral relegation as a “dispensable frill” (Efland, 1995, p. 25) within schools. In their shared struggles of marginalization and perpetual need for advocacy in order to stay relevant and adequately funded, art museums and school art education programs have much to gain from additional communication, collaboration, and partnerships with one another.

**Contemporary Models of Professional Development and Collaboration between Art Museums and K-12 Schools** Historically, art museums in the United States have provided educational programs for K-12 school-aged children and their teachers. Programs consisted mostly of tour programs, and increasingly from the 1930s on, teacher training programs for classroom teachers (Buffington, 2007; Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; White, 2004). For most of the twentieth-century, these programs generally followed the “top-down” model (Willumson, 2007). Buffington (2007) describes the earliest programs and how expert curators and museum educators developed agendas to teach students and teachers aesthetic appreciation and “historically accurate, factual information about museum objects, placing little emphasis on personal connections, contextual information, and meaning making” (p. 13). Learning goals connected to school curricula were secondary.

Within the past 30 or 40 years, the same constructivist, postmodern, and critical theories that spurred change and complicated pedagogy in school art education have similarly impacted
education in art museums (Dyson, 2013; Ebitz, 2007; Rose, 2007; Willumson, 2007). Rose reports that,

Museum educators are presently facing the challenges posed by postmodern forces that are blurring the distinctions between modernism and popular culture, high art and pluralism, and historicism and memory work…and others have contended that museums are more and more focused on giving voice to many experiences and points of view. (2007, p. 49)

Much of contemporary museology advocates for shifting primary focus away from object study and preservation to a visitor/learner-centered one. This shift complements contemporary shifts in school-based art education from subject/content-centered to learner/contextually-centered models. Increasingly, more and more museum education staff have taken to applying the same constructivist philosophy driving progressive school reform and applied it to their work, notably demonstrated by participatory interpretation strategies and other interactive opportunities for meaning-making (Cooper, 2007; Ebitz, 2007; Kydd, 2007; Rose, 2007; Willumson, 2007).

Buffington describes a range of collaboration between teachers and museum staff in developing education programs, from those that “involve little teacher input” to those that “require near constant cooperation among all the educators” (2007, p. 14). However, she also notes that regardless of the level of teacher input during planning and development, teacher choice determines which K-12 programs are utilized. Many art museum educators seeking to cultivate school tour programs and relationships with K-12 teachers have aspired to better align their school tour and teacher PD programs with constructivist and inquiry-based pedagogies (Burchenal & Lasser, 2007; Buffington, 2007; Dyson; 2013; Grenier, 2010; Jones, 2014; Marcus, 2008; Sandell & Henry, 2014). Museum-initiated PD experiences that truly embrace constructivist and inquiry-based learning establish museum educators and participating
classroom teachers as co-learners; for example, teachers can reciprocally inform museum educators about nuances and challenges of classroom instruction and specific needs of distinct student groups. Increased cultivation of such cross-institutional PD opportunities has the potential to benefit both domains in multiple capacities: strengthening shared geographic and professional communities; facilitating teacher access to high quality and varied instructional and curricular resources; and growing museum audiences of educated users/supporters (Burchenal & Lasser, 2007).

**Collaborative Professional Development Models between Art Museums and K-12 Schools**

The increased application of constructivist and inquiry-based approaches to designing museum spaces, exhibitions, and programs (Ebitz, 2007; Falk & Dierking, 2012; Hein, 1998) make museums particularly well-suited to PD experiences that inspire transformative learning. They are natural locations for any combination of informal, nonformal, and formal learning and may function as sites of “disorienting dilemmas” as teachers are situated outside of their regular school and classroom environments (Mezirow, 1997; Lind, 2007). Museum-initiated PD may meet the needs of art teachers who are not served by staff development or in-service models provided by schools. They also reflect attention to research that advocates for new collaborative approaches to teacher PD involving institutions beyond the traditional school setting. These types of programs connect teachers with physical and human resources beyond those of K-12 schools and districts to create new, broader networks of support. They also challenge assumptions that “teaching is shaped and structured primarily by school systems” (Darling Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995, p. 600) and reinforce the notion that learning also takes place outside of traditional schools (Kydd, 2007). Cross-institutional communities may validate members’ pedagogical and curricular ideas, empowering them to risk trying out strategies or
introducing content that runs counter to the status quo, ultimately bringing about real school reform (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Grenier, 2010). Constructivist and inquiry-based cross-institutional PD programs may increase professional understanding between art educators in museums and K-12 classrooms, which may lead to improved learning outcomes for educators and students in both institutional domains (Marcus, 2008).

**Summer institutes and non-job-embedded PLCs.** Many museums offer immersive summer institutes for K-12 teachers that satisfy many characteristics for high quality teacher PD, including; extended contact hours, constructivist learning experiences, subject-relevance, and opportunities for individual reflection and collaborative work. Summer institutes usually take place over four or five consecutive days and feature museum educators or other invited facilitators leading teachers through a variety of inquiry-based experiences, such as art-making, hands-on problem-solving, journaling, object study, and guided readings and discussions (Grenier, 2010; Marcus, 2008; Sandell & Henry, 2014). Goals for these summer institutes are generally focused on making classroom teachers more comfortable with using museums and objects as instructional resources in the classroom and cultivating visual literacy (Buffington, 2007; Burchenal & Lasser, 2007; Grenier, 2010; Marcus, 2008; Sandell & Henry, 2014). Other programs seek to address issues of teacher stress and low morale by designing experiences that “nurture the nurturers” in addition to “teaching the teachers” (Allison, 2013; Sandell & Henry, 2014). Building in opportunities for socializing also contributes to art teachers’ feelings of community and well-being (Grenier, 2010).

While teacher PD in art museums is not job-embedded, hosting institutions may create systems for participating teachers to maintain contact, discussion, and collaboration beyond the summer experience—efforts reflective of the PLC model. Programs based in major metropolitan,
tourist-destination cities, such as NAEA’s SummerVision institute in Washington, D.C., bring art teachers together from all over the country and maintain the sense of community established during the on-site sessions through social media and other web-based PLC platforms (Sandell & Henry, 2014). Art museums PD institutes in other cities connect regional participants and create PLCs with teachers from a variety of local school districts. Art museum-based PLCs can provide classroom teachers with access to community and knowledge-based resources, reduce feelings of isolation by creating regular opportunities for interaction with peers and museum educators, align art educational learning outcomes between K-12 school and art museum settings, and improve field praxis.

**Frameworks for Analyzing Museum-Initiated, K-12 Teacher Professional Development Programs**

In addition to using a list of characteristics for high quality PD, a few other lenses might be considered for analyzing museum-initiated PD for art teachers. Sabol (2006) recommends seeking out multiple indicators for both intended and unintended outcomes of the PD experience. He cites three major points of consideration posed by Guskey (2000) to ensure meaningful, intentional PD experience, “1) Begin with a clear statement of purposes and goals . . . 2) Ensure that the goals are worthwhile to all parties. . . and 3) Determine how the goals can be assessed” (Sabol, 2006, p. 16).

Liu (2007) offers criteria used in Canada for the Museum & Schools Partnership Award as a tool to “help us reflect on how to successfully make art museums and schools work well together” (p. 135). This annual award is presented to outstanding collaborations between museums and schools that focus on developing students’ understandings of Canadian culture, heritage, and natural resources. Nominees are assessed over six major categories;
- Collaboration: Demonstrates how museums and schools can work effectively together.
- Heritage: Enriches and expands students' understanding of and appreciation for Canada's cultural and natural heritage.
- Partnership: Shares authority, investment of resources, and risk-taking.
- Relevance: Demonstrates relevance of the project/program to the communities served and to the advancement of museum and school practice.
- Synergy: Realizes an educational opportunity neither partner could achieve without the help of the other.
- Vision: Advances the possibilities of what museums and schools can achieve together. (Canadian Museums Association, 2010)

Five of these areas and their descriptive qualifications—Collaboration, Partnership, Relevance, Synergy, and Vision—are well-suited for analyzing the workings of school and museum PD partnerships in the United States, including those focused on teacher professional development.

**CHAPTER II Summary**

When districts and schools are preoccupied with meeting high-stakes testing standards, they may lack the initiative and/or ability to imagine or provide high quality PD for teachers in non-tested subjects like the visual arts. Further, PD focused on constructivist and inquiry-based pedagogy may be subjugated to PD focused on boosting student content knowledge in tested subjects and improving test-taking performance. By fostering collaborative, content-specific PD communities for art teachers, art museums may fill PD gaps left unattended by schools and districts. By doing so, they also take on more prominent leadership roles that may shape efforts of education reform. As backlash to testing culture gives rise to calls for more constructivist, inquiry-based, and trans-disciplinary learning paradigms, art education is poised to serve as a model—and classroom and museum art educators as leaders—for K-12 education. In order for this to happen, Kydd (2007) maintains,

> It is time to break down the barriers between the world of the museum and the world of the classroom. School as we know it today is a fairly recent phenomenon where children
are separated from the community to learn. Teachers cannot be expected to educate them well in a vacuum. There are rich resources and expertise in our communities that could be an integral part of our education system. Both sides—the museum world and the school world—must work together, valuing each other’s strengths and basing every decision on what we know about how people learn. (p. 121)

Professional development programs for art teachers are likely to continue to grow as an area of focus for museum educators. Continued research into and analysis of existing partnerships can suggest areas for further cultivation, troubleshooting, and creating better program outcomes and praxis in the field.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of research paradigms and methodology that guided the direction of this study of the Columbus Museum of Art’s 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute (TFCI). A discussion of the research approach—a blending of case study and grounded theory—is presented along with the blended emic/etic perspectives that characterized the research. Data collection methods, sources, triangulation, and analysis are described along with research settings and participants.

Qualitative Research Design

Stake (2010) describes qualitative research as applying “human perception and understanding” as opposed to using “linear attributes, measurements, and statistical analysis” to study how things work (p. 11). He goes on to identify four distinct sets of characteristics for qualitative study. It is 1) interpretive, allowing for multiple meanings and perspectives from subjects and researcher; 2) experiential, empirical and field oriented; 3) situational, relying on unique and specific contexts; and 4) personalistic, working to understand and empathize with diverse and individual perceptions (Stake, 2010, p. 15). Similarly, Yin’s (2011) five features of qualitative research note its focus on investigating “real world conditions,” and “representing the views and perspectives of the people” being studied (Yin, 2011, p. 7). Qualitative research also necessarily represents the perspectives and understanding of the researcher (and research advisors), as all themes and patterns which may emerge from collected data are the result of their unique analysis and interpretation.
Because I sought to uncover the perceptions, interactions, and relationships between participants as they developed within the real-world context of a museum-initiated professional development program for K-12 teachers (rather than to measure quantifiable shifts in pedagogy and practice) qualitative research guided my methodology. I began this research with a specific interest in the major teacher professional development program offered by the Columbus Museum of Art, thus, the Teaching for Creativity Institute became a suitable subject for case study. Although I had a few preconceptions about potential factors that might shape the impact of the Institute on teachers’ practice and beliefs, my research also reflected approaches of grounded theory.

**Case Study and Grounded Theory**

Yin (2011) defines case study research as inquiry into “a phenomenon (the case) in its real-world context” (p. 17). Creswell (2009), drawing from Stake (1995), constructs a more elaborative definition for case study as a,

strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. Cases are bounded by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time. (Creswell, 2009, p. 13)

Defining the boundaries of the phenomenon to be studied is an essential part of case study research design (Davenport & Bergmark O’Connor, 2014; Stake, 2003). While case studies generally take place over a sustained period of time, Davenport and Bergmark (2014) reference the roles of limitations and delimitations in defining a case study’s bounded system, citing Hays’ (2004) recommendation that case study researchers set limits on “the number of site visits or observations because the story does not end when the study is over” (p. 60). This study centered on the workings of a particular museum’s (the Columbus Museum of Art) teacher professional development program (the 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute). While the 2015
Institute began with a four-day “participatory immersion into ideas and practices for fostering creativity” during the month of June (Columbus Museum of Art, 2015), it was also designed to continue throughout the subsequent school year, during which teachers meet as fellows “with master teachers and outside experts during 3, single-day workshops designed to support them in being effective and inspiring agents for creativity in their own classrooms and schools” (Columbus Museum of Art, 2015). This case study focused primarily on the experiences of K-12 art teachers and museum facilitators during the 2015 TFCI’s intensive four-day summer session and the weeks immediately preceding and following.

Corbin and Strauss (2008) and Stake (2003) emphasize the importance of structuring case study research around specific issues and questions, but also note that different researchers may find different areas of emphasis or purposes for conducting case studies of the same subject. As such, while a case study of the TFCI might posit a variety of research questions and issues for study, the questions and issues guiding this study were focused on how a museum-initiated, PD program for teachers might shift art education pedagogy and value within 21st-century, K-12 schools. As previously mentioned, I had some preconceptions about factors which might play a part in how the TFCI worked going into the study. Such assumptions included beliefs that the TFCI might demonstrate a) best practices for teacher professional development and adult learning, b) content in alignment with postmodern art education pedagogies, and c) responsiveness to issues and concerns relevant to Columbus area schools. However, I did not approach the study with any defined hypothesis or testable theory and instead conscientiously allowed room for theories to emerge from participants’ perceptions and experiences—a research practice characterized as grounded theory (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Miraglia, 2014; Yin, 2008).
Case study and grounded theory research are similar in that both approaches are concerned with gathering substantive, rich, sensory data and studying subjects in their natural contexts (Miraglia, 2014; Yin, 2009). Grounded theory is an inductive, qualitative research methodology in which the researcher develops theories around an issue or question from constant analysis and comparison of collected data instead of starting with defined hypotheses or theoretical frameworks (Creswell, 2009; Davenport & Bergmark O’Connor, 2014; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Miraglia, 2014; Yin, 2008). Using a constant comparative coding process during data analysis, grounded theory researchers draw upon participants’ language and perspectives (captured in transcribed interviews and detailed field notes) as the basis for emergent themes and patterns (Creswell, 2009; Miraglia, 2014; Yin, 2008). In keeping with grounded theory methodology, this case study research developed out of constant comparative analysis of in-depth and transcribed interviews, pre- and post-experience teacher surveys, four days of direct observations, and document analysis—a saturation of data subjected to multi-level, Open Coding.

Relatability, Fidelity, and Triangulation

Davenport and Bergmark O’Connor (2014) remark on the limitations of qualitative case study for producing generalizable results in the same way that more controlled, quantitative research can. However, they cite Stake’s (1995) proposal of “naturalistic generalization” and Bassey’s (1981) concept of “relatability” as valid and significant goals for case study research. According to Bassey (1981):

An important criterion for judging the merit of case study is the extent to which the details are sufficient and appropriate for a teacher working in a similar situation to relate his [/her] decision making to that described in the case study. The relatability of a case study is more important than its generalisability. (Bassey, 1981, p. 85, as cited in Davenport & Bergmark O’Connor, 2014, p. 58)
Stake (2003) uses an inquiry’s aims to further delineate subsets of case study research; *intrinsic* case studies are driven by a researcher’s wish to understand the particulars of a unique case, while researchers undertaking *instrumental* case study are seeking to use the case as a means for deepening understanding around broader issues. These categories are distinct, but Stake cautions that “[b]ecause the researcher simultaneously has several interests, particular and general, there is no line distinguishing intrinsic case study from instrumental; rather, a zone of combined purpose separates them” (2003, p. 137). In keeping with Stake’s point, this case study grew out of my specific interest in understanding the workings of the CMA’s TFCI teacher professional development program. However, by studying the unique case of the TFCI, I hope to also establish relatability of the case for institutions and individuals interested in developing and/or evaluating cross-institutional professional development experiences for arts educators.

Davenport and Bergmark O’Connor (2014) challenge qualitative research’s capability for producing “valid” data interpretations (as made possible in quantitative experimental research through control groups and random sampling) and instead call for case study researchers to strive for *fidelity*. While their terminology differs, Stake (2003), Yin (2008), Creswell (2009), and Davenport and Bergmark O’Connor (2014) all make the case that given the relativist nature of qualitative research, data should be verified across a range of sources and interpretations.

Triangulation—frequently cited as a standard practice for establishing credibility and accuracy in data interpretation and reporting—entails collecting data from a variety of sources (e.g., observations, interviews, document analysis) and perspectives (e.g. interviewing multiple participants, observations by multiple researchers) to corroborate possible meanings and interpretations (Creswell, 2009; Davenport & Bergmark O’Connor, 2014; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Miraglia, 2014; Smilan & Miraglia, 2014; Stake, 2003, 2010; Yin, 2008). In this
study, data source triangulation was achieved by collecting via field observations, document analysis, pre- and post-Institute participant surveys, and interviews. Perspective triangulation was attempted by surveying a range of art teacher participants, interviewing elementary and high school art teacher participants as well as museum educator facilitators, and researcher observations. In addition to triangulation, additional attempts to ensure credibility and fidelity of this case study research include using thick description in reporting, member-checking of data derived from interviews by interview subjects, and confirmability audits performed by peers and my thesis advisor. (Creswell, 2009; Davenport & Bergmark O’Connor, 2014; Stake, 2003, 2010; Yin, 2008).

**Participant Selection and Participants**

Research participants consisted of K-12 art teachers enrolled in the 2015/2016 Teaching for Creativity Institute (TFCI) as well as the CMA museum educators and facilitators who programmed and presented the experience. In advance of participant selection and data collection, I undertook all necessary steps for conducting research using human subjects in accordance with the research ethics and standards outlined by Kent State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) process. IRB approval was granted in June 2015 and participant selection and data collection immediately followed.

**Museum educators.** Because this study focuses on a specific museum and its programs, I proactively approached the museum’s education director via phone call to ascertain their interest and willingness to participate in this study. From the CMA educator interviews, I sought insight into: the TFCI’s history, goals, outcomes, content, structure, evolution, and context within the education department and its mission; how the Institute’s planners and facilitators understand their relationships with teacher participants and school district administrators; and
how their perceptions about teacher and administrator buy in to the topics and concepts addressed by the Institute. Purposive sampling was used to select two major interview subjects from the museum educator and facilitator pool. For context of current the 2015 TFCI and its history, I interviewed Jennifer Lehe, the museum’s recently hired Manager of Strategic Partnerships directly in charge of the 2015 TFCI, and Cindy Meyers Foley, the museum’s Executive Assistant Director, Director of Learning and Experience. (Museum staff are identified by their given names, with permission.)

**Registered Participants.** Upon IRB approval, the CMA’s education staff provided access to the registrant applications for the 2015 TFCI, which included information about subjects and grade levels taught along with contact information (see Appendix A). Prior to the 2015 Institute, participant registration was capped at 15. As interest in the TFCI grew, in 2015 the CMA’s staff decided to accept all interested teachers and administrators, which expanded the Institute’s size to 56 registered participants. The 2015 TFCI in its entirety included: CMA museum staff and invited presenters who plan its structure and content; invited facilitators who guide inquiry groups through reflective conversations; and the K-12 school teachers, administrators, and support staff who sign on to participate. While participant experiences—specifically art teachers’ experiences—are at the center of this study, their fellow TFCI participants are an essential piece of what shapes their experiences. Through its tour, outreach, and teacher professional development programs, the CMA serves students and teachers across the full spectrum of K-12 grade levels and subject areas. This spectrum is partially reflected by the demographics of the 2015 TFCI summer session’s 56 registered participants who represented 25 schools from six districts. The five Columbus-area districts were designated as either urban or suburban (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). One teacher represented a suburban/rural
district in Massachusetts. Most participants were white/Caucasian, women (93%) teaching at the elementary level (88%). Seventeen of the 56 were art teachers. Table 4 provides an overview of the 2015 TFCI’s participants’ subject area, grade level, and gender demographics, and Table 5 gives an overview of urban, suburban, and suburban/rural school and district distributions.

Some participants came to the TFCI in groups from the same school, with the intention of working together as a team. Ten schools sent teams ranging in size from two to nine staff members, including art teachers, non-art classroom teachers, and administrators. Table 6 gives an overview of the teacher team demographics by content area. Seven of the 17 participating art teachers attended with other staff members from their buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Intermediate / Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>K-12</th>
<th>Subject Area Totals</th>
<th>Subject Area Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Classroom</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian/Media Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Intervention Specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrative Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Totals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Percentages</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TFCI’s registered participants’ subject areas, grade levels, and gender demographics by number and percent.
Art teachers. As mentioned above, 17 of the 56 teachers and administrators who applied and were accepted into the 2015 TFCI were art teachers. Initially, I hoped to survey and conduct one-on-one interviews with mid-career teacher participants (characterized as having between five to 20 years of service) who were living and working in central Ohio (the museum’s targeted demographic for the Institute). I reasoned that mid-career teachers would have accumulated a significant range of hands-on experiences in the classroom, developed solid curricula and assessment strategies, and felt confidence in their teaching styles. Mid-career teachers also must have participated in a variety of professional development activities throughout the course of their careers in order to keep their licensure current, therefore enabling them to speak critically and comparatively about these experiences versus those of the TFCI. Finally, I sought to diversify interview subject representation by including art teachers of both elementary and secondary grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typologies Represented by 2015 TFCI Participants</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
<th>Art Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Districts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Schools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.

District and school urban/suburban/rural typologies (as designated by the Ohio Department of Education, 2013) represented by 2015 TFCI participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Teams</th>
<th>Art Teachers</th>
<th>Principal/Admins</th>
<th>Non-Art Teachers</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.

Overview of school teams attending the 2015 TFCI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Teams</th>
<th>Art Teachers</th>
<th>Principal/Admins</th>
<th>Non-Art Teachers</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | 7            | 5                | 23               | 35     |
One and a half weeks prior to the first day of the Institute, museum educator Jen forwarded my email invitation for case study participation to all seventeen art teachers (Appendix B). Two art teachers directly responded to the initial email solicitation. Five days before the Institute’s start, all seventeen art teachers were again invited to participate, this time via a direct email from me (see Appendix B) that included a link to the pre-Institute survey (Appendix C). I sent a final email invitation (Appendix A) to all art teachers, including the pre-Institute survey link, on the eve of the TFCI’s first day. Audio recording and general consent forms (Appendix D) were emailed in advance to all participants agreeing to such interviews and hard copies were provided to them in person (one for signing and returning to the researcher, and one to keep) on the first meeting day of the Institute’s summer session. In total, eight art teachers completed the online, pre-Institute survey, five of which indicated that they would be willing to participate further during recorded interviews.

Four out of the five teachers who gave consent followed through with the recorded, one-on-one interviews. Three were elementary teachers and one taught high school. Three of the four teachers had three or less years of teaching experience. The fourth teacher, who did qualify as mid-career with fifteen years of experience, had traveled from New England to participate in the Institute. I interviewed her because she provided the mid-career perspective that I was originally seeking, and because her New England roots challenged my preconceptions about the importance of geographic community for the Institute’s workings, reinforcing data triangulation. Also during the institute, I was approached by a few art teachers who expressed interest in participating in the study, but were unable to dedicate additional time to interviews outside of the Institute’s contact hours. These teachers (who all taught within the same urban school district, but at different schools) invited me to sit in on and record one of their break-out “action team”
meetings. One of the teachers in this group of three was also one of the one-one-one interview participants. An overview of the study’s art teacher participants, including additional details about those who agreed to be interviewed is listed in Table 7. All teachers are identified by pseudonyms.

**Role of the Researcher**

Qualitative research studies are often described as demonstrating *emic* or *etic* perspectives. Stake (2010) defines emic issues as those “emerging from the people” who participate in the study, and etic issues as those “brought by the researcher” (p. 15). Yin (2011) explains that emic and etic perspectives usually differ because of differences between the demographic characteristics and values of the researcher and study participants. Researchers must be aware of how their unique lived experiences, “political assumptions and theoretical commitments” might impact the researchers’ study emphasis, data interpretation, and participants’ behavior and responses (Yin, 2011, p. 12). As a researcher interested in how the TFCI works and meshes with my preliminary research on high quality professional development and contemporary education pedagogies, I bring etic issues to the study. However, I am also interested in understanding how the TFCI works through the perspectives of the classroom teachers and museum educators who are part of it—in other words, through an emic perspective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Research Activities</th>
<th>Brief Description of Interview Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Urban A</td>
<td>Recorded one-on-one interview&lt;br&gt;Recorded teacher meeting/interview&lt;br&gt;Pre-Experience Survey&lt;br&gt;Post-Experience Survey</td>
<td>Lynn, a confident and ambitious teacher in her early to late-20s, had just finished her third year teaching Digital Art, Computer Graphics, and Yearbook at a Title 1 High School in the CCS district. At the time of the interview, she was taking coursework to prepare for teaching AP Art History during the 2015-2016 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Urban A</td>
<td>Recorded one-on-one interview&lt;br&gt;Pre-Experience Survey&lt;br&gt;Post-Experience Survey</td>
<td>Leah, an enthusiastic recent graduate in her mid-20s who strongly identifies with teaching for social justice paradigms, was hired half-way through the 2014-2015 school year as a long-term substitute at an urban elementary school in the CCS district. She was hired as the school’s contracted art teacher at the end of the year and will begin her first full year of teaching in the fall of 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Suburban A</td>
<td>Recorded one-on-one interview&lt;br&gt;Pre-Experience Survey&lt;br&gt;Post-Experience Survey</td>
<td>Wendy, an adventurous and involved teacher in her late-30s, postponed her professional teaching career after graduating with a degree in art education in her early 20s, opting instead to focus on starting a family. She recently completed certification requirements and her second year of teaching art at the elementary school that her children attended. She was recently asked by her principal to co-lead her school’s Enrichment Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>MASS</td>
<td>Recorded one-on-one interview&lt;br&gt;Pre-Experience Survey&lt;br&gt;Post-Experience Survey</td>
<td>Sue, an enthusiastic and energetic mid-career art in her early-40s, traveled from Massachusetts to participate in the TFCI. She found out about the TFCI after she was assigned to watch Cindy’s TEDxColumbus talk as part of an online class offered by the Art of Education website. Sue is very interested in implementing Teaching for Artistic Behavior (TAB) and Choice-based Art Education pedagogies in her classroom. She is also the Curriculum Coordinator for her school’s summer enrichment program and has been teaching art for 15 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Urban A</td>
<td>Recorded teacher meeting/interview</td>
<td>Helen has taught art for over 22 years in both a small rural school district and in the CCS district where she currently coordinates all city-wide art competitions and professional development for art teachers while also teaching at a Title 1 elementary school. She is a passionate and optimistic art teacher who takes an active role in CCS leadership and has a close relationship with CMA education department staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Urban A</td>
<td>Recorded teacher meeting/interview</td>
<td>Mary, a down-to-earth teacher in her mid-30s with more than 8 years in the CCS district, teaches art at a Title 1 elementary school. She entered into the TFCI reflecting on the sense of isolation she often feels as the only art teacher in her building and with hopes of collaborating and connecting with other art teachers in her district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Urban A</td>
<td>Pre-Experience Survey</td>
<td>No further description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Suburban A</td>
<td>Pre-Experience Survey</td>
<td>No further description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Suburban A</td>
<td>Pre-Experience Survey</td>
<td>No further description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Urban B</td>
<td>Pre-Experience Survey</td>
<td>No further description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Art teacher participant information.
Also complicating the emic/etic dichotomy are my personal histories as both a former classroom art teacher and museum educator. These educator roles remain a part of my identity even though I am not currently engaged in active practice of either role. In a sense, parts of me are both researcher and subject participant. Corbin and Strauss (2008) call for researchers to consider reflexivity and keep conscious of how their personal feelings and responses during interviews and observations (consciously or subconsciously) influence participants while data is being collected. The authors also point out that many qualitative research paradigms recognize researcher objectivity as a myth, given the deeply embedded personal histories, knowledge, and experiences that researchers carry into each unique study. Instead Corbin and Strauss advocate that researchers strive for *sensitivity*:

Sensitivity stands in contrast to objectivity. It requires that a researcher put him- or herself into the research. Sensitivity means having insight, being tuned in to, being able to pick up on relevant issues, events, and happenings in data. It means being able to present the view of participants and taking the role of the other through immersion in data. (2008, p. 32)

Keeping the above in mind, I approached the study as a participant-as-observer; while I sat in on sessions and engaged in some activities and break-out group discussions, all TFCI participants were aware of my professional history and that I was there to conduct a case study of the 2015 TFCI’s summer session (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). I was conscious about my level of engagement and tried not to impede or influence the Institute’s goals or outcomes. During most of the activities and conversations, I acted as a passive-observer to optimize my ability to capture rich, descriptive notes and preserve as much sensitivity as possible. I approached interviews from a conversational rather than formal position. My professional history in school and museum education served as a common point of reference for myself and the interview participants; I was able to communicate empathy and recognition for the topics and
issues each discussed. However, while some of my professional experiences, ideas, and opinions might be similar to those expressed by the study’s participants, they are not identical (Yin, 2011). I made sure to keep conscious of the blended emic/etic perspective that guided me through the research process and kept capturing participants’ voices and ideas about the TFCI as my primary objective.

Settings

The majority of research took place at the Columbus Museum of Art in Columbus, Ohio during the summer session of the 2015/2016 Teaching for Creativity Institute from June 16th through the 19th. Two of the recorded interviews took place at a Columbus-area coffee shop.

Columbus Museum of Art

The museum is centrally located in the downtown area of Columbus, Ohio and attracts around 300,000 visitors annually. It is a mid-sized, Mid-western art museum with collection strengths in American and European Modern art and work by regional artists with national significance like George Bellows, Aminah Brenda Lynn Robinson, and Elijah Pierce. A variety of spaces make up the museum’s collective footprint, many of which were used during the TFCI summer session. The museum has occupied the Renaissance Revival-style Broad Street building since the early 1930s and has since gone through several expansion projects, the most recent of which—the contemporary Walter Wing addition—opened in October 2015, a few months after the TFCI’s summer session. During the Walter Wing construction, visitors (including TFCI participants) entered the museum through the group tour entrance leading into the Broad Building (see CMA floorplan in Figure 3). TFCI summer session activities utilized the Center for Creativity’s (which debuted in 2011) Big Idea Gallery along with more traditional galleries in the
Broad Building (Figure 4a-b). The most commonly used spaces were the Forum (Figures 5a-b) and Ready Room (Figures 6a-b).

Figure 4a-b. Participants of the Columbus Museum of Art’s 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session in traditional galleries (left) and Big Idea Gallery (right), both photos used with permission and taken from the Columbus Museum of Art’s Padlet for the 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute.

Figure 5a-b. The Columbus Museum of Art’s Forum set up, during the 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session.
The Forum (Figure 5a-b) was used for all full group activities, such as the daily morning welcome and agenda-setting, key note presentations, and end of the day wrap-ups. The room was set up with large round tables covered with black table cloths and ringed by black folding chairs which were frequently pushed aside to make room for teachers working in teams on the polished hardwood floors. The walls of the room were adorned with artworks by Columbus artist Aminah Brenda Lynn Robinson. A large screen and podium were set up in the front of the room for presenters. The back of the room featured two large hospitality tables filled with snacks, water, coffee, and tea. Break-out sessions took place in the Forum and the nearby Ready Room (Figure 6a-b). This room was set up as a more open space, furnished with only a few large, rectangular folding tables and a smattering of chairs. The museum’s Studio, Auditorium, and Innovation Lab meeting spaces were also occasionally used during break-out sessions along with the Derby Court, which many teachers also used as a site to eat lunch, socialize and reflect on the day’s events (Figure 7).
Coffee Shop

Two of the art teacher interviews took place in a popular coffee shop franchise located in a busy shopping area in an inner ring Columbus suburb. The location was selected by the two teachers for its convenience and proximity to their homes. The lively coffee shop was buzzing with patrons and featured standard, cozy décor. During each interview, the teacher and I sat on comfortably padded chairs at a small table in the middle of the main café space. During both interviews we were able to converse with ease, and I was able to obtain good recordings for transcription despite the crowds and background noise.
Methods and Data Sources

As previously mentioned, data collection and sources were diversified for triangulation in order to better ensure the study’s relatability and fidelity. Research methods included pre- and post-Institute surveys of art teacher participants, document analysis, field observations during all four summer session meeting days, and recorded and transcribed interviews of art teacher participants and museum educators. More thorough descriptions of each method and data source, as well as an overview of data analysis follow.

Data Source: Document Analysis

Document analysis was used as a strategy for gathering data about the TFCI’s structure and design as well as participants’ attitudes and beliefs about its content. Upon IRB approval, CMA educators shared multiple documents regarding the TFCI’s history, goals and outcomes, as well as those specific to the 2015/2016 institute, including plans, schedules, agendas, and teacher applications. During the June 2015 summer sessions, the CMA educators shared all hand-outs and materials, revised daily schedules and agendas. I was given access to the interactive Padlet.com site and closed Facebook group that CMA educators set up for all TFCI participants (museum educators, facilitators, and teachers) to document summer session events by posting photos and text, and to keep participants connected following the summer session. Also during the summer session, I documented and tracked changes to a whiteboard featuring a working definition for creativity that all TFCI participants were asked to modify and annotate with questions and ideas. At the summer session’s conclusion I was given access to all: PowerPoint presentations; daily feedback forms turned in by teachers at the end of each day; post-its and facilitators’ notes from the Action and Inquiry Group break-out sessions; Used to Think/Now I Think sheets used as a means for summative feedback; and the participants’ Action Plans, which
were meant to outline the actionable steps teachers would take to implement the TFCI content into their teaching practice throughout the following school year.

**Data Source: Pre- and Post-Institute Surveys**

Davenport and Bergmark O’Connor (2014) remark on the value of using surveys in case study research (in combination with more in-depth, personalized interviews) to help paint an accurate picture of participants’ attitudes and beliefs. All art teachers who enrolled in the 2015/2016 TFCI were invited to complete a pre-experience SurveyMonkey.com survey. The eight-item survey (Appendix C) included questions designed to gauge the philosophies, interests, and curricular emphases of participants coming into the Institute as well as their motivations for participation. Eight of the 17 art teachers who enrolled in the TFCI completed the pre-experience survey; these teachers were also invited to participate further in the study, or opt out. All eight teachers were invited to also participate in a post-experience SurveyMonkey.com survey. Four out of the eight also completed the post-experience survey. The nine-item, post-survey (Appendix B) included questions similar to the pre-Institute survey to help determine if any of the teacher participants’ philosophies, interests, or curricular emphases had shifted following the TFCI. Several short-answer questions focused more specifically on how the four-day summer session may have affected their pedagogical beliefs, and how they anticipated the experience might impact their teaching and curricular content in the future.

**Data Source: Field Observations**

I attended and observed all four days of the June 2015 summer session of the TFCI. Creswell (2009) describes qualitative observations as “those in which the researcher takes notes on the behavior and activities of individuals at the research site…in an unstructured or semistructured way” (p. 181). Yin (2011) acknowledges the value of observation as a primary
data source collected firsthand through the researcher’s senses rather than filtered through the perceptions of other parties, but offers a caveat; the researcher cannot possibly observe the totality of the case and must make intentional decisions about which aspects to observe. The TFCI included sessions involving all participants together (daily welcoming and concluding assemblies and key note presentations) and break-out sessions and activities that placed participants into small groups scattered throughout the museum. I opted to try and follow and observe break-out groups that included interview participants from the Columbus City School district as an attempt to flesh out a more comprehensive portrayal of their summer session experience. My observations were documented through thorough, hand-written field notes in two notebooks and digital photographs of activities and settings throughout the four days. The dates, times, and locations of each observation session were logged with descriptions.

**Data Source: Interviews**

Interviews are crucial to both case study and grounded theory research, as they provide insight and points-of-view on the case from outside of the researchers’ perspective (Davenport & Bergmark O’Connor, 2014). Once interview participants were selected and consent forms were distributed and collected I conducted a series of semi-structured, conversational, one-on-one interviews with art teachers and museum educators involved with the 2015 TFCI. The aim of these qualitative interviews (Yin, 2011) was to use participants’ responses to open-ended questions about the TFCI to discuss potential key topics and themes as captured by their own words. In order to help set the interview participants at ease and to help them feel prepared for our conversations, I emailed each a copy of some possible interview questions (Appendix D) so that they could look them over or disregard them as they saw fit. I also explained that these
questions were not to be followed as a script and that I hoped our discussions would be more conversational.

Interviews ranged from 20 minutes to just over an hour in length and were digitally recorded and transcribed for analysis and coding. All interviews were arranged in accordance with the preferences and availability of each participant and took place in person. Both recorded interviews with CMA educators took place over lunch in the CMA’s Broad Street lobby space seven days after the TFCI summer session concluded. The first teacher interview (Leah) also took place in the Broad Street lobby during the lunch break on the last day of the TFCI summer session. The second teacher interview (Sue) took place at a table nestled in the CMA’s Big Idea corridor gallery space immediately following the TFCI summer session’s conclusion. The remaining two teacher interviews took place at a coffee shop in a suburb of Columbus ten days after the TFCI’s summer session ended. Finally, I was invited to sit in on the culminating Action Team meeting made up of three Columbus City School art teachers as they worked together to draft an action plan for implementing content and ideas from the TFCI during the next school year. Over the course of the two months following the digitally recorded interview sessions, I transcribed them, verbatim, for subsequent coding and analysis.

**Data Analysis**

Because of the nature of the research structure that blended case study with grounded theory approaches, data analysis was a multi-tiered, on-going process (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Creswell, 2009; Yin, 2011). The process of data analysis coincided with its collection; constantly comparing data as more was added from a variety of sources. First passes at the data occurred during transcription of interviews and organization of other sources. Digital copies were printed into hard copies and all sources were initially organized and clustered by data type into binders.
These hard copies were marked up, passages underlined, memos written in margins and on sticky notes, and some emergent patterns color-coded with highlighters—a process Ryan and Bernard (2003) refer to as “pawing” through the data. Next, I returned to the digital transcriptions of participant interviews, field notes, survey data, TFCI planning and session materials to begin “cutting and sorting” data and codes into Word and Excel files. This pass through the data involved Open Coding, which “casts a wide net for ideas, and involves breaking up the data and labeling or naming” concepts and events (Miraglia, 2014, p. 109). This processing of the data primarily involved breaking apart/splitting the data according to Attribute Codes (basic descriptive codes that denote dates and times, participant demographic info, etc.) and Structural Codes (or Descriptive Codes) that label key words and concepts related to research and interview questions (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Davenport & Bermark O’Connor, 2014; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Saldana, 2009; Miraglia, 2014; Ryan & Bernard, 2003; Yin, 2011). At this point, I also created an Excel file code book to track and highlight the process of splitting, and lumping codes to uncover larger categories and themes (Ryan & Bernard, 2003; Miraglia, 2014; Saldana, 2009).

After the initial round of open-coding and the creation of a code book, I began Axial Coding, or the process of reaggregating codes and categories generated during Open Coding into narrower clusters and categories based on patterns, commonalities, similarities and differences (Miraglia, 2014; Saldana, 2009). Ryan and Bernard (2003) suggest a systematic process of scrutinizing qualitative data and processing it into useful, meaningful information, “(1) discovering themes and subthemes, (2) winnowing themes to a manageable few (i.e., deciding which themes are important in any project), (3) building hierarchies of themes or code books, and (4) linking themes into theoretical models” (p. 85).
Axial Coding resulted in four broad categories: 1) Characteristics of registered participants, 2) TFCI’s purpose and goals, 3) TFCI’s content and structure, and 4) Evidence for TFCI’s impact. Relationships between these categories began to suggest working models of, 1) the content, structure, and impact of the TFCI, and 2) characteristics of high quality teacher PD evinced (or contradicted) by the TFCI content and structure as intended by the museum educators who developed them, and the perceptions of the teacher participants. Axial coding also began to indicate relationships between the two models that point to key themes and speak to the study’s research questions.

CHAPTER III Summary

Chapter III presented the research design for this qualitative study of the Columbus Museum of Art’s summer session for the 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute. The research, combined case study and grounded theory methodologies and was approached by using a blended emic/etic lens. Data collection included several methods which were triangulated to better ensure the relatability and fidelity of the study’s findings; these methods included document analysis, surveys, field observations, and semi-structured, conversational interviews. Most data collection took place on site at the museum, with a few teacher interviews taking place at a local coffee shop. I sought to use the words and observations of museum educator and art teacher participants to develop multi-layered codes and themes during constant comparative data analysis, but also acknowledged how my professional history in art education would affect the research and my participant-as-observer role. The following chapter will focus on data analysis and interpretation and the significant codes and themes that emerge.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

Overview

This chapter presents an overview of the codes, categories, frequencies, and patterns that emerged from multiple cycles of data analysis. Interview and field note transcriptions, survey responses, and TFCI planning, organizational, and feedback documents were deconstructed into discreet chunks which were then assigned codes. The initial coding cycle yielded 108 codes that were grouped into eight categories and 11 subcategories (see Appendix X). Additional rounds of analysis and coding distilled these into fewer codes, categories, and subcategories organized into five major sections: 1) Commonalities and patterns of art teacher interviewees’ characteristics, 2) TFCI’s purpose and goals, 3) TFCI’s structure and content, 4) Evidence of TFCI’s Impact, and 5) TFCI’s alignment with characteristics of high quality art teacher PD. Each numerated topic, discussed in the following sections, contributes insights for possible answers to the study’s research questions: How does the CMA’s shift from focusing on content and technique to creativity, imagination, and critical thinking manifest in the TFCI; and How does this program contribute to the ability of a midsize, Midwestern art museum to catalyze authentic measures of school reform within its community, specifically in the realm of arts education?

Commonalities and Patterns of Art Teacher Interviewees’ Characteristics

As mentioned in Chapter III, eight of the TFCI’s 17 art teachers completed and returned pre-institute surveys. Of those eight, four agreed to be interviewed and completed post-institute surveys. These four women share similarities in professional experience, pedagogical interests
and concerns, and character traits. Table 8—which was compiled from frequency and pattern analysis of each participant’s TFCI application, pre- and post-survey responses and interview transcriptions—gives an overview of their basic demographic information, and familiarity with the CMA’s K-12 teacher PD offerings. A more detailed analysis of the demographics and characteristics of these four art teacher participants follows.

Demographic information. As suggested by the previous broad participant analysis, all four interviewed art teachers were women, three of whom were Caucasian/white and one of whom was an indeterminate ethnicity/race. All except for Susan live and work in or near Columbus, Ohio. Susan traveled from Massachusetts to take part. Participants’ ages ranged from mid 20s to early 40s. Although I set out to interview mid-career teachers, three out of the four had three or fewer years of experience teaching in their own art classrooms. All had a Bachelor’s degree in Art Education. Julia initially earned a Bachelor’s of Art History before returning to school for Art Education. Susan, the most senior in terms of age and years of teaching experience, also had completed a Master of Fine Arts program. Three of the four taught art in elementary schools, one designated as urban, one suburban, and one suburban/rural. The sole high school art teacher works in an urban district.

Despite variations in grade levels taught and urban/suburban/rural designations of their schools’ settings, code repetitions and patterns indicated that all four teachers: shared professional and pedagogical interests and concerns; significant character traits; and experience and exposures that predisposed them to acceptance of the TFCI’s core content and ideas.
Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Julia*</th>
<th>Lindsey</th>
<th>Wendy</th>
<th>Susan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at time of interview</strong></td>
<td>Late-20s</td>
<td>Mid-20s</td>
<td>Late-30s</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>BA, Art History and Art Education</td>
<td>BA, Art Education</td>
<td>BA, Art Education</td>
<td>BA, Art Education, MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of K-12 Teaching</strong></td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level</strong></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban/Suburban/Rural School</strong></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Suburban Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character Traits</strong></td>
<td>Aversion to boredom, Propensity for experimentation and risk-taking, Inclinations toward leadership roles</td>
<td>Propensity for experimentation and risk-taking, Inclinations toward leadership roles</td>
<td>Aversion to boredom, Propensity for experimentation and risk-taking, Inclinations toward leadership roles</td>
<td>Aversion to boredom, Propensity for experimentation and risk-taking, Inclinations toward leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Concerns</strong></td>
<td>Testing Culture, Jaded Colleagues, Administrator Support</td>
<td>Testing Culture, Jaded Colleagues, Administrator Support</td>
<td>Testing Culture, Jaded Colleagues, Administrator Support</td>
<td>Testing Culture, Jaded Colleagues, Administrator Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivations and Goals for TFCI</strong></td>
<td>Experienced several one-day, CMA-hosted, art teacher PD workshops with colleagues in her district. Goals: Access to ideas and strategies that will push the boundaries of her classroom and curriculum and get her students excited about learning again. Forge connections with fellow educators interested in teaching for creativity.</td>
<td>Experienced a one-day, CMA-hosted, art teacher PD workshops with colleagues in her district. Goals: Access ideas that will help shift her thinking to better support students’ creative growth. Acquire language and terminology to advocate for creativity in the classroom.</td>
<td>Involved in her district’s Creativity Task Force. Many teachers in her district participated in past TFCIs and she heard lots of positive feedback. Goals: Learn new ways to engage students and bring back info to share with non-art teacher colleagues.</td>
<td>Completed several choice-based/Teaching for Artistic Behaviors workshops and online courses, one of which featured Cindy Foley as a keynote speaker. Goals: Learn strategies for managing student projects and helping students develop their strengths and interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison overview of 2015 TFCI art teacher interviewees’ demographic, professional, and character trait information. *All teacher participant names are pseudonyms.
Character Traits: Propensity for experimentation and risk and leadership inclinations.

When teacher interviews were analyzed for frequency codes connected to TFCI ideas and content, the “Experimentation & Risk-Taking” code ranked at the top of the list for two teachers (Julia and Wendy), third for Susan, and tied for fourth for Lindsey. During the interviews, all teachers stayed open to new ideas, embraced trying out new strategies and approaches in their classrooms, and described a willingness to get out of personal and professional comfort zones.

Susan, Wendy, and Julia all specifically mention personal aversions to boredom. Julia hoped that participating the TFCI might help her out of a professional rut:

I noticed this year is I was a little bored...And I think I just kind of fell into a routine...And I wasn't excited about things...the kids, they like my classroom, they like me, so I didn't have issues behaviorally, but I kind of got that vibe that they were bored. So I think the biggest thing I took from the institute is...just...you can't do the same thing all the time. It doesn't work that way. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)

For Lindsey, experimentation and risk-taking is reflected in her willingness to share TFCI ideas and strategies with other teachers in her building, even though she is a relatively novice teacher; “I don't know that it's really given me confidence. But it's given me the feeling that I need to suck it up and do it anyway” (personal communication, June 19, 2015). Her comment also reflects a burgeoning leadership inclination that has more fully developed in the other three.

Julia served on her school’s Leadership Board and was preparing to serve her first year as Department Chair the following school year. Wendy was tapped by her principal to lead her school’s Enrichment Team and she was also part of a district-wide Creativity Task Force. Susan was preparing to direct the curricular aspects of her school’s summer program, and served as a leader and resource to the pre-service teachers she worked with as an art education adjunct teacher at a local college.
Professional and pedagogical interests and concerns. Pre- and post-institute survey responses and teacher interview analysis revealed similarities of professional and pedagogical interest and concerns for these four art teachers.

**Interests: 21st Century Skills, choice-based art education/Teaching for Artistic Behavior, and transdisciplinary learning.** In their survey responses and interviews, all four teachers indicated that teaching 21st Century Skill development (i.e., Creativity, Critical Thinking, Collaboration, and Communication) and implementing Choice-based models for art education (e.g., Teaching for Artistic Behaviors (TAB) or other student-directed opportunities for arts inquiry) were top priorities for their practice. Of the eight completed pre-institute survey responses, six ranked 21st Century Skill development as “Extremely Important” and two as “Very Important” (see Appendix X for survey sample). Unsurprisingly, the 21st Century Skill framework for learning has clear connections to creativity and the focus of the TFCI. The concept of 21st Century Skills is one part of the national Framework for 21st Century Learning initiative. The authors of the 21st Century Skills Map for the arts stress that preparing students for the future requires that they develop their creative capacities. They also note that, “creativity is native to the arts” and that students who are educated to be creative thinkers are “better able to tolerate ambiguity, explore new realms of possibility, express their own thoughts and feelings and understand the perspectives of others” and will, through the study of the arts more likely become “globally aware, collaborative, and responsible citizens” (Dean et al., 2010). As Susan succinctly remarked, “Creativity is a 21st Century Skill” (post-institute survey response, July, 2015).

Choice-based art education. Each teacher reported either having already integrated or experimented with these approaches in their regular practice, or working out how to do so in the
coming school year. Each was also able to connect choice-based art education with other unique pedagogical interests. For example, Lindsey repeatedly expressed her embrace of social justice art education models during her interview. She connected with choice-based models of art education’s support of students’ agency and empowerment—aims that are also particularly relevant to social justice art education:

I feel like they go hand in hand, to a degree. . .a lot of these creative approaches are student-centered. And if we're going to truly be student-centered, then we have to consider what is a student interested in? What's impacting their day-to-day life? [W]hat is their perspective and why that is informed by their…social-political environment? So, to even consider that is going to require some social justice responsibility. . .When I'm hearing the discussion of bringing creativity into the classroom, I'm hearing. . .going toward the facilitator, going toward student-centered. . .Where I'm not, you know, that lecturer downloading information into their brain. (laughs) Instead, I'm just there to kind of guide as they explore their own education. (Lindsey, personal communication, June 19, 2015)

Julia, who teaches digital arts classes, brought up the importance of technology as a tool for students’ creativity, while Susan reflected on how she could use more technology to connect her students with the technical information they need to complete a self-directed project and to document their thinking and creative process.

Transdisciplinary learning and collaboration. Three of the four questioned whether teaching and learning is best served, or even possible, when inquiry centers around a single subject or discipline. They discussed enthusiasm for transdisciplinary research and benefits of collaborating with non-art teachers on projects and units of inquiry. Julia described a collaboration with a Language Arts teacher that took place during the 2014-2015 school year. The teacher approached her about working together to guide students through a research/persuasive essay project that also required them to use graphic organizers to present their case visually:
We had like two days blocked out for it and they brought in all their information. . .I showed them the site and they made these really neat info graphics and it was cool that the English teacher sought me out. . .she was like, "I'm not trying to dump this on you, but could you help me brainstorm a way to do this?" And, and we found that site, and, so it was kind of cool. She went around and checked all their writing and I was going around, just visually trying to help them move things around...So it was kind of cool and we have that connection now so I'm sure we'll do it again next year. And, I'll ask her for help with my AP class now that I'll have one. (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Of course, such transdisciplinary teaching models require willing colleagues. Buy-in to these ideas is not universal. Some teachers prefer to stay siloed in their own classrooms and subject areas. The challenge of working with less open-minded peers was an issue of concern mentioned by three of the four interviewees.

**Concerns: Jaded colleagues, administrative support, and testing culture.** In addition to the positive collaborative experience mentioned above, Julia described discouraging interactions with other, “veteran” teachers in her building:

I feel like also, just being a younger teacher. . .it's often... "well, you're young and energetic" like, "of course you have all these ideas". . .but the one AP teacher that asked to work with me, she was my parents' age. And the fact that she saw that something of value was happening, and at least hearing from her students that something of value was happening in my room and that she reached out to me, meant a lot to me. [Be]cause I feel like it becomes this divide between veteran teachers and new teachers. And the veterans don't want to change and don't really want to hear about the new ideas. (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Similarly, Lindsey mentions discussing the content of an in-school teacher professional development workshop with more experienced teacher colleagues:

some of the teachers were sold on it, but some of the other teachers...and with good reason, were like "Oh, this is just a, a fad. Everything in education changes... So, I'm just going to ride it out until there's like a new version of "Math Talks" whatever that may be. And I'm like, "No! This is going to be real because it's addressing changes in our culture and how we're approaching learning. If we don't catch up with these changes we're not going to improve the school and we will fall to the wayside the way that a horse and
buggy did once Ford created a car! Let's not do that!” (Lindsey, personal communication, June 19, 2015)

These concerns were not relegated to just the younger and less experienced interviewees. In reflecting on the generally positive energy of the TFCI participants, Susan remarked that “There are definitely some hardened teachers at my school...waiting for retirement. So, it's nice to be among a group of people who really, love what they do...and want to keep getting better at it. For their kids' sake” (personal communication, June 19, 2015). Jennifer Lehe, the CMA educator responsible for school-museum programs and partnerships observed similar dynamics in her interactions with teachers during other PD initiatives:

There's just such a range of learners who are wanting a range of things, too. Because you will always have those who are like just give me the tools just show me how to do it. And then the others who, you know, are sort of resistant because they, maybe they've seen a lot of things come and go. . .Or they, they just believe really strongly about the way that they are doing already. (personal communication, June 26, 2015)

Administrator support. In addition to their collegial concerns, all participants referred to how their relationships and communications with administrators impacted their practice and morale. Lindsey felt that her principal personally disliked her along with her pedagogical approaches to teaching. One of her motivations for registering for the TFCI was "to have a better vocabulary for this method of teaching to defend it to my administrators" (Lindsey, TFCI application, May 2015). She respected that administrators from other schools made an effort to attend the TFCI with their staff:

I just appreciate. . .access to administrators. That's been heartening. Like, there was an administrator who was working with us on that first day, but he could only come that first day. And it was sad. I kept thinking how much more beneficial it could have been to have his perspective throughout the whole thing. Because, such a common complaint is lack of support from the administration. So, to see folks, like principals and folks here try to push themselves...and then Fred was a principal at an elementary school. Which is awesome.
I'm like, "Yes, there is support out there!" (Lindsey, personal communication, June 19, 2015)

Wendy reported having a good working relationship with her principal which began when she was involved with her school as a parent involved in the PTO. Her principal expressed understanding of the nuance underlying her teaching approaches:

He was commenting on how...he's noticed that [when] I teach, I demonstrate techniques and I show a lot of examples, but I don't tell kids how to do it. So I'm teaching about the technique, I'm not teaching about what to do and how to do it. (Wendy, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

He recognized how her approaches to teaching and leadership potential would serve the school’s Enrichment Team and asked her to act as its Chairperson. She also described frustrations from getting mixed messages from administrators about the value of and how to best teach for creativity:

Well, I feel like (clears throat)...what they're telling us is "Go for it! Go wild! Go get creative! Let's do this thing!" And I'm excited about that, but then also you hear things from principals like, "A principal should be able to walk in a room and ask a kid, 'what's your goal for today?' and the kid should be able tell them. Like a first grader? And that's a little stressful as a teacher. Because, I don't know. It might not always work out! I mean, I try. I actually list goals for the day for each group of kids that come in. But, I don't know. If you have. . .If you have this open-ended...I'm just curious how it's going to look. (Wendy, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Julia, who is involved with her school’s Leadership Board, also reported feeling conflict between her personal pedagogical priorities and PD goals and those mandated by her building’s administration. Her principals objected to the art teachers in her building participating in an off-site, district-wide art teacher PLC on in-service days, instead preferring that they stay and work with colleagues in their building. She partially attributed the administrators’ resistance to a lack of understanding about art education and the value of subject specific PD:
Ultimately, they couldn't tell us not to go because we had to go with what's relevant for us...they wanted us to do all our meetings at our school...Attend all those meetings, but why when, you know, five miles down the road there's all the art teachers in the district getting together...And we're all getting on the same page. And we had to fight for that a little bit...I think probably...they don't know what's going on over there. So part of it was we had to tell them what was happening (both laugh) "It's a good thing! We're not just getting together to drink coffee! (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

She also described frustrations with a lack of flexibility and interpretation for some of the building-wide instructional mandates issued by her administration to address her school’s top priorities for the 2014-2015 school year: 1) improving the graduation rate, and 2) literacy skills:

They are 2 very important things...But the biggest battle I fought was how literacy...the way it was told to me was "you need to show proof of literacy, I want to see that they're reading something and answering questions based on it." There's more to it than that! You know? And there's such a thing as visual literacy...students can talk about something and navigate through a piece of art work and in that conversation, they're showing literacy... and they're using vocabulary...we had to turn in evidence and...track of different types of literacy things we were doing...and I found myself toward the end of the year just kind of like, "well, you know what? I'm just going to do what they ask me to do." And even my students were like, "Why are we doing this right now?" And I'm like "Well, it's something the administration wants out of us. So we're, we're going to do it. It's important." But, I didn't believe it. (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015).

Julia’s inability to convince her principal to let her guide students through explorations of visual literacy skills instead of more traditional reading comprehension exercises alludes to how arts education can be undervalued and/or marginalized by administrators facing tremendous pressure to meet performance benchmarks—like standardized test scores.

*Testing culture.* All four teachers remarked on how standardized testing impacted both their practice and students’ learning, despite the arts disciplines remaining largely “untested” subjects (in the standardized sense) in the United States. Standardized testing was specifically mentioned by seven of the TFCI’s 17 art teachers in their institute applications. In her application, Julia lamented:
Unfortunately, I fear creativity is lost among the endless sea of standardization in education. So much emphasis is placed on content, assessments, and testing and less on the way in which students are learning. I am fortunate to be an art teacher, but that does not exempt me from the pressures of standardization. (Julia, TFCI application, May 2015)

Wendy echoed this in her application, writing “[t]oo often the idea of creativity seems daunting and unachievable in today’s test driven school culture” (TFCI application, May 2015).

During her interview, Lindsey (who also mentioned standardized testing’s impact on creativity in her application) brought up personal observations about changes in how her students approach projects in the art room. She imagined how her students might respond to the introduction of more choice-based and open-ended opportunities for inquiry:

By third grade they're already really entrenched in like, the testing phenomenon… They're really very used to "Here's the problem. There's one solution. How do I find the solution?" And that's it. Um, but I, I don't know that they would fight against it necessarily. I think they would just be kind of confused. (Lindsey, personal communication, June 19, 2015)

During their interviews, Julia, Wendy, and Susan all brought up the mixed blessing of teaching a subject that is not beholden to standardized tests. Susan mentions that the lack of standardized testing in the arts can make colleagues and administrators take these subject areas less seriously:

In Massachusetts, there's no standardized tests for arts. I mean the arts technically aren't even a requirement in many schools, you know? It's not a requirement of the state for graduation...Others are always very skeptical about what we do because we don't have a test. We weren't given a textbook. There's no standardized tests, so it's like you're coming up with your own curriculum and it's like a fox, you know, guarding the hen house. (both laugh) Other teachers look at you like, "You could be doing nothing all day and nobody would know!" You know? But it's just...that sense of pride and your career...And what you do for the kids. (Susan, personal communication, June 19, 2015)

Similarly, Wendy states that she feels “lucky that...what I teach is not tested” because it allows her “creative freedom” to design her own curriculum; “nothing is prescribed. I mean I have
standards, but I can achieve those however I want.” She also mentions that having this freedom is “awesome and it's...stressful at the same time...it's kind of like reinventing the wheel” (Wendy, personal communication, June 22, 2015).

All four teachers have a strong desire to take advantage of their curricular autonomy and are looking for strategies that will help them establish cultures of critical thinking and creativity in their classrooms. The PD experiences provided by their school districts—which were generally designed around tested subjects—did not meet the professional needs or goals these art teachers identified for themselves. By contrast, through the TFCI’s promotional materials and experience, art teacher participants were able to self-identify and clearly articulate professional learning goals relevant to their subject areas.

Participants’ motivations and goals for attending the TFCI. All interviewed teachers had some kind of connection, previous experience or encounter with the TFCI’s core ideas or CMA staff that sparked interest in signing on the TFCI. Their TFCI applications and pre-institute interviews indicate that they had a familiarity with some of the research, ideas, and terminologies referenced throughout the institute. Julia had previously experienced single-day teacher workshops hosted by the CMA for art teachers in her district. Lindsey had also previously attended one of these. Susan had pursued a personal interest in learning more about choice-based approaches and completed several workshops and online courses on the topic. One of the online course featured CMA’s Cindy Meyers Foley as a keynote speaker. Wendy, who described positive experiences visiting the museum’s interactive spaces as a parent with her children, had no previous experience with CMA teacher workshops. However, many art teacher (and non-art teacher) colleagues in her district were participants of TFCI’s past and spoke about the
experience with such high regards. Their endorsement combined with the encouragement of her principal compelled her to sign up herself.

The teachers’ goals for TFCI participation were largely focused on acquiring new strategies and approaches for engaging students in creative learning. For example, Susan sought strategies for dealing with the volume and variety of student work that choice-based art education can produce, while Wendy hoped to discover ideas and routines that she could use and share with non-art teachers in her school. Other goals included hopes that participation would “shift my way of thinking, so that I am fostering creative growth rather than hindering it… I want it to come more naturally and easily” (Lindsey, personal communication, June 19, 2015) and forge “lasting connections with fellow educators…communication and collaboration” (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015). These goals are reflected in the TFCI’s goals outlined by the CMA’s staff and addressed through the TFCI’s design and content.

**TFCI’s Purpose and Goals**

The CMA’s TFCI developed out of a larger, institutional value focused on the importance, relevance, and power of creativity for all people. The 2015 TFCI marked its fifth year. While the TFCI may feature a special topic of focus each year—2015’s emphasized strategies for documenting student thinking and the processes of creativity—the institute’s primary intention is to make “The Case for Creativity” (Foley, 2015, PowerPoint presentation) by illuminating its inextricable links to critical thinking and deep, meaningful learning.

The institute’s “At-a-Glance” sheet transparently lays out its purposes and intended outcomes, during the four-day intensive summer institute. The Teaching for Creativity Institute was developed to:

- Provide teachers the time, space, and support to think about the role of creativity in their teaching and learning in the 21st century.
• Build a community of teacher learners in Central Ohio who are committed to cultivating a culture of creativity in their schools and classrooms.
• Advocate for creativity as an essential and necessary element of learning for all students. (Lehe, 2015, para. 1)

The “At-a-Glance” sheet also identifies three museum-identified TFCI outcomes:

• Participants will deepen their understanding of how to teach for creativity.
• Participants will feel confident in articulating the importance of creativity in learning.
• Participants will implement new strategies that foster creativity in their classrooms and schools. (Lehe, 2015, para. 3)

The CMA’s education department staff worked together to establish and communicate the TFCI’s purpose and outcomes. However, individual staff members may have their own nuanced ideas about the institute’s purpose and goals. The TFCI registrants also signed up with expectations and ideas about what they wanted to get out of participation. The perspectives of two key staff members involved with TFCI planning (Foley and Lehe) are presented followed by an overview of participants’ TFCI goals and expectations.

CMA Staff’s TFCI Goals and Priorities

As mentioned in Chapter III, in addition to interviewing TFCI teacher participants, I interviewed two leaders in the CMA’s education department: Cindy Foley, Director of Learning and Experience and Jen Lehe, Manager of Strategic Partnerships. Analysis of these interviews and TFCI observations indicate that the two operate in complementary roles with regard to the TFCI’s design and execution. Foley is the vision-setting leader for the department. She models and engages her staff in reflecting on and articulating museum, departmental, and TFCI core values and supports them with research. Lehe is the implementer, imagining and organizing the TFCI’s agenda and activities. She works to further participant buy-in by orchestrating invitations
and opportunities for participants to discuss and experience strategies that support creativity and learning firsthand.

**Foley: Vision Setting Leader, Establishing Meaningful Mentor Relationships.** Foley is the Executive Assistant Director, Director of Learning and Experience at CMA. Now in her early 40s, she has been with the museum since 2006. Conversations with Cindy reveal her deep curiosity about the world and sensitivity to issues of education, social justice and current events, whether local or global in scale. She is passionate about communicating a vision for art education that champions its capacity for developing imaginative and critical thinkers who are equipped with the skills and dispositions necessary to live a meaningful 20th century life.

The story of the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute begins with CMA Executive Director Nanette Maciejunes asking Foley a question; “What is the value of an art education department…in our museum?” (Foley, 2014, p. 139). Foley was challenged with answering the question in a concise document to be used to communicate the museum’s value in advance of the launch of its major, multiphase *Art Matters* capital campaign. Foley’s approach and execution of this challenge became a major catalyst for change, not just for the education department, but for the entire institution and its relationship with the Columbus-area community.

Prior to Maciejunes’ request, the education department, as in many other art museums at the time, designed its K-12 programs in response to teachers’ needs and administrators’ priorities. This generally meant that school programs revolved around supporting cross-curricular learning and standardized, graded courses of study, which in turn, supported improving student performance on standardized tests (Foley, personal communication, June 26, 2015; Jones, 2014). Despite their best efforts and intentions, the staff discovered that the programs were poorly utilized and received. Maciejunes’ challenge was an opportunity to reflect
on and address such conundrums. After much reflection, Foley arrived at the conclusion that the value of the CMA and its education department centered upon the power of creativity:

When you walk into our museum...you encounter...the byproducts of some of the most creative thinkers who have graced the planet...These artists questioned, challenged the norms of society, played with ideas and materials, embraced ambiguity, and bravely and passionately engaged in developing creative products even when those around them rejected their work. Nannette’s exercise forced me to articulate that creativity was not something that we just valued in the arts, but something we value within our community. Everyone is capable of creativity. Creative thinking is needed at every level of school, in all lines of work, at every stage of life. (Foley, 2014, p. 140)

Foley envisioned creativity becoming a central focus for not only the education department, but as a unifying concept to guide the institution. The capital campaign evolved to include the establishment of an 18,000 square foot Center for Creativity housed within the CMA (see Figure 3), the purpose of which was to “Cultivate, Champion, and Celebrate” creativity in its visitors and community (Foley, 2015, PowerPoint presentation; Columbus Museum of Art, 2015a). Foley and her team began regularly working with evaluators to help the department better align their programs with their newly articulated values statements. Examination of the CMA’s K-12 school programs led the evaluators to conclude that the staff were asking the “wrong questions” (e.g., what are the curricular goals and priorities of teachers and administrators, what are they saying they need from us?) as they tried to figure out what the focus of these programs should be. Instead, the evaluators advised that the staff should "determine what you value and what do you feel the world needs to change" (Foley, personal communication, 2015). These events were revolutionary to Foley’s sense of professional self. “For the first time in my career, my role was as visionary, imagining what the museum could be and developing a case and a team to implement change” (Foley, 2014, p.141). The visionary
thinking that Foley brought to reconceiving the value of art museums and art museum education extended to approaches to school programs and teacher PD:

It's the shift in paradigm from focusing on the student, where I think we've lived in the museum world for a very long time [to]..."Wait a minute, we're really pretty powerful and, and if we think about our influencing factor. . .what if we were to focus more on teachers. . .who then have much more impact here, and then what if we even think higher and idealize? What if we could think about schools? And if we could lead that kind of change, then our impact is exponentially so much bigger. And maybe that's a better place for us than where we've been focusing for far too long. (Foley, personal communication, June 26, 2015).

This interest in focusing on cultivating relationships with teachers extends to establishing TFCI coaching and mentor relationships. According to analysis, Foley brought up the TFCI’s mentorship aspect significantly more frequently than any other interviewee as she discussed working through logistics of setting up mentors for the 56 participants and questioning how the experience and relationships could be structured to be as meaningful and productive as possible. Relatedly, in her interview, Lehe was the interviewee who most frequently brought up how the TFCI engages participants through invitations for reflecting upon and engaging with the research, ideas, and strategies that support creative learning.

**Lehe: Collaborative Implementer, Establishing Collegial Communities of Support.**

Jennifer Lehe is the Manager of Strategic Partnerships at CMA. Confident, droll, and in her early 30s, her career in education ranges from teaching photography workshops to high school students to international education advocacy work. She is relatively new to the CMA staff; at the time of the recorded interview she had been with the museum for less than a year. She assumed primary responsibility for planning, organizing, and overseeing the TFCI and school-museum partnerships. The 2015 summer session marked her first foray into the TFCI.
Analysis of Lehe’s interview indicates that she is as fascinated by ideas and enthusiastic about questioning as Foley. She is also thoughtful and reflective when approaching her role as the TFCI primary planner and point person. Her key responsibilities center on arranging for a variety of presentations and entry points through which attendees can engage with the TFCI’s major ideas. To this end, she reviews all participant applications, researches and contracts guest presenters, designs prompts for conversation and reflection, and initiates hands-on activities to model approaches and allow participants to experience their impact firsthand:

We cast a wide net, when we have…creativity alarm clocks and we have a list of thinking routines. And then we have a day, and part of our presentation where we say, "If you only ask one question in your classroom, [if] you just change one thing," just ask "What makes you say that?"…I think it enabled the significant majority to connect with certain aspects of it. I do think that there's a tension with buy-in, where we want people to both start with where they are, but also imagine things as being radically different. (Lehe, personal communication, 2015)

Bringing in guest presenters in another way Lehe sought to “cast a wide net.” By varying the voices and perspectives of the institute, she increased the odds of a registrant connecting with TFCI concepts. In addition to Foley and herself, Lehe brought in two invited guest presenters who both had established relationships with the museum as frequent thought and project collaborators. Dr. Frederick “Fred” Burton is a well-respected local university professor with research interests in literacy and Reggio-Emilia teaching approaches who has been involved with the TFCI since its inception. Before teaching in academia, Burton was a classroom teacher and elementary school principal. Todd Elkin is a coastal high school art teacher who has affiliations with prestigious academic and art education institutions, and worked previously with Foley and the CMA team as a keynote presenter for a CMA-organized PD workshop for art teachers.

Lehe also brought in “facilitators” to lead break-out inquiry group discussions. Facilitators included a range of CMA education staff, art education professors, and TFCI teacher
and principal fellows from years past. The TFCI’s inquiry groups (which Lehe meticulously agonized over the groupings of) were another attempt to highlight the intellectual contributions teachers bring to the experience and engender smaller communities within the whole:

we are not assuming that we know, that we, as museum educators, know what creativity looks like in [all] learning environments…they're all teachers who are struggling with these same questions that we're struggling through (at least we hope) that was the idea behind putting the inquiry groups in. (Lehe, personal communication, 2015)

At the beginning of Day 1, Lehe introduced the TFCI’s “Guiding Questions” and asked participants to work collectively to them: “What does creativity look, sound and feel like throughout the learning process? How do we create the conditions in which creativity thrives, and foster the dispositions that support the creative process?” (Lehe, 2015, para. 3). She also asked participants to collaborate on an evolving definition of creativity, beginning with a working definition used by the museum (see Figure 8.)

The invitation to help co-define creativity and what it means in K-12 learning helps to establish a common vocabulary and entry point for participants. It is also another example of how Lehe models and sparks collaborations and interactions between participants in hopes of building a community of teachers dedicated to teaching for creativity. The institute encompassed many, many presentations, activities, and prompts for reflection and engagement in addition to the ones mentioned above. Data analysis of these elements as recorded in TFCI documents, observation notes, interviews, and survey responses generated a model for the TFCI’s structure and content, to be explored in the next section.
Figure 8. An image of the collaborative, evolving definition of creativity that was posted in the Forum and documented throughout the four-day institute session.

**TFCI Content and Structure**

As indicated in the section above, the museum staff established a value set based on creativity, and then set a vision for a teacher institute in alignment with those values. Content and structure were carefully designed to realize the museum’s TFCI outcomes and maximize
participant engagement and buy-in. During analysis, frequency of mention and patterns of reference merited using aspects of the TFCI content and structure as codes which were then distilled into broader categories and subcategories that were featured in TFCI presentations. Of particular note, “modeling” creative behaviors, dispositions, teaching strategies, and how to effectively establish conditions for creativity in a learning environment was an essential element for both the TFCI’s content and structure.

TFCI Structure.

The structure of the TFCI refers to its logistics, in terms of time and place, the strategies and activities used to garner engagement and catalyze meaning-making in participants, and organizations and groupings of the participants themselves.

Communities and configurations of teacher learner groups. The topic of community—defined by shared subjects and grade levels taught, school buildings and districts, demographic characteristics, professional interests and concerns, pedagogy, teaching philosophies, and socio-cultural values—appeared repeatedly during coding and analysis. Issues related to communities and relationships manifested in a variety of contexts (to be explored at greater length in Chapter V). In terms of the TFCI’s structure, “relationships” refers to how participants formed and were grouped for activities and discussions, and how these groupings helped forge bonds of connection and support throughout the summer session. Some groups formed by self-selection (most commonly observed early in the four-day time span), some by convenience and location (sitting at the same table), and some were assigned by Lehe into specific inquiry groups. Some discussions and activities involved all participants sharing and working together. Participants like Susa—who attended without partners from their school or
district—appreciated that the breakout inquiry groups ensured opportunities to speak with a variety of other attendees and helped them feel part of smaller communities within the whole:

There were basically like three school districts. . . . they already had a sense of community (laughs) because they already work together! But, being forced to break apart and talk with other people— their protocols that they put in place—that was them making sure that we broke up. . . . that was really good. (Susan, personal communication, June 19, 2015)

**Logistics.** As discussed in Chapter III, the TFCI’s intensive four-day summer session at the heart of this study is situated entirely in the space of the museum and takes place outside of the regular school/work year. Interviewees expressed appreciation for the length of time the full, four-day experience allowed for deep investigation and reflection on the concepts and information covered during the institute. Wendy found it “helpful to like have those four days to kind of, you get information...you know, you take in information, but also it gives you a chance to reflect on it and like put those pieces together” (personal communication, June 22, 2015). Julia explained that for her, dedicating a block of time to PD outside of the space and time of the regular work year helped keep her focused and engaged:

At least once a year we're at the museum doing a workshop, and so . . . Cindy Foley's talk, that wasn't the first time I've heard it... but it was different in this capacity... I feel like throughout the school year, at a professional development there's a sense of like, you have to be there, like, this is still a pay day, you know? And [it’s] not to say that your attention is not totally there, but it's also a much-needed break... from the work week... Having that space of... actually signing up for a workshop and making it part of my summer break to be there... I was 100% engaged the entire time. (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Similarly, Lindsey expressed appreciation for the four-day model versus the single day workshop:

This week-long thing gave me more concrete ideas of what to actually try out. The one day thing just got me inspired. I was like, "I really want to do this" but I was still stuck on "how do I do this in my situation... How do I make it work?” And I feel like a lot of
information I got here has answered those questions for me. (Lindsey, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

The whole TFCI experience, however, extended into the following school year as teachers reconvened for Saturday sessions in November, January, and April and informally kept in contact via social media platforms and other channels of communications. The extended experience also gave participants the opportunity to bring aspects of the TFCI into their schools by opting to have a CMA-assigned mentor/coach visit them in their classrooms as they work through what teaching for creativity looks like for them and their students.

Finally, to safeguard against participants losing the momentum and/or focus necessary to carry through with implementation in the fall—Gulamhussein’s (2013) “implementation dip” from the literature review—the final small group, break-out activity of the TFCI had teachers working together to craft “Action Plans.” These plans asked participants to: 1) identify the specific change(s) they wanted to initiate toward making creativity a priority in their practice; 2) explain why the change was needed and what they hoped would happen as a result; 3) formulate concrete steps and a timeline for implementation; 4) identify the people and resources needed to implement the change(s); and 5) describe how they will assess progress and growth resulting from the change. Before participants left, taking the plans with them, CMA staff made copies to keep on file at the museum for participants to review to as they reconvened during TFCI school year. Some participants asked for blank copies of the Action Plan sheets to take back to their schools so that they could continue planning throughout the year and share the format with colleagues.

**Modes of content presentation and delivery.** Daily agendas for the summer session varied by format and strategies. Each day included PowerPoint lectures to introduce research, theory, and ideas connected to teaching for and documenting creativity. Participants jumped into
hands-on experiences with games, challenges, routines, and other strategies designed to provoke and document creativity. Opportunities and prompts for individual reflection and journaling were complemented by opportunities and prompts for conversation and dialogue about key TFCI concepts. Frequency analysis of summer session field notes tracked and compared the number of unique concepts and ideas introduced by lecture-formats alongside the number of invitations for hands-on and/or other nuanced modes of active engagement (e.g., discussions and journaling prompts) for each day (see Table 9 and Appendix E for coding samples). PowerPoints and lectures were used to introduce and explore TFCI topics, ideas, and strategies were used roughly twice as often as hands-on/active methods of exploration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Week Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of discrete research studies, theories, and ideas introduced by lecture/PowerPoint format.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of discrete hands-on activities and other modes of active participant engagement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of unique concepts and ideas introduced by lecture/PowerPoint formats versus hands-on and active modes of engagement.
TFCI Content

The content of the TFCI refers to the research, theories, and ideas introduced through its structural elements to further understanding of and reflection on creativity and critical thinking, as well as the content’s relevance to participants. TFCI content codes and categories categorized can be conceptualized as working toward the over-arching outcome of Engendering Creativity in Students, Teachers, & Schools (see Table 10). These codes applied to all data sources. Appendix X gives an example of a round of coding during analysis of observational field notes. Codes that corresponded to TFCI topics of presentation fell into three key subjects: 1) Defining, challenging myths, and “making the case” for creativity; 2) Nurturing creative behaviors and dispositions, and creating conditions in which creativity thrives; and 3) Making creativity visible: documenting creativity and critical thinking.

Content relevance. Previous discussion of art teacher interviews mentioned their frustration with being required to implement instructional strategies or participate in PD focused on improving student learning in other disciplines and subject areas (a topic also addressed in Chapter II’s literature review and to be discussed further in Chapter V). Most TFCI participants were able to connect with some aspect of the summer session’s content. Table 11 gives an overview of TFCI ideas and concepts that each art teacher interviewee found “sticky” after the conclusion of the summer session, in the order of mention. Some of the elements they identified overlap, some are only mentioned once. Some elements are ideas and some are actionable strategies.

Data suggest that some facets of the content were more successful at securing teacher buy-in and getting them to imagine how the ideas might work in their own classrooms. The 2015 TFCI relied heavily on presentations and activities lead by invited presenter and high school art
teacher, Elkin. Teacher interviews and observations indicated that some elementary-level teachers felt that the concepts and strategies he introduced were more appropriate for middle or high school students. A large part of his Day 1 PowerPoint was structured in a traditional lecture format; at one point he cautioned “this part of the presentation will get very ‘lecture-y’” (Observation, June 16, 2015). This presentation established his teaching philosophy and context for subsequent presentations and activities he would lead throughout the week. It also modeled a teacher articulating his pedagogical beliefs and values. Elkin’s later presentations involved more hands-on explorations of student-centered, idea-generating, and assessment processes that participants seemed much more responsive to.

Burton’s presentations extended content from Foley’s Day 1 presentation that set up teacher buy-in. He focused on thinking routines, strategies to nurture critical and creative thinking in students, and ways to establish a classroom environment that supports creativity and critical thinking. In comparison to Burton’s Day 2 presentation, Elkin’s involved elements that participants deemed specific to visual art. Non-art teachers found some of the ideas interesting and some of the activities enjoyable, but had a hard time imagining how his philosophy and approaches would translate to their classrooms—a reversal of the PD situation most art teachers find themselves in. For most participants, Burton’s strategies were more universal in terms of suitability for multiple grade levels and subjects. Also, most of Burton’s examples illustrating his content involved elementary classrooms—the grade level demographic of 88% of participants.

Wendy describes some of the conversations she had with fellow participants about Elkin’s and Burton’s presentations:
### Table 10. An overview of codes and categories generated from key 2015 TFCI content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Categories &amp; Subcategories</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity as an amalgamation of Imagination, Innovation, and Critical Thinking. Positing that everyone can be creative and develop creative capacities. Embracing that creativity isn't necessarily about a finished, polished end-product, but rather it is the process and steps taken to arrive at the product. Introducing research that both...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Defining, Challenging Myths and Making the Case for Creativity (creativity ≠ talent and technical skill)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That names, notices, and highlights thinking (Fred's presentation)</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For engaging in thinking (Ritchhart labels this as &quot;Opportunities&quot;)</td>
<td>Invitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;How can we support creative learning and endeavors?&quot; Adapted from Ritchhart, Church, &amp; Morrison's Making Thinking Visible: How to Promote Engagement, Understanding, and Independence for All Learners and Ritchhart's Creating Cultures of Thinking: The 8 Forces We Must Master to Truly Transform Our Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That scaffold thinking and learning (Fred's presentation)</td>
<td>Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling thinking- the behaviors and dispositions of thinking and creativity</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment as muse, shaper, and evidence of the learning culture of its user group(s). Group works together to establish a studio vs. classroom- space changes with projects and needs and features physical evidence that documents and inspires the process of learning and meaning-making.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forethinking and learning vs. of student behavior and work to be turned in. Setting goals and purposes for groups, periods of time, and projects.</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For thinking, learning, creativity. Time as &quot;statement of your values&quot; -Ritchhart, Connects to Qualities of HQ PD</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ritchhart labels and Fred references this as &quot;Interactions: Forging Relationships and &quot;Expectations&quot;) Showing respect for student thinking. Collaborative, and cooperative learning, often in small groups. Instructor acts a project facilitator and resource instead of a lecturer- facilitator and groups are co-learners.</td>
<td>Interactions &amp; Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the Creative Process. Can be further distilled to four sub-parts: fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration- Ellis Paul Torrance; Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking</td>
<td>Idea generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying out new (unfamiliar) things and different ways of approaching a problem, task, or project. Connected to Persistence through failure and Tolerance for ambiguity.</td>
<td>Experimentation &amp; Risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in activity for enjoyment and recreation rather than (although not in opposition to) serious or practical purpose- related to feelings of flow, joy, and wonder. Through play we &quot;imagine situations and experiences we have never encountered before...and learn from them&quot; May be collaborative or solo endeavor.</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking in terms of projects vs. subjects. What do I need to know to achieve a goal/complete a project? Connected to curiosity (Cindy refers to it as a &quot;by-product of curiosity&quot;) connotes a research strategy that crosses many disciplinary boundaries to create a holistic approach. It applies to research efforts focused on problems that cross the boundaries of two or more disciplines.</td>
<td>Transdisciplinary Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not rushing to answers, digging deeper and generating more questions around an issue or topic. Relates to curiosity and somewhat to tolerance for ambiguity.</td>
<td>Questioning over answering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing and pursuing a strong desire to know or learn something. Self-motivated.</td>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also, comfort with ambiguity) Recognizing and accepting a multiplicity of perspectives, approaches, and answers to issues and problems…no one &quot;right&quot; answer or point of view.</td>
<td>Tolerance for ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td>the controlling perceptual (mental, emotional, spiritual) qualities that determine the person’s natural or usual ways of thinking and acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing one's own capacity for creative behaviors and pursuits, Challenging myths about creativity (creativity = talent and technical skill) Connected to (Re)Defining creativity.</td>
<td>Belief that &quot;I am creative.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to keep trying and refining practice and/or let go of things that aren't working to try something new.</td>
<td>Persistence through failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions of what to document about teaching and learning, and examples of how to document. Portfolio-based assessment vs. traditional testing assessment models.</td>
<td>Documentation: Making Creativity Visible</td>
<td>Challenging standard assessment practices, emphasizing/valuing process along with finished work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview of codes and categories generated from key 2015 TFCI content.
Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julia</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Lindsey</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Wendy</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Susan</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Social Justice/Paulo Freire references</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>6 Artistic Orientations</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>“Used to think, Now I think”</td>
<td>Jen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea generation, seeing ways to make it happen</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Teacher as coach/ facilitator vs. expert lecturer</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Worst Case Scenario Challenge</td>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Documenting student work and one's own teaching</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Making Creativity Visible” and documenting process</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Using student interests/concerns as the basis for inquiry/projects</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Fred’s “world’s most important questions”</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Comfort with ambiguity and failure</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabby wall</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Fred’s beach analogy</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Epic Fail wall</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Chalk Talk</td>
<td>Fred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Art is not just painting and drawing” Creativity Myth-busting</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Concept mapping and graphic memos</td>
<td>Todd, Fred</td>
<td>Questioning Game</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Micro Lab</td>
<td>Fred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transdisciplinary learning</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Artful Thinking Routines: See, Think, Wonder</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Mapping</td>
<td>Todd, Fred</td>
<td>Fred’s synonym generating exercise for “think”</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Talk</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity Challenges</td>
<td>Jen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of “sticky” TFCI ideas and concepts referenced in each art teacher interviewee by order of mention, top items being the earliest mentioned.
I think parts of it [Todd’s presentations]...they were kind of like (raising pitch) "this isn't pertaining to meee" like, “it is in a way, but it's not.”...the second day [Fred’s presentation] was, by far, the most valuable. At least, [for] regular classroom teachers and principals...It was very valuable to them...Just because, I mean it was captivating, but it was more about the whole school. And I feel like Todd did a great job, and was great for art teachers, and his second day was much better...you know, the second to last was much better than the first day. Uh, I mean it was all good, but I don't know...I feel like, his second day of presenting was more valuable to me, Just, I felt like I could connect to it more...I mainly talked to elementary people...And, you know, when Todd was talking art and he was talking high school art, you know I could relate because of the art. And we all have some experience, and kids are kids...Um, but I feel like, they felt like Fred really spoke to them a little more. I could kind of see that happening, just observing...

Interviews with other teachers, Foley and Lehe, and field note observations support Wendy’s perceptions. Wendy’s observation raises questions about how teachers connected to the content of the TFCI. What might data sources show about the TFCI’s impact on art teacher attitudes, practices, or ideas?

**TFCI Evidence of Impact: Transformation**

The review of literature connected to teacher PD in Chapter II made the case that for PD to be successful, it must create a change in teacher practice, attitudes, and beliefs about teaching and learning. Mezirow (2000, 2006) defines the ideal learning that teachers engage in during PD experiences as “transformational.” Transformational learning may happen in dramatic paradigmatic shifts. More commonly shifts are modest, incremental, and progressive, but still result in a meaningful “transformation in habit of mind” of the learner (Mezirow, 2006, p. 28).

Lehe shared that the TFCI’s summer session’s emphasis revolves around the question, “can we spark changes in practice?” She imagines that the impact of the institute as “kind of a slow release capsule that in small ways or in large ways we will spark shifts in peoples' teaching practice…around increased evaluation of the creative process” and “what they think creativity is and looks like…” (personal communication, June 26, 2015). Answers to Lehe’s question would
need to wait until participants returned to their classrooms and students in the fall. Instead, evidence of the impact of the TFCI on teacher ideas and beliefs were ascertained from changes in question responses on pre- and post-TFCI surveys, daily observations, and teacher interviews. Data analysis indicates that the TFCI impacted participant attitudes and beliefs about creativity (e.g. its definition, and what it is not; its connections to critical thinking; its importance and relevance across subjects and disciplines), and interest in implementing strategies to support creative learning during the following school year. The next section explores evidence for how change manifested (Shifts in Art Education Curricular Priorities) and the degrees of change (Small Shifts and Simple Changes).

**Shifts in Art Education Curricular Priorities**

Each art teacher interviewee completed identical survey items on pre- and post-institute questionnaires that asked them to assign levels of importance to a selection of art education curricular content categories, ranking each item on a scale from “Not Important” to “Extremely Important.” Figure 9a-d shows how their priorities shifted, from most subtle (Lindsey) to most pronounced (Wendy). Variations of degree of impact may correlate to prior participant experience and exposure to the TFCI’s core ideas. Wendy had the least experience with CMA teacher PD going into the 2015 Institute. Changes in priorities suggest that the participants were reflecting upon and reformulating teaching philosophies and reconsidering how these curricular content areas might factor into their classrooms during the following school year. Evidence of the TFCI’s impact was also evinced in participant interviews. These comments can be grouped into two general categories: 1) TFCI Elements That Reinforced Existing Ideas and Practice, and 2) TFCI Elements That Challenged Existing Ideas and Practice.
**TFCI elements that reinforce teachers' existing ideas and practice.** In some aspects, teachers indicated that participating in the TFCI participation didn’t change their thinking as much as it reinforced or solidified ideas or inclinations they had when starting on Day 1. For example, Susan entered the TFCI with a strong personal interest and prior PD experiences with choice-based art education and TAB, noting “I was already kind of feeling this way, but it just made it more concrete that...Yes, in art we teach skills, um, drawing, painting, collage, whatever...but it's more important now to teach the mindset...studio habits” (personal communication, June 19, 2015). Lindsey was not sure about the extent to which the TFCI had changed her ideas about teaching art but recognized that it helped clarify her understandings of creativity:

It's still percolating…obviously I came to the table with the belief that the arts are valid and necessary…I'm not sure how it's impacted my beliefs on the importance of art yet. I know it's impacted my beliefs on the importance of creativity, but I don't see creativity as existing only in the art room…I can see that existing in math and in science and in literature, the library. So, I think it's just impacted, perhaps, my belief of how all the disciplines should not be considered so separately…To, to separate these things... it's like when you look at history without all the other contexts…It becomes way less useful. (person communication, June 19, 2015)

Julia felt that she already shared many of the TFCI’s core ideas and messages and that participating helped her better articulate and back up why these ideas were important,

I have something to back me up now. Our city's museum is doing this…this is something that they've researched. There's validation to it. It's not just my opinion. Whereas, before I was just trying to stand up for me and what I believed…now…I could actually print out an article and be like, "Here! It's happening somewhere else." And, you know, I think when you're approaching other educators, you need to have that...everybody wants to know that this has been backed by research…I feel a little bit more empowered to speak up and...um, excited to have that opportunity. (person communication, June 22, 2015)
Figure 9a-d. Comparison of teachers’ rankings of art education curricular content categories as recorded in Pre- and Post-TFCI surveys, with 5 being “Extremely Important” and 1 being “Not Important.” Note: Wendy skipped rating “Art History: Multicultural” in her post-questionnaire responses.
Wendy thought that, rather than changing her ideas, the TFCI helped her make connections between her pedagogical inclinations and other facets of her professional life:

Maybe [it] didn't change anything, but it did help me put the pieces together. The art, and this creativity thing, and being asked to be the enrichment team leader for my school...all these were kind of separate floating things. And then, you know, these maker spaces that I'm in charge of now...it's putting all those pieces together...it helped me figure that out a little bit more. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Wendy’s perception that the TFCI didn’t change her ideas is at odds with the fact that her pre- and post- survey valuation of art education curricular showed the most changes in both areas impacted and degree of change (see Figure 9a-d). Her interview, along with those of her colleagues, indicated that despite pre-disposition to its core content, the TFCI challenged teachers’ ideas about art education and its benefits to students.

Aspects that challenged teachers’ existing ideas and practice. For many art teachers, changes in practice brought up questions about how “traditional” curricular components of art education fit into the TFCI’s emphasis on teaching for creativity. Many conversations raised questions about where and how building student skills in media and techniques fit into a creativity-centric approach. Some raised questions about how parents and administrators used to seeing glossy, appealing student art projects (largely the result of “step-by-step” instruction by the teacher) would react to the less polished work that can result from play, experimentation, and student-guided inquiry. Susan recognized that the TFCI’s (and other choice-based resources) approaches to teaching were,

the exact opposite of how I was trained as a teacher. You know, I was trained to have a finished product, put it up on the board, this is how I did this...step-by-step-by-step...You're a good student if you follow step-by-step-by-step and it looks pretty at the end. And that's totally not my thinking now. (personal communication, June 19, 2015)

All four art teachers communicated interest and enthusiasm in increasing opportunities for their students to engage in open-ended, self-directed opportunities for inquiry in the art room, but
some had big questions about the realities of making it happen. Wendy still found value in teaching “traditional” studio techniques and was working through how to integrate art history into a creativity-focused curriculum:

> It kind of challenged me to consider the open-ended, curiosity, investigating part compared to traditional ways that we teach art education. I feel like we probably still need to have a really good balance. I would love to just...week after week, go in and let the kids explore, but I think we still have to do some of the more traditional things as well...I don't know, I'm excited? But I'm a little...not stressed out...a little...unsure about how it's going to look in the classroom. I'm excited about the new ideas and I think I can work them in really well, but combining what I've been doing and what I'm learning about...might be a challenge...How do you find the balance? I'm confident and yet, there is that little bit of anxiety about that. I'll make it work. No one will ever know that I was afraid of it! (Personal communication, June 19, 2015)

She was concerned about how allowing some of her students more freedom to experiment and play would create classroom management challenges, “there are some kids that are not going to stay on task...you have to have somewhat of defined rules for them...I mean there's play and there's experimentation and then there's goofin' around” (personal communication). She was also unsure about how the TFCI’s approaches to learning and assessment would mesh with the structure and expectations of her school and district:

> Our district, they want us to have specific learning goals for the kids, which makes sense...But how is that really possible with this inquiry stuff? And the creative freedom...I don't know. I feel like that's a question that we might need to bring forward as a group of art teachers to the district...I'm not sure how that is going to look or work. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Wendy felt that her experience with the TFCI institute created as many questions as it answered—not that this was a bad thing, especially considering that “Questioning over Answering” is one of the creative behaviors the institute sought to highlight and provoke (see Table 10):
It raised a lot of questions for me…but now I feel confident about why I have the questions…and now I feel like I can say "hey, I have the questions, too!" but I can articulate why I'm asking this…Like I love the idea of inquiry-based learning, but, you know, what about art history and how do we piece those ideas together? (Wendy, personal communication, June 22, 2015).

The TFCI’s summative assessment, introduced by Lehe at its conclusion, consisted of a single handout that asked participants to complete the prompts, “I used to think…” and “but now I think…” This simple exercise required participants to reflect on the week and distill the impact of the institute into two short paragraphs, sentences, or phrases. One of the key shifts in thinking was echoed in Susan’s response (see Figure 10).

Figure 10. Susan’s TFCI’s summative “I used to think…, but now I think…” Assessment.
Small Shifts and Simple Changes

The intensive, four-day summer session of the TFCI offered a trove of ideas, strategies, and frameworks for teachers interested in nurturing their students’ (and their own) creative timeframe and breadth of content that they could draw from and integrate into their classrooms. The extended timeframe and full day agendas excited and inspired participants, but also left them exhausted and overwhelmed by possibilities, referring back to Spelman and Rohlwing’s (2013) “Christmas tree effect” in Chapter II.

Both Burton and Foley tried to mitigate this information overload by helping participants set reasonable expectations for gradually integrating ideas and strategies into their practice. Both Lindsey and Susan mentioned that throughout the institute, they kept returning to an analogy that Burton recommended at the beginning of his Day 2 presentation, “Today is like visiting the beach-When you visit the beach you don't take home the beach, you take a pebble or a shell or some drift wood. Don't try to take the entire beach” (Burton, observation, June 17, 2015). He returned to the analogy at the close of the institute on Day 4 and followed it by advising participants to “take what you want to do, cut that in half…and then cut it in half again” (Burton, observation, June 17, 2015). Also on Day 4—just before teams of participants broke out into groups to write Action Plans to help them envision and plan how they would implement TFCI ideas in the next school year—Foley advised the group to “think about how and where to start…intentionality. You don't have to change every lesson plan or change your school right away. If you approach everything with passion and intentionality, things will change” (observation, June 19, 2015). This idea of “simple changes and small shifts” resonated with participants and helped them to process TFCI content in a way that was meaningful and manageable. Susan elaborated on her “I used to think…now I think…” response:
I came into this having already dabbled and read some things on creativity and taken an online course where it's all about supporting creativity...I still had in my mind that it was a huge undertaking, you know, maybe I should go get my master's degree in this. Or, it's going to be lots of money for the supplies, or, I have to get the whole school to buy in. I used to think it was really big and overwhelming. After taking this, I know that there are simple shifts...small changes that can take root and grow and expand to different audiences. Um, everything from just introducing a new vocabulary to staff to introducing simple concepts of how you gear your conversations with your students...Um, so those little small steps...to kind of make sure the virus grows. (Susan, personal communication, June 19, 2015).

Susan’s reflection serves as an example of how the TFCI impacted participant attitudes and beliefs about teaching for creativity, and instigated their conceptualizing of how they might begin to incorporate strategies in their practice.

Transformation and change are the desired results of PD. By placing creativity at the heart of its guiding principles and inviting individual K-12 teachers and administrators to share in their vision and values, CMA education department challenged staid preconceptions about the socio-cultural roles of art museums and K-12 art education, and broadened the scope of their relevance and possibility within the imagination of their community. What might the implications of this analysis be for situations beyond the specific context of the CMA and its surround school districts?

**TFCI’s Alignment with Characteristics of High Quality Art Teacher PD**

Previous sections of this chapter explored how participant characteristics, the vision and goals of the TFCI’s creators, and the modes of delivery (structure) for what was presented (content) combined to provoke such shifts. This section explores why this combination was successful and how it aligns with qualities of high quality professional development presented in Chapter II. Examination of Table 12 demonstrates how the ideas presented as strategies (content) for teachers to use as tools for deepening student learning and nurturing their creative capacities are
transposed onto the structure the TFCI team used in their design of the PD experience. As discussed, the TFCI’s purposes and goals intentionally support the CMA’s aim to “Cultivate, Champion, and Celebrate Creativity.” These objectives are part of a larger set of “Guiding Principles” for its Center for Creativity, shared via the museum’s website (see Figure 11a-b). Elements of these Guiding Principles, the TFCI’s structure and content, and characteristics of high quality professional development synthesized in Chapter II reveal significant overlap (see Table 12).

Analysis of these parallels and alignments revealed by analyzing key aspects of each domain began to yield a model of high quality PD for potential stakeholders interested in developing PD programs of their own (see Table 13). The model and key areas of its implication will be explored in Chapter V.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Quality PD Characteristic</th>
<th>TFCI Structure</th>
<th>TFCI Content</th>
<th>Columbus Museum of Art’s Center for Creativity’s Guiding Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increases teachers’ content knowledge of the subject they teach</td>
<td>Subject and/or grade-level relevant versus content specific.</td>
<td>Developing skills and mindsets for learning/creativity that are relevant across disciplines and grade levels.</td>
<td>We engage by designing activities that are personal and relevant to our audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for active learning (i.e., is related to real-life classroom situations) and is classroom-focused</td>
<td>Hands-on/Active Engagement/ Toolbox: PD experience employs and models the ideas and approaches presented, including frameworks and strategies for teaching, and documenting practice and student learning.</td>
<td>Promotes and models setting the CONDITIONS for creativity and critical thinking. Asks participants to engage in creative BEHAVIOR of experimenting/ risk-taking.</td>
<td>We engage by providing participatory experiences. We value exhibitions and programs that are designed to provoke audience contribution and are strengthened by visitor collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs over a span of time vs. a single workshop</td>
<td>Extended time/ongoing.</td>
<td>Time as CONDITION for creativity and learning.</td>
<td>We commit to lifelong learning opportunities for people of all ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-embedded- embedded in the culture and logistics of the workplace</td>
<td>Summer session takes place entirely at CMA. Later sessions also at the CMA, but opportunities for in-school mentoring and coaching are available.</td>
<td>Environment as a CONDITION for creativity and learning.</td>
<td>We believe that museums have the capacity for transformative experiences. We uphold that the museum has a responsibility to the community to impact positive social change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to reflect on self and practice</td>
<td>Prompts reflection &amp; articulation of ideas, beliefs, &amp; values.</td>
<td>Invitations and Routines to prompt reflection, CONDITIONS for creativity and thinking. Questioning over answering as a creative BEHAVIOR.</td>
<td>We believe that being intentional and developing measurable outcomes is essential for accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to clearly articulate their teaching philosophies</td>
<td>Prompts conversation &amp; articulation of pedagogy, research, theory.</td>
<td>Invitations and Routines to prompt discussion as CONDITIONS for creativity and learning. Interactions &amp; Relationships as a CONDITION of creativity.</td>
<td>We engage by fostering social learning. Families and social groups provide a primary context for learning. We appreciate that learning takes place through the language, conversations, and shared experiences of social groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps teachers link current art education research to classroom practice (Praxis)</td>
<td>Encourages praxis by: 1) Introducing research, theory, and ideas; and 2) Modeling and inviting participation in hands-on approaches and strategies that demonstrate and support the research, theory and ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models how to implement strategies and accurately document teaching progress</td>
<td>Models Approaches and strategies. See also notes above for “Allows for active learning.”</td>
<td>Modeling as a CONDITION for creativity and thinking.</td>
<td>We believe that artists are models for creative thinking. Everyone has the potential for creative thinking and doing. We believe that strategies employed by artists can cultivate and develop creative potential in everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates mentors</td>
<td>Mentor relationships: Creates ongoing mentoring relationships across levels of experience that continue beyond the space and time of formal PD sessions/meetings.</td>
<td>Interactions &amp; Relationships as a CONDITION of creativity.</td>
<td>We commit to a visitor-centered approach to museum learning. We understand that each visitor has different expectations, motivations, and prior knowledge, and we address this through our spaces and programs to promote a unique learning experiences for each visitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist/Inquiry-based</td>
<td>Inquiry-based/Constructivist Content &amp; Structure: Participants construct their own knowledge and meaning and connect/adapt content to their own contexts.</td>
<td>Introduces concepts and strategies for establishing a constructivist/ inquiry-based teaching mindset and practice (CONDITIONS, BEHAVIORS) and nurturing documenting creative and thinking BEHAVIORS &amp; DISPOSITIONS in their students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for and prompts collaboration</td>
<td>Community Building: Creates Collegial communities of support (such as PLCs)</td>
<td>Interactions &amp; Relationships as a CONDITION of creativity.</td>
<td>We engage by fostering social learning. Families and social groups provide a primary context for learning. We appreciate that learning takes place through the language, conversations, and shared experiences of social groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforms participants’ attitudes, beliefs, and practice</td>
<td>Changes (transforms) practice and/or pedagogy, evinced over time.</td>
<td>Desired outcome: Engendering Creativity in Students, Teachers, &amp; School Culture</td>
<td>We believe that museums have the capacity for transformative experiences. We uphold that the museum has a responsibility to the community to impact positive social change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alignment of High Quality PD Characteristics, TFCI Structure and Content, and Guiding Principles for the CMA’s Center for Creativity.
CHAPTER IV Summary

This chapter reviewed organizations and interpretations of data in five sections: 1) Commonalities and patterns of art teacher interviewees’ characteristics, 2) TFCI’s purpose and goals, 3) TFCI’s structure and content, 4) Evidence of TFCI’s Impact, and 5) TFCI’s alignment with characteristics of high quality art teacher PD. Evidence of the impact of the TFCI on teacher ideas and beliefs were ascertained from changes in question responses on pre- and post-TFCI surveys, daily observations, and teacher interviews. Analysis indicates that the TFCI did impact teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about creativity and learning, and sparked interest in implementing new strategies to support and document their students’ creative learning in the future. Further analysis of the CMA values and guiding principles along with the content and structure of the TFCI and characteristics of high quality PD suggest a model for art teacher PD with key, transferrable takeaways supported by data. Some aspects of the model reify the list of high quality PD characteristics generated from the literature review. The model challenge others. What are some starting points for other museums (or institutions) to consider as they envision PD for art teachers and beyond? The next chapter offers themes and possible answers to these questions.
Table 13. A model of effective professional development based on the Columbus Museum of Art’s 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Subcategories &amp; Codes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Extended time/ongoing</td>
<td>Structured over a significant period, as opposed to a “one shot” workshop-type model. TFCI features an intensive four-day summer session followed by three subsequent Institute dates throughout the school year, the option for ongoing mentor and coaching supports, and modes of continued contact and connection via social media platforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Job-embedded (Time &amp; Place)</td>
<td>PD should be a natural and integrated part of the teachers’ work, therefore it should take place in schools and during regular work hours. Other research indicates that there may be value in moving PD to new, less familiar environments—helping to set up a “disorienting dilemma” to challenge existing ideas and beliefs. The TFCI’s summer session makes use of the latter strategy, but later allows for some aspects to take place in schools through visits by mentors, coaches, and collaborating peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry-based/ Constructivist Content &amp; Structure</td>
<td>Subject/Grade-level relevant versus content specific</td>
<td>Instead of focusing on enhance teachers’ subject- or content-specific knowledge, the TFCI focuses on developing skills and mindsets for learning and creativity that are relevant across disciplines and grade levels. The TFCI’s goal is to develop Learners versus Knowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry-based/ Constructivist Content &amp; Structure</td>
<td>Encourages Praxis</td>
<td>Content reflects a balance between theory and practice, ideas and actionable strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry-based/ Constructivist Content &amp; Structure</td>
<td>Models approaches &amp; strategies</td>
<td>The structure and content of the PD experience uses and models the ideas and approaches presented, including frameworks and strategies for teaching, and documenting practice and student learning. Gives participants a “toolbox” of resources to use in their practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry-based/ Constructivist Content &amp; Structure</td>
<td>Research/ Theory/ Ideas</td>
<td>PD encourages participants to write or speak about how the content reflects, shapes, or challenges their personal teaching philosophies. Establishes a common language for discussing TFCI concepts/ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>Garners Trust &amp; Credibility</td>
<td>PD institutions/presenters earn the trust of participants by: establishing reputations for leadership and high quality and/or innovative programs; backing PD content with research; and establishing affiliations with other trusted institutions of learning. Ideally, trust and credibility extends to participants and the field of art education with regard to how they are perceived by non-art teaching peers and administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>Support Relationships</td>
<td>PD creates communities of support made up of any combination of art teachers, teachers in the same building from various subject areas, administrators, and educators from various institutions (K-12, higher education, museums, etc.). The structure of the communities may come together as PLCs or in less formal arrangements. Communication between community members is sustained and ongoing and may take place during in-person meetings or through online communities/social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>Collegial communities of support (PLCs)</td>
<td>Creates ongoing mentoring relationships across levels of experience that continue beyond the space and time of formal PD sessions/meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>Administrator support</td>
<td>PD and teachers participating receive/perceive administrator support and encouragement. Administrators may offer support for their staff to attend (time authorized time away from school, fees paid, expressed interest) or choose to attend themselves alongside staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS

Overview

Chapter IV’s data analysis gave an overview of how the TFCI set the stage for transforming participants’ attitudes and beliefs about creativity and learning, and prompted the development of action plans for implementing strategies to support and document their students’ creative learning in the future. This chapter considers the study’s broader implications for museums, school districts, schools, teachers, and administrators—individually or in collaboration—interested in pursuing or developing PD opportunities for art teachers. Data analysis combined with key findings drawn from the literature review suggest three overarching, fundamental elements that comprise a model of high quality professional development for art teachers and beyond: 1) Creating Communities of Support Based on Trust and Credibility; 2) Logistics of Time and Place; and 3) Constructivist/Inquiry-based Content and Structure for Meaning-Making and Praxis. An overview of the model precedes examination of themes nested within each of its three major components. These examinations are followed by two vignettes from the TFCI summer session that raise new questions and suggest additional research.
Figure 12. Graphic model of high quality professional development for teachers as suggested by the purposes, goals, content, structure, and framework of the Columbus Museum of Art’s 2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute.

**TFCI-inspired Model for High Quality Arts Education Professional Development**

Ryan and Bernard (2003) propose one method of analyzing data that ultimately results in codes and themes synthesizing into theoretical models. This study generated a model for teacher professional development with potential transferable relevance to other parallel K-12 and art museum education stakeholders. The version of the model presented in Table 13 (with notes and annotations) can be reproduced into a more graphic and streamlined format that reveals its key components and the relationships between them (see Figure 14).

As shown in the model, three key areas of consideration strongly contributed to the TFCI’s impact: 1) Logistics of Time and Place; 2) Constructivist/Inquiry-based Content and Structure, and 3) Community. As stated in Chapter IV, the model validates some of the high-
quality PD characteristics generated from the literature review, and refutes or suggests modifications for others (signified by red text and outlines). The model also shows that these overarching categories are not discrete. All areas, along with their sub-parts, inextricably link to and influence one another. With this interconnectedness acknowledged, the following sections submit themes drawn from this model that considers the study’s broader implications for museums, school districts, schools, teachers, and administrators—individually or in collaboration—interested in pursuing or developing PD opportunities for art teachers.

**Logistics and Job-Embeddedness: Time and Place are Negotiable**

The first area of consideration deals with the logistics of teacher PD planned by and situated within an art museum setting. Chapter II’s literature review makes the case for the benefits of teacher PD that is ongoing or extends over a significant period of time, and is job-embedded in the sense of time and place. Research indicates that PD experiences must involve a substantial amount of time to be effective (Charland, 2008; Gates, 2010; Gulamhussein, 2013; Lind, 2007; NCLB, U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Penuel at al., 2007; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013; Wei et al., 2009). The TFCI’s intensive summer session extended across 32 hours (four, eight hour days). While less than the 50-hour minimum recommended by some researchers (Gulamhussein, 2013; Wei et al., 2009) this extended time allowed teachers time to process and apply the information being introduced and establish relationships of support as they work toward implementation (to be discussed at greater length in subsequent sections).

With regard to job-embeddedness, school-based PLCs epitomize the qualities of ongoing and job-embedded, as they involve teacher groups meeting within the same school building during designated times in the regular work day or week to address common goals for student learning. This embeddedness means that PD is a constant and that teachers are always refining
their practice with the end goal of maximizing student learning and growth. Such models of teacher PD in some European and Asian countries demonstrate that when PD is part of the regular workday (in some cases, up to half of their daily hours) clear benefits emerge. These benefits include improved teacher performance and student learning outcomes, positive teacher morale, and high professional regard by the public (Wei et al., 2009).

The structure of the TFCI’s intensive, four-day summer session does reflect the high-quality PD criteria for extended time, but is neither job-embedded in time nor place. Museums are not regular worksites for K-12 teachers. However, the experiences of TFCI participants suggest that PD that is not job-embedded may have its own benefits.

**Time: Flexibility and Focus**

Several museums in destination cities like Washington D.C. have used summer institute formats for their immersive teacher PD experiences (Buffington, 2007; Burchenal & Lasser, 2007; Grenier, 2010; Marcus, 2008; Sandell & Henry, 2014). While the CMA’s audience focus for the TFCI is Columbus-area school staff, in 2015 it attracted participation from out-of-state participant Susan. Logistically, hosting these PD experiences during the summer makes it easier for teachers to attend and museum educators to program. Some participants reported feeling that the TFCI’s summer session allowed them to better focus their attention when compared with PD experiences held on workdays during the school year, as described in Julia’s previously cited quote (p. 94).

**Place: Cross-Institutional PLCs and Disorienting Dilemmas**

PD programs like the TFCI reinforce that shared student populations and school buildings are not the only factors uniting PLCs. Convenience, familiarity, and participant comfort are benefits to PLCs group members meeting in their school buildings. However, some arts teachers
(along with teachers of other un-tested subjects) may find that they are inconveniently and/or inadvertently marginalized to the group’s periphery as its goals become focused on initiatives designed to address performance objectives for tested subjects (Allison, 2013; Balsey, 2013; Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Chapman, 2005; Lind, 2007; Penuel et al., 2007; Sabol, 2006, 2010, 2013). The fact that the TFCI is programmed by and within an art museum may present an inverse benefit for art teachers. Although the TFCI is open to teachers of all subject areas and grade levels, art teachers may enjoy an elevated sense of comfort and familiarity in the setting when compared to that of their administrators or non-art teacher peers. The positive esteem in which the museum is held may also transfer to how art teachers are regarded throughout the institute; the setting may help frame them as leaders or peer resources for exploring creativity (this idea will be explored in more depth in later sections).

Paradoxically, the fact that the space of the museum is less familiar and more novel than that of participants’ schools may present unique advantages for sparking changes in their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Museums and schools are different types of learning institutions. The physical setting of the museum is often designed to create out-of-the-ordinary sensory experiences and elicit wonder from their visitors. This change in environment may contribute to what Mezirow frames as a necessary precedent to authentic, transformative learning—the “disorienting dilemma.” The disorienting dilemma is an experience that pushes an individual out of his or her comfort zone by situating him/her in an experience that conflicts with or is in opposition to existing paradigms. The unfamiliar setting of the museum may help set the stage for such experiences (Mezirow, 1997, 2000, 2006; Lind 2007; Spelman & Rohlwing, 2013). Related to the Piagetian notions of *equilibrium* and *disequilibrium* and Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development, these dilemmas may be experienced as subtle and incremental or
more dramatic and jarring (Ginsberg & Opper, 1998; Hein, 1998, Piaget, 1952). According to Mezirow, experience of the dilemma is followed by 1) critical reflection on one’s personal assumptions and prior experiences around the provocative topic and the topic, itself, and 2) conversations and discourse that either validate or refute their understandings and judgements of the topic (Mezirow, 2006). Excerpts from Wendy’s interview presented in Chapter IV suggest that although she entered the TFCI with a basic understanding of and strong interest in its ideas, some of its aspects became disorienting dilemmas for her. Her interview also indicated that she engaged in (and was still working through) the subsequent steps of reflection and resolution through discourse—leading to transformative learning.

**Logistics and Job-Embeddedness, Summary of Key Ideas**

In sum, schools and museums are both beneficial sites for teacher PD, but in unique and complementary ways. Museums seeking to create meaningful teacher PD programs should consider structuring them as extended experiences, ideally spanning around 50 contact hours with participants. The TFCI’s model of an intensive, immersive experience over the summer followed by sporadic sessions during the school year is one logistical model. Museums can also capitalize on the uniqueness of their environments, using their sensory potential and out-of-the-ordinariness to set the stage for learner expectations of new experiences and ideas. When these new ideas are introduced, organizers may anticipate some participants experiencing disorienting dilemmas and structure ample time and invitations for individual reflection and group conversations about the concepts throughout the PD.

One key idea introduced by the TFCI is the integration of constructivist and inquiry-based learning strategies into K-12 classrooms. Over the last few decades, schools and museums have also diverged in terms of the primary pedagogical models of learning they institutionally
support and employ. Differentiation between formal, nonformal, and informal education, as their relationships to constructivist and inquiry-based learning paradigms, and the TFCI’s impact will be explored in the following sections.

**Constructivist/Inquiry-based Learning Content and Structure:**

**Inspiring Learners vs. Producing Knowers**

The second major area of consideration in the TFCI’s model for teacher PD is the complementary pair of content and structure, and specifically, how constructivism and inquiry-based learning strategies are essential to their impact. Testing culture and its repercussions on student capacities for creativity and critical thinking were a recurrent topic of concern for both TFCI participants and presenters. The establishment of testing culture in public schools is one marker of their general designation as formal learning institutions. In such institutions, student learning is planned, paced, and outlined by pre-defined curricular agendas crafted and directed by “expert” administrators and teachers (Wells, Butler, & Koke, 2013). Similarly, art museum education began within the constructs of formal learning; expert curators and educators teaching visitors “how” to appreciate art works and the characteristics that signify a work’s importance (Buffington, 2007; Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; White, 2004; Willumson, 2007). Over the past half-century, K-12 art education academics and theorists have put forth models of learning that champion inquiry-based and constructivist models of learning, models—in their purest forms—that are at conflict with formal learning. Whereas testing culture is concerned with producing students who demonstrate their grasp of content knowledge (aka, “knowers”), constructivist and inquiry-based cultures are concerned with creating students who are capable of identifying and investigating their own interests across a range of contexts and disciplines (aka, learners).
Chapter II described how cycles and trends in K-12 art and museum education theory have increasingly geared toward inquiry-based and constructivist models of learning (Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; Dyson, 2013; Ebitz, 2007; Hein, 1998; Rose, 2007; Willumson, 2007). K-12 art education occupies an ambiguous space within the apparatus of public schools. Visual arts are generally not subjected to standardized testing and many districts allow their art teachers freedom in deciding on curricular content. However, this pedagogical freedom and lack of standardized testing does not mean that testing culture has no impact on student learning or expectations for learning in the art room. As Julia stated, “I am fortunate to be an art teacher, but that does not exempt me from the pressures of standardization” (Julia, TFCI application, May 2015). Schools and districts focused on meeting externally-generated and standardized measures of success may be incapable of setting new visions for K-12 public schooling, or providing teacher PD that encourages constructivist and inquiry-based approaches to teaching.

Art museums and K-12 art classrooms are branches of art education, but art museums exist outside the public school apparatus. Foley’s status as a “knowledgeable outsider status” allowed her the distance required to set aside testing culture as she imagined possibilities for situating her vision for constructivist and inquiry-based approaches to nurturing student creativity in K-12. As discussed, for years, the CMA’s approach to supporting schools and teachers was to offer programs that supported their formal learning curricula and outcomes. This model helped to ensure that schools would continue to visit the museum and funders would continue supporting programming. In evaluating these school programs, the museum had indications that this program was not adequately reaching the museum’s goal of supporting teachers and student learning.
The questions and challenges set forth by Maciejeunes and the program evaluators combined to create a sort of disorienting dilemma for Foley that eventually led to transformative thinking about the role and value of the education department, the CMA, and beyond to public schools. Foley’s process for confronting these questions—researching and investigating possible answers, reflecting upon and discussing issues with colleagues, revising and revisiting potential models and solutions before arriving at a shared and radically reimagined vision for meaningful 21st century art education—models constructivist learning in action. Further, the process required her to demonstrate the creative behaviors (e.g., questioning over answering, idea generation, risk-taking) and dispositions (e.g., curiosity, tolerance for ambiguity, persistence) highlighted in the TFCI’s content. The processes, behaviors, and dispositions that Foley and her staff used to reimagine the value and purpose of the CMA, their department, and art education are built into the fabric of the TFCI. Ideally, its structure and content will lead participants on similar journeys of their own. Meaningful change requires that someone (in this case, Foley) goes through the process of setting a vision and intention for the change. In this sense, Foley’s own constructivist, transformative learning experience was the catalyst for the constructivist, transformative learning experiences of TFCI participants. In order to prompt participants’ own transformative learning experiences, the CMA staff designed the content and structure of the TFCI with constructivist and inquiry-based approaches in mind. Lehe, in reflecting on the 2015 summer session, described an ideal version of how a truly constructivist TFCI might look:

You always want everybody to be happy and everybody to have profound shifts. And everybody...I mean your hopes are always, maybe a little more ambitious than what you know could possibly happen in a best-case scenario. But, what I was... what I was hoping for was that...participants would be hungry for and really engage in the opportunity to help us to co-construct what we think of as creativity and learning. And that as a result, the inquiry groups would generate...opportunities for us to shift in our thinking about...these guiding questions. Opportunities for them to shift one another and
themselves, independent of us. You know, that they're off working in these groups and we're not over there telling them anything. We're not even asking them questions. Facilitators were just going with their gut, you know? (Lehe, personal communication, June 26, 2015)

In planning the content and structure of the TFCI, the museum strategized to come as close to Lehe’s vision as possible. Julia’s assessment of her TFCI (and other museum PD) experiences indicate that the museum is on the right track:

Any time I go to one [a PD program] that's with the museum I feel like it's way more beneficial. Um, and I don't know why that is? If it's just that they're...creative minds presenting information? I feel like there's just...there's always something new and refreshing. And...it's never just, "Well this is what we're going to do and this is how you do it." It's "Here's our idea...how you interpret it is fine. We're going to give you some suggestions, but you need to make it work for you." 'Cause I feel like sometimes with my professional development in the district or at my school, it's just very much like, "Do this. Do it like this. Turn it in like this." And it's kind of a one-track way of thinking. And I've never done well with parameters like that! (both laugh) So just, any type of freedom and leeway I can get, and I can just kind of take an idea and run with it, is exciting to me. (Julia, personal communication, June 22, 2015)

To realize this constructivist, inquiry-based approach to PD, the museum sought to introduce content that was relevant across participant grade-levels and subject areas, and inspired praxis. Discussions of these efforts follows.

Praxis: Balancing Research and Theory with Modeling Application

Chapter II explored how the most frequently offered and enrolled art teacher PD tends to involve hands-on, studio-based experiences. Art teacher PD with a focus on theory tends to be infrequently offered, or not garner much teacher interest. However, additional research stresses the importance of PD that engages teachers as “both technicians in research-based practices, as well as intellectuals developing teaching innovations” (Gulamhussein (2013) p. 4). Theory and research are major components of the TFCI.
Julia, in the previous section’s quote remarks on how the TFCI introduces ideas. Table 11. Shows how the “stickiest” aspects of the TFCI for the teacher interviewees were a combination of ideas and hands-on strategies for implementing them. Table 9 and Appendix E give an overview of how the TFCI introduced a significant amount of research, theory, and ideas throughout the course of the summer session. The 2015 TFCI tripled its capacity compared to years past in order to meet growing interest. Engagement with theory does not seem to be a deterrent to registration. How did the TFCI inspire participant interest in engaging with theory?

The TFCI’s summer session reflects and models an inquiry-based mode of learner engagement that blends research and theory on creativity and critical thinking with active explorations of the concepts introduced. Gulamhussein (2013) also recommends that “initial exposure to a concept should not be passive, but rather should engage teachers through varied approaches so they can participate actively in making sense of a new practice” (p. 3). Ideally, the result of this blend of theory and practice is praxis—teachers embrace the ideas and apply them to their practice with understanding and intentionality. Other PD models may also be structured as a blend of theory and practice, but museum educators’ experience with formal and nonformal learning (versus formal learning in schools) may help them to present research and theory in such a way as to allow participants to interpret its meaning and significance in a personal context.

If schools are generally categorized as formal institutions of learning, museums are generally understood to be sites of informal and nonformal learning. Learning in museums is an elective experience; attendance and engagement is largely optional and therefore audience-initiated. Museum-users decide the purpose of the visit, when they will attend, who they will attend with, how long they will stay, and what they will experience while they are visiting.
Curators and educators can help set the conditions for visitor experiences, but the visitors themselves determine which aspects best meet the aims of learning needs and curiosities. Visitors who direct their own learning are engaging in a mode of constructivist learning.

Sometimes visitors may seek out more intervention or interpretational aides during their museum experience. They may decide to participate in a guided tour, use an audio guide, follow a brochure, or attend a lecture to help them better understand an object, exhibition, or the architecture of the space. In all cases, the goal of the museum educator is to help the visitor realize his or her objective for the museum experience and to make their own meaning from the encounter.

These types of mediated experiences, which are led by a facilitator but guided by the intrinsic curiosities and motivations of the learner(s) are classified as nonformal learning (Hein, 1998; Wells, Butler, & Koke, 2013). The TFCI’s content and structure reflects these approaches. Research and ideas are introduced through multiple entry points (which Lehe frames as “casting a wide net”). This meant that research and theories were introduced as content (see Table 10), foundations for practice, and modeled within its structure. Lindsey commented on how the examples and applications of the theory presented throughout the institute helped her see how they might fit into her practice:

It's kind of re-inspired me a little bit. Especially Todd's first presentation, when he was talking about social justice and working that into the classroom. It was just nice because that's what I had focused on a lot while I was in school. And my whole teaching philosophy was all about that. And then I suddenly got in the classroom…of course I was only there for a couple of months 'cause I was hired so late in the year. But I felt like I really failed to get that in there the way I wanted…I like, I felt kind of fraudulent. I was like (laughs) "Oh! Is this where my art teaching's going?" So to see some concrete examples and to know that there are some other teachers who are doing the same thing…who are doing very well, is just really re-inspiring to me…I can do this, I just gotta get back in the classroom and start with a plan and be prepared (laughs)…when I was studying at OSU I had some examples but a lot of what I was getting was just kind
of, theory? And so, while I was really inspired by the theory and ideas, there wasn't a lot of concrete evidence to show me how to do it or show me that it was possible. Not, not the way that there was when Todd was presenting it. It was like "Ahhh!" So that was nice. That was really energizing (laughs). (Lindsey, 2015, personal communication).

Participants determine which aspects are the most significant to them and build a foundation for practice based on what is “sticky” to them. Burton tells participants to “select which parts of the beach they want to take home.” Wendy remarks, "I took a lot of notes, a lot of notes…And I'm sure my notebook looks nothing like anyone else's…Just because of what grabbed me” (personal communication, June 22, 2015). Museum educators can apply their skill and experience in creating interpretive strategies for visitors to explore, connect with, and make meaning from works of art to helping educators explore, connect with, and make meaning from education research and theory.

**Content Relevance versus Subject Specificity**

One of the characteristics of high-quality PD generated from Chapter II’s literature review states that effective PD strengthens teachers’ content knowledge and understanding and are specific to their subjects and/or grade levels are most beneficial. This characteristic reflects PD goals connected to creating “knowers” of both students and teachers. This success of this type of PD and the resultant impact on student learning is measurable by standardized tests. Schools and districts under pressure to raise their “district” score cards and performance ratings may not prioritize developing or seeking out content-specific PD for teachers in non-tested subject areas. At worst, non-art teachers are instead required to participate in PD designed for other subjects to “unify” the school around improving specific student learning outcomes.

The TFCI included teachers across a range of subjects and grade levels. Tailoring the TFCI to meaningfully incorporate subject/grade-specific content knowledge for each participant would be a significant challenge, if not impossible. However, again, the purpose of the TFCI was
not to focus on subject knowledge, but rather on creativity, critical thinking and maximizing student learning across disciplines—topics relevant to teachers of any subject or grade. The TFCI’s goal is to nurture skill sets and mindsets for learning, create communities of student and teacher learners rather than knowers (see Figure 1a-b). The TFCI is based on content relevance versus subject specificity.

The universal but authentic relevance of the content also helps to frame participants (and facilitators) as a collaborative community working together toward common student learning outcomes in all subject areas and disciplines.

**Content and Structure, Summary of Key Ideas**

To review, museums seeking to develop meaningful PD for diverse groups of teachers should focus on content relevance rather than subject specificity. When introducing theories and planning activities and examples that illustrate their impact, museum educators are encouraged to draw upon their experience with informal, nonformal, and interpretive approaches to learning. Content and structure should be designed with constructivist and inquiry-based learning models as much as possible.

**Communities of Support based on Trust and Credibility**

The third major consideration for effective PD focuses on the creation of PD community networks to support teachers and schools in their efforts to enact meaningful change in their practice, schools, and classrooms.

**Trust and Credibility**

In addition to establishing praxis, research and theory contribute to a sense of community and engender credibility and trust in the museum’s message and vision. An essential part of creating change in participants’ attitudes, beliefs, and practice is establishing “buy-in” about the
value and benefits of the content being introduced. As Foley went about the process of setting and articulating her vision, she continuously explored and critically assessed research and other information sources that either challenged or helped further a case for her ideas. She and her team worked together to refine and articulate an institutional philosophy and pedagogy. They began to share their ideas and collaborate with other museums educators, universities professors, researchers, teachers, and administrators with similar research interests and ideas. The result of this research and collaboration was that the museum gained a reputation as: 1) a place where visitors can expect to engage in creative practices and critical thinking; 2) having credible, highly-qualified staff who are leaders and collaborators at the forefront of museum and art education; and 3) a valuable resource for their community. The credibility and trust the museum engendered through research, collaborations, and affiliations with other esteemed institutions of learning helped it to gain the trust of its community, including local school districts and schools. Foley elaborates on the importance and impact of trust and credibility:

[What] a lot of teachers respond to, is that the museum comes with authority. It comes with, you know, respect. The mayor is here on a regular basis…People are paying attention. We're in the press, you know? We're perceived as a bigger institution, as the authority. Now of course, that's not what we're wanting to necessarily continue. We don't want the capitol "A" authority. But what if we were to leverage that to help move along our mission [and] also, give [teachers] the support…advocacy? Like, "I've got the museum behind me" kind of support to take on the challenges that we're provoking them to take. So, in some ways, I think the shift in my demeanor around, you know, "We're going to do this. This is what's going to happen," teachers were responding to [it]…Maybe they're needing us to be a little bit more [authoritative]? But feeling like, they've got this powerful force by their side… (Foley, personal communication, June 26, 2015)

Comments from teacher interviews support this idea. Julia mentions how both having access to research that supports her pedagogy and the museum’s championing and endorsement for the strategies she uses in her classroom contribute to a sense of agency and empowerment:
I think that having gone to this institute, I think that I'm going to be a little bit stronger in my own voice…I have something to back me up now. Our city's museum is doing this. They're working with Harvard's Project Zero. They're working with Art 21 artists…This is something that they've researched. There's validation to it. It's not just my opinion. Whereas, before I was just trying to stand up for me and what I believed and now it's going to be like, I could actually print out an article and be like, "Here! It's happening somewhere else." And, you know, I think when you're approaching other educators, you need to have that…Because…you know, everybody wants to know that this has been backed by research. It works. It's not just me coming up with my own whim and idea. So, I think that's, that's why I feel a little bit…I don't know, a little bit more empowered to speak up and…um, excited to have that opportunity. Like, to be on the leadership board, and know that I will actually have an audience with the administration and they will have to listen to me… (personal communication, June 19, 2015)

Similarly, when Susan first became interested in and began researching choice-based art education ways to integrate more constructivist and inquiry-based learning into her practice, she was motivated to share the information with her building’s staff. However, she explained:

I was a little bit hesitant because who's going to listen to me? I, I'm just the art teacher. (nervous laugh) You know that kind of feeling!? Um, so, coming here I feel like I certainly have plenty of information to, like, beef up what I'm saying. Something to, you know, stick to, to um, you know, support what I'm trying to convey. (Susan, personal correspondence, June 19, 2015)

This suggests that the credibility and trust established by the museum can transfer to credibility and trust for art teachers involved with the pedagogical ideas put forth by the museum’s PD.

Susan and Wendy both mentioned that the lack of a mandated graded course of study in their districts gave them freedom to set their own curriculum, but that it also meant that administrators and colleagues might question or devalue what and how they teach. The TFCI gave teachers the language and messaging to explain and advocate for their practice and ideas. Teachers also mentioned how the TFCI’s emphasis on documenting student thinking and learning would help validate their teaching methods and art education in general. Julia explains:
That whole idea that we are promoting that deep thinking...And promoting the problem solving...and it's...I feel like that's one thing that's easy to say, but to be able to document and show that on paper, it's huge...And I think it's just going to further validate how important art education is...just overall in education. You know we're doing a lot of the same things that other classes are doing, but all they ever see is the pretty work in the hallway. (personal communication, June 22)

Establishing a common vocabulary and language to discuss and describe the strategies and ideas that unify PD participants’ interest and inquiry is another way that research and theory can help define and solidify a community of teacher learners.

**Communities of Support**

As mentioned in Chapters II and IV, high quality PD creates a community of support for participants that extends beyond the setting of the formal PD sessions and meetings. PD experiences that do not build in mechanisms for teacher support as they return to the classroom and work through the logistics of implementing new strategies may fall victim to “implementation dip.” The support of colleagues, mentors and administrators is therefore, essential to seeing desired shifts in practice through to fruition. High quality PD will define, create, and ideally expand a community of stakeholders working together toward a unifying outcome. The sense of community that developed during the TFCI was, itself, a powerful outcome for all of the art teachers who were interviewed, especially for teachers who did not feel a strong sense of community within their schools. Julia relates:

> to get back in that room, full of educators that are excited...That, to me is always refreshing. And even though I'm not nearly close to a burnout stage in education...But, I feel like...sometimes, that like vigor and that excitement is lost among a lot of your co-workers. And the fact that we were in a room with like 50 to 60 people that are educators at all different stages in their career that are excited...I'm excited for those opportunities still throughout the year to just keep me going. 'Cause that's important. I feel like the more, the more you surround yourself with those people, the more encouragement you have to keep going. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)
**PD defining community.** Support communities may include any combination of peers (from shared or different subject areas and grades), administrators, members of the museum staff, and other PD presenters. The PD experience helps to define the community through a common vision or goal for personal growth and student learning. The group is further defined by its use of shared language and vocabulary for discussing concepts and issues (e.g. knowers versus learners) and the systems and platforms used to maintain connection outside of PD meetings (e.g., social media groups).

**PD creating community, “joining the movement.”** The community is created as participants interact throughout the PD sessions and meetings. During the TFCI, community was formed during conversations and discussions, activities and creative challenges, within break-out inquiry groups, during the social spaces of lunches and breaks, and through social media posts on the group’s Facebook and Padlet pages and tweets on Twitter. The fabric and energy of the community that developed as a result of the TFCI caused Julia to see it as “a movement” based out of the museum:

> We have this museum here close by that is doing revolutionary things in education. And it just…and…I don't know that my relationship has changed too much other than I just want to be more involved…I guess I didn't realize just how much they're [the CMA staff] just a part of a bigger movement...and really advocating for a change in education. And that as a country we've gotten away from preparing our kids to be successful. You know, they're not finding relevance to what they're doing in the classroom...to how it's going to help them on in later life, you know?…I want to be more a part of that movement…the connections I think are a little bit stronger, on an individual basis rather than, I'm just a part of a group of teachers that went to the museum. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)

The art teachers appreciated the diversity of participants and enjoyed hearing a variety of perspectives—from principals, librarians, and classroom teachers. They also recognized that for
the TFCI’s core messages and values to really impact the culture of schools, multiple school staff members would need to get on board. Lindsey commented that it was heartening to,

…see folks, like principals and folks here try to push themselves...and then Fred was a principal at an elementary school. Which is awesome. I'm like, "Yes, there is support out there!" We have to just get all of us on board here. So, I really appreciated that aspect. Yeah! I'm glad that this wasn't just all art teachers. It's been way more valuable getting the perspective of librarians, and music teachers, and regular ed teachers, and just everything in between. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)

Wendy also mentioned how much she appreciated the presence of principals at the Institute’s summer session, saying,

it's awesome that they're here! I think that was really great, because it's not just one person. It's not just the art teacher that is gonna be doing this. Everyone has to be on board. Or at least, you know, a core group of people need to be on board with this. And you know, when I'm trying to figure out this whole enrichment team…I'm definitely going to bring in this information. This is…this is what it's all about, I think. (personal communication, June 22, 2015)

**PD expanding community, going “viral.”** As all four art teachers saw the benefit of getting buy-in from staff throughout their schools, they all were eager to share TFCI ideas back with colleagues and administrators. The dissemination of TFCI ideas from enthusiastic past-participants to curious new prospective candidates is a significant factor for the Institute’s growth. Susan frames this phenomenon as the “making sure the virus grows” (personal communication, June 19, 2015). The museum staff also recognized the benefit of teams of staff members attending the institute together and that at its inception, Foley and Jones (2014) planned to recruit teachers to participate in the TFCI. They envisioned teachers who were already predisposed to the TFCIs core ideas about art education and creativity "infecting" other teachers in their district. In its fifth year, more than 60% of the Institute’s participants attended teams coming from 10 of the 25 represented schools.
Community, Summary of Key Ideas

Rigorous, research-backed PD content and professional partnerships and affiliations with other respected institutions of learning contribute to participant buy-in and provide teachers with tools and resources to validate their practice. In the case of art teachers, these factors also may help validate their subject area. PD content should establish and introduce a unifying language that includes a vocabulary of key ideas based on research and theory. These shared resources are first steps in defining and creating a community of teacher learners within and beyond the PD experience. Creating this community is essential to teachers working through the challenges and uncertainties of implementing ideas in practice. Finally, museums should leverage positive and enthusiastic feedback and sustain relationships with participants who want to “join their movement” and “make sure the virus spreads” to colleagues and administrators whom they might recruit for future PD experiences.

New Questions, and Suggestions for Additional Research

This case study of the TFCI raised new questions about its impact. Two logical areas for further research are on the Institute’s rapid growth and long-term impact on participant beliefs, attitudes, and practice. Alternately, some specific incidents and conversations that took place during the institute were particularly provocative in less obvious ways, and also elicited new questions and directions for additional research. Two vignettes are offered as examples.

Non-Art Teachers’ Perceptions about Their Own Creative Capacities

The morning of the final day of the summer session kicked off with a “Creativity Alarm Clock” that asked participants to grab a slip of paper with a “creativity challenge” on it and spend five minutes with a stack of supplies to execute the challenge. As with most of the creativity challenges introduced earlier in the week, the creativity prompts were met with
laughter and easy chatter. Some people worked quietly while others chatted with a table mate as they worked.

At the five-minute marker participants began sharing their challenge solutions with the rest of the group. One non-art teacher shared her creation and a sentiment, "this is the first creative challenge this week that I didn't feel any anxiety over. I don't consider myself a 'creative person', in the drawing/painting sense...but my challenge was to make a ninja taco and I could do that" (observation, June 19, 2015). Jen shared that the challenges on the table came from the museum’s studio room. CMA educators spend about 20 minutes each week coming up with fun new creative challenges to add into the mix. She concluded the activity by stressing the importance of teachers and educators exercising their own creative practice before moving on to the next point of business.

How might the TFCI impact participants’ creative dispositions, including “Belief that I am creative?” How does the TFCI’s impact on participants’ creative dispositions compare between art teacher and non-art teacher groups?

**TFCI Community and Arts Education Advocacy**

An unanticipated outcome of the TFCI involved its potential to serve as a tool for promoting deeper understanding and appreciation for visual arts education by principals, other school administrators, and non-art teachers. Interactions between art teachers and classroom teachers during the summer session revealed a range of ideas and understandings about the value of art education. One particular conversation that took place on Day 3 of the institute became a disorienting dilemma for a number of the participants as they debated and worked through questions about the value of art education and what an art education curriculum should look like at different grade levels. What was notable about these conversations and debates was that they
involved non-art teachers with passionate opinions about art education and their personal art education experiences.

During one of Elkin’s presentations, a discussion arose about the amount of time he and his students invested in idea generation and refinement. As part of the conversation, a first-grade teacher remarked that she would be disappointed to see the teaching of studio skills and "step-by-step" instruction (that were part of her school’s art curriculum) displaced by emphasis on idea generation. She praised her building's art teacher’s ability to break down drawing skills and techniques, exclaiming that the "step-by-step" instructions meant that, "Even I can do it!" (observation, June 18, 2015). These comments sparked a big discussion that carried through the rest of Day 3 and into the next. More group members began to question, “Is it good thing that her art teacher does this? Isn't learning techniques an important part of art education, especially at the elementary level?” (Observation notes, June 18, 2015). Elkin acknowledged the importance of skill building but reemphasized the importance of leaving time for idea development. One of the CMA’s educators offered an analogy of a team building challenge to help bridge understanding. Skills and idea generation are both needed; “It’s like two people sitting on the ground, back-to-back pushing against each other to stand up” (Observation notes, June 18, 2015). Another teacher mentioned that at the elementary level, it makes sense to approach art curriculum sequentially and build a lot of technical skills, so that by high school they can focus on ideas.

The first-grade teacher then mentioned how she valued the way her building’s art teacher supported the general first-grade classroom curriculum and referenced this as an example of an integrated curriculum. (The art teacher being discussed did not attend the TFCI). At this point, an art teacher participant (whose tone and body language indicated that she was offended by the first-grade teacher’s comments) jumped in to point out that the first-grade teacher’s comment
intimated that art education exists to support learning in other subjects. She reminded the group that the arts—and their pedagogical aims and learning outcomes—should be equally respected and valued for their own sake. Most of the TFCI participants murmured assent while Lehe cautioned the group about making assumptions about the (absent) art teacher's practice or philosophy, as she was not present to speak for herself. Lehe steered the discussion back to Elkin’s presentation and the first grade teacher left the room for a brief break.

This spontaneous exchange is remarkable for a few reasons. First, it framed a recurrent point of debate that arose throughout the institute: should art education, especially in the elementary grades, privilege process over product? This question connected back to Foley’s presentation on Day 1 when she asserted that creativity was not equivalent to technical studio skills. Second, the debate featured a passionate non-art teacher having a discussion about art education pedagogy and what it should prioritize. I’m not sure that such a discussion would have arisen for her in any other context or PD experience. Had this first-grade teacher previously dedicated as much thought to the purpose and value of art education?

Earlier sections quoted art teachers who recognized how implementing methods for documenting student learning (and process) would help others see the types of thinking and creative work that students engage in during art class. How might the events, activities, and conversations of the TFCI’s summer session impact non-art teacher and school administrator perceptions about the value of art education? How might the experience of the TFCI change their regard and understanding for the art teachers in their schools? How might these perceptions change over the course of the school year following the summer session?
Concluding Thoughts

In the introduction to her 1982 book *Instant Art, Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools* Laura Chapman writes:

We have inherited a particular view of the arts in this century, a view that makes art seem to be so mysterious, intuitive, and so much a question of native talent or personal preference that teaching art to the young does not really seem to be possible or valuable.

These unreconciled attitudes are reflected in contemporary art education. What many schools offer to children is little more than a token exposure to the visual, performing, and literary arts. Even this exposure is offered grudgingly, as if learning about the visual arts, music, dance, theater, and literature were a bonus or a luxury. The instruction offered in some schools is so casual or wasteful of time and resources that many children actually are miseducated in the arts. Many of our young people graduate from high school with the impression that art is undemanding, unless one has talent, and irrelevant to contemporary life, unless one has the wealth and leisure to indulge in it. (pp. xiii-xiv)

More than 30 years later, Chapman’s (self-professed, harsh) assessment of art education still has resonance. By inviting its local schools—and the broader communities in which they are situated—to share in their reimagined vision for art museums and art education, the CMA is working to rectify some of the criticisms lodged in Chapman’s statement.

The museum staff, led by Foley, used constructivist inquiry to arrive at a collaboratively established set of values and guiding principles for their work. They supported these values and principles with research and scholarship. They recognized the potential for focusing on teacher PD programs to exponentially increase their capacity for impacting student learning, and then set out to design a PD program that would model and reflect the behaviors and strategies they hoped teachers would bring to students. In their editors’ message for the July, 2014 issue of the *Journal of Museum Education*, Foley and co-editor/former CMA educator Trinkley conclude with advice for potential stakeholders seeking guidance in establishing their own visions for education and the programs to support them. Their statement also makes an apt conclusion to this case study.
After issuing a caveat that the issue tells stories specific to the CMA, the authors communicate their hope that sharing these stories will,

provoke reflection and inspiration. What is the social mission of your museum? What is your rallying cry that gathers together staff, board, members, and the community and propels the museum forward?…We encourage other museums to develop clarity and intentionality of purpose and ask more “why” questions, even if the answers illuminate embarrassing, self-serving, or risk-averse behaviors. We continue to ask these questions, and often find that the answers serve as mirrors and magnifying glasses, reflecting and revealing our practices as well as our assumptions. What is essential is the desire to always keep changing, growing, and learning: our community’s needs and values are rapidly changing, and we run the risk of irrelevance if we do not keep pace with them. (Foley & Trinkley, 2014, p. 128)
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APPENDIX A

Columbus Museum of Art’s
2015 Teaching for Creativity Institute Application

2015-2016 APPLICATION
TEACHING FOR CREATIVITY INSTITUTE

Name: 
School: 

School District: 
Position and Grade Level: 

Name(s) of other educators from your school who are applying as part of your team (each individual team member must fill out their own application):

Why do you feel that creativity is an essential part of learning?

What is the role of creativity in education today? What does creativity look like in your classroom or position?

What do you hope to gain from the Teaching for Creativity Institute?

What strengths will you be able to bring to the Teaching for Creativity Institute cohort?

Home address: 
School address: 

Home phone number: 
School phone number: 

Email address: 

Please complete and return via email to Jennifer Leise, Jennifer.Leise@cmaohio.org. Early acceptance date is Friday, April 3, 2015; final deadline for application is Sunday, May 10.
APPENDIX B

Email Solicitations

Email 1

Dear Art Teacher,

This summer, I am excited to conduct my master’s thesis case study on the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute, and I hope you might consider being a part of my research. The aim of this case study is to learn more about how art museums are helping to meet the content-specific professional development needs of art teachers (an endeavor once more commonly fulfilled by school districts). The Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity summer institute presents a compelling case study of this phenomenon. Through it, I plan to investigate how;

• the CMA’s Teaching for Creativity Institute impacts the pedagogical beliefs and practices of participating art teachers
• art teachers perceive the role of the museum within the field of art education and the community
• the summer institute experience compares with art teachers’ past professional development endeavors and influences their ideas about future professional development pursuits.
• how the CMA education staff (past and present) have worked to position the museum as a leader within their community and in matters of school reform, in part through its teacher professional development programs.

As a participant, you would agree to participate in a 30 to 60 minute long, audio-recorded interview about your TFCI experience. This interview could take place face-to-face, via Skype, or Google Hangouts—whichever you prefer.

If you are interested in participating, please respond as soon as possible and I will email you consent form documents to review. I am happy to answer any questions or provide additional information regarding the study.

Thanks so much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Missy Higgins-Linder
Arts Education Consultant for Museums and K-12 Schools
OAEA Jerry Tollifson Art Criticism Open Chair
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Art Education
School of Art
Kent State University
o. 330.672.1441
c. 330.805.0836
mhigginslinder@gmail.com
mpaxson@kent.edu
oaeajtaco@gmail.com
Email 2

Dear Teacher,
I hope you’ve had a moment to read through my previous email invitation to participate in a case study of the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute. If you’ve already responded, thank you! As a reminder, I hope to learn more about how art museums are helping to meet the content-specific professional development needs of art teachers (an endeavor once more commonly fulfilled by school districts). The Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity summer institute presents a compelling case study of this phenomenon.

As a participant, you would agree to take part in some or all of the following research components;

- Allowing the researcher access to your TFCI application materials
- Completing a brief 6 item pre-institute experience survey and 7 item post-experience survey (link here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/F3HW7GH)
- Be observed and photographed by the researcher throughout the course of the four-day summer session
- Share notes and/or journal entries about your TFCI experience with the researcher
- Potentially participate in a 30 to 60 minute long, audio-recorded interview about your TFCI experience.

If you are interested in volunteering as a participant, please respond as soon as possible and I will email you consent form documents to review.

I appreciate your time and consideration and am happy to answer any questions or provide additional information regarding the study.

Sincerely,
Missy Higgins-Linder

Email 3

Dear X,
I hope you’ve had a moment to read through my previous email invitations to participate in a case study of the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute. I’d very much like to include you as part of the study, but completely understand if you are unable to participate.

I am happy to answer any questions or provide additional information regarding the study and appreciate your time and consideration of this invitation.

If you are interested in participating, please take this brief pre-experience survey. Here's the link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/2FCGJ7F

I will also send you the consent forms to look over if you wish to do so before tomorrow. I will provide hard copies for signing tomorrow for anyone opting to participate.

I look forward to saying hello in person, soon!

Best,
Missy Higgins-Linder
APPENDIX C

Surveys

Pre-Experience Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMA TFCI Summer Session Pre-Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Enter your first name and the first initial of your last name.


2. What motivated you to apply to the 2015-2016 CMA’s Teaching for Creativity Institute?


3. Have you previously participated in the CMA’s Teaching for Creativity Institute?
   - ] Yes
   - ] No

4. Have you previously participated in extended summer professional development experiences offered by other institutions or organizations?
   - ] Yes
   - ] No

5. What essential skills or qualities do you most hope students will take away from their time spent in your classroom? What are some major, overarching goals you hope your students achieve in your art classes?


6. Consider the following possible areas of curricular content and rate each in importance to your personal philosophy of art education and current teaching practice, 5 being “extremely important” and 1 being “not important.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure/Unfamiliar with this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History: Western Art (images, maps, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History: Multicultural Emphasis (non-Western, global, feminist, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Media and Techniques: Drawing, Painting, Printmaking, Ceramics, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-based Media and Techniques: Photoshop, web design, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Criticism: Interpretation, Discovering meaning in the works of others, Assessing the value of an artwork, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Issues: What is art? What is good art? What isn’t art? What is beauty?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Culture: Pop culture, mass media, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Education: Communication, product, architectural/environmental, and interactive design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching for Artistic Behaviors or other choose-based, student-directed opportunities for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Skill Development: e.g., Collaboration, Creativity, Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How do you see your current top two or three curricular priorities from the previous survey item connecting with teaching for inquiry, creativity, and innovation?

8. Are you willing to participate in a brief (30-60 minute) interview about your experiences with the CMA’s 2015 Teaching for Creativity summer session?
   - [ ] Yes, I’d love to!
   - [ ] No thanks.
Post-Experience Survey

CMA TFCI Summer Session POST-Survey

1. Enter your first name and the first initial of your last name.
   
   
2. What essential skills or qualities do you most hope students will take away from their time spent in your classroom? What are some major, overarching goals you hope your students achieve in your art classes?
   
   
3. Consider the following possible areas of curricular content and rate each in importance to your personal philosophy of art education and future teaching practice, 5 being “extremely important” and 1 being “not important.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure/unfamiliar with this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History: Western Art Canon (isms, masterworks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History: Multicultural Emphasis (non-Western, global, feminist, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Media and Techniques: Drawing, Painting, Printmaking, Ceramics, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-based Media and Techniques: Photoshop, web design, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Criticism: Interpretation, Discovering meaning in the works of others, Assessing the value of an artwork, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Issues: What is art? What is good art? What isn’t art? What is beauty?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Culture: Pop culture, mass media, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Education: Communication, product, architectural/environmental, and interactive design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching for Artistic Behaviors or other choice-based, student-directed opportunities for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Skills development (e.g., Collaboration, Creativity, Critical Thinking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How do you see your current top two or three curricular priorities from the previous survey item connecting with teaching for inquiry, creativity, and innovation?

5. What are your hopes for the extended fellowship experience? How involved/engaged do you think you'll be?

6. How has the Teaching for Creativity Institute's summer session impacted or shifted your curricular and instructional priorities? Your beliefs and attitudes about art education?

7. How has your experience with the Teaching for Creativity Institute's summer session compared with other PD experiences you've had?

8. How do you envision yourself sharing the knowledge you gained during this experience with colleagues at your school and in your district?

9. Any other thoughts or ideas you'd like to share about your experiences over the course of the 4 day, TFCI summer session?

Thanks so much for your participation!
APPENDIX D

Sample Consent Forms

General Consent Form

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title: Case Study of the Columbus Museum of Art's Teaching for Creativity Summer Institute

Principal Investigator: Dr. Linda Hoepner Foling, co-Investigator: Melissa Higgins-Linder

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Purpose:
The aim of this case study is to learn more about how art museums are helping to meet the content-specific professional development needs of art teachers (an endeavor once more commonly fulfilled by school districts). The Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session presents a compelling case study of this phenomenon. Through it, I plan to investigate how:

- The CMA’s Teaching for Creativity Institute impacts the pedagogical beliefs and practices of participating art teachers
- Art teachers and museum educators perceive the role of the museum within the field of art education and their community
- The summer institute experience compares with art teachers’ past professional development activities, and influences their ideas about future professional development pursuits.
- The CMA education staff (past and present) have worked to position the museum as a leader within their community and in matters of school reform, in part through teacher professional development programs.

Knowledge gained from such an analysis may provide insight into how a variety of arts education Institutions and organizations can effectively collaborate to improve issues of praxis within the field, as well as public opinion about the value and relevance of the arts in everyday life.

Procedures:
As a participant, you agree to take part in some or all of the following research components;

- Allowing the researcher access to your Teaching for Creativity Institute (TFCI) application materials
- Completing a brief 6 item, pre-institute experience survey and a brief, 7 item post-experience survey
- Be observed and photographed by the researcher throughout the course of the four-day summer session
- Share notes and/or journal entries about your TFCI experience with the researcher
- Participate in a 30 to 60 minute long interview about your TFCI experience. These interviews will be semi-structured, one-on-one, and conducted using face-to-face, Skype, or Google Hangouts format in accordance with your preference and availability. Interviews will be audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed for data analysis.

In addition to the hours each study participant has already dedicated to the TFCI four-day summer session, teacher participants will spend an estimated maximum total of 2.5 hours participating in this study (time spent reviewing case study information and consent forms, completing pre- and post-experience surveys, gathering notes to share, and potentially sitting for a thirty minute to one hour long interview). Museum educators and invited facilitators will also be asked to dedicate around 2.5 hours to the study (time spent reviewing case study information and consent forms, gathering notes and agendas to share, and potentially sitting for one or two thirty minute to one hour long interviews). Study participants may be asked for permission to contact them again in the future regarding subsequent research related to the extended fellow component of the CMA’s TFCI, its impact on teaching practices, and its evolution. You may consent or opt out of any part of the case study at any time.

Audio and Video Recording and Photography
As a participant you may be photographed by the researcher while you are participating in activities of the TFCI four-day summer session. These photographs may be included in the final thesis case study publication and in subsequent professional presentations about the case study. If you choose to allow the use of the photographs for inclusion in the case study file or in subsequent publications or presentations about the case study, you will have the option to see or and approve photographs prior to their use.

If you are asked and accept participation in a one-on-one interview, the conversation will be audio-recorded and transcribed for data analysis. You will be asked to sign a second consent form specific to the audio-recorded interview. Recordings will be stored for three years before being destroyed. Participants have the option of hearing the recordings prior to their use and transcription.

Benefits
The Columbus Museum of Art’s education staff may benefit from the study by using the results to advocate for or make changes to the TFCI program. This research study is unlikely to directly benefit the teacher participants. However, research in this area has the potential to improve future, cross-institutional models of professional development, issues of praxis within the field, the quality of student learning, teacher satisfaction and morale, and public opinion about the value and relevance of the arts in everyday life. Such research could prove a potential later benefit for teacher participants, in terms of improving the efficacy and relevance of their future professional development options as well as the subsequent classroom experiences of their students.

Risks and Discomforts
There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life. The time investment required could be an inconvenience. Interviews will be kept on schedule and tasks so as to minimize time commitments and
inconvenience. All participants will have the option to consent or withdraw from any and all parts of the proposed research study at any time should they decide any part causes them distress.

Privacy and Confidentiality
Your study-related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Interview data will be audio-recorded and stored on a flash drive secured in a locked file cabinet. The original recording will be destroyed after three years. Transcriptions of each interview will use only first name (or pseudonym), general age (e.g., in his/her late twenties to early thirties, etc.), gender, grade level taught (for classroom teachers), and basic descriptions of his/her school district (e.g., urban, rural, etc.) as descriptors. Research participants will likewise be described in any subsequent publications or presentations of this research.

Compensation
No compensation is offered for participation in this study.

Voluntary Participation
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Melissa Higgins-Linder at 330-865-0836 or Dr. Linda Hoepner Polliag at 330-672-7895. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

Consent Statement and Signature
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

Participant Signature Date
AUDIOTAPE CONSENT FORM

Case Study of the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Summer Institute

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr. Linda Hopmer Poling, CO-INVESTIGATOR: Melissa Higgins-Linder

I agree to participate in an audio-taped interview about my experiences with the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute as part of this project and for the purposes of data analysis. I agree that Melissa Higgins-Linder may audio-tape this interview. The date, time and place of the interview will be mutually agreed upon.

__________________________________________
Signature Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the recording of the interview before it is used. I have decided that I:

_____ want to listen to the recording

_____ do not want to listen to the recording

Sign now below if you do not want to listen to the recording. If you want to listen to the recording, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Melissa Higgins-Linder may / may not (circle one) use the audio-tapes/video tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

_____ this research project

_____ publication

_____ presentation at professional meetings

__________________________________________
Signature Date

[Stamp: APPROVED]

[Stamp: JUNE 3, 2015 TO JUNE 3, 2016]
APPENDIX E

Sample Interview Questions for
Art Teacher (Participants) and Museum Educator (Institute Facilitators)

Art Teacher Participant Questions:

- How has your participation in the Columbus Museum of Art’s Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session impacted your ideas, feelings, and/or beliefs about art education?
- How do you anticipate that the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session will impact the content and instructional strategies you introduce in your classroom in the next school year? Can you offer an example of some new idea you will try out?
- How do you anticipate that your experiences with the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session will impact your students’ learning?
- How has your participation in Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session impacted your confidence as an art teacher? How has it affected your ideas about why teaching art is important to contemporary life?
- How has your participation in Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session impacted your feelings or ambitions about taking on leadership roles within your school or district?

Museum Educator/Institute Facilitator Questions:

- What are the major goals and outcomes for the CMA’s Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session? Have the goals and outcomes for the program evolved over time? If so, how?
- How do you regard your relationships with/to the teacher participants and school administrators in your community? How has the teacher institute shaped these relationships?
- What roles do local teachers and school administrators play in determining the content of the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session? To what extent are they involved in the planning and development process? How has/does their participation in shaping the content and form of the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session evolved/continue to evolve?
- What aspects of the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session do you feel are most effective in securing teacher participant buy-in?
- What aspects of the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session do you feel are most effective in securing school and district administrator buy-in?
- How are you able to model and enact some of the other key pedagogical ideas and strategies promoted by the Teaching for Creativity Institute’s summer session in your own daily work? How do research and inquiry into current art and museum education fit into your daily work experience?
### APPENDIX F

Field Note Coding Sample for 2015 TFCI, Day 1

**DAY 1, AM- 2015 TFCI Agenda and Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welcome &amp; Orientation: Lehe</th>
<th>Ideas/ Theory/ Research</th>
<th>Activity/ Dialogue</th>
<th>TFCI Content Codes</th>
<th>TFCI Content Categories</th>
<th>TFCI Structure Codes</th>
<th>TFCI Structure Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Questions: 1) What does creativity look, sound, and feel like? 2) How do we create the conditions in which creativity thrives and foster the dispositions that support the creative process?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Invitations; Expectations; Questioning over Answering</td>
<td>Conditions; Behaviors</td>
<td>Prompts Reflection; Prompts conversation; Inquiry-based/ Constructivist; Models approaches (of TFCI Codes at left)</td>
<td>Research/ Theory/ Ideas; Hands-on/ Active Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to participate in TFCI social media- shares hashtags</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Invitations; Interactions/ Relationships; Documentation</td>
<td>Conditions; Documentation</td>
<td>Prompts conversation; Shows teachers how to document practice; Creates Community</td>
<td>Hands-on/Active Engagement; Relationships &amp; Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentation: Foley, The Case for Creativity**

| Reflection/Journal Exercise- Write about a time in childhood when your imagination was fully applied | X | Invitations; Play | Conditions; Behaviors | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas; Hands-on/ Active Engagement |
| Alistair Smith quote- Knowers vs. Learners | X | Invitations; Language | Conditions | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |
| 20° → 21° Century Shift and implications for jobs, schools, and organizational culture | X | Invitations; Language | Conditions | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |
| CMA Value- Definition of Creativity and its centrality in the CMA’s mission and vision | X | Language; Modeling; Documentation | Conditions; Documentation | Prompts Reflection, Establishes Trust & Credibility | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |
| Research on workforce and leadership skills needed in future, global workforce- Multiple sources. Emphasis on business and industry. | X | Invitations; Language | Conditions | Prompts Reflection; Establishes Trust & Credibility | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |
| Research on declining creativity in the United States, in part demonstrated by student performance on the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking. Cindy has an emotional, personal response as educator and mother. | X | Invitations; Language; Interactions/ Relationships | Conditions | Prompts Reflection; Establishes Trust & Credibility | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |
| Lego metaphor (false) task to connect participants with feeling overwhelmed by a creative challenge; ambiguity is hard for everyone. | X | Expectations; Interactions & Relationships; Tolerance for Ambiguity | Conditions, Dispositions | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas; Hands-on/ Active Engagement |
| How to support Creativity: Encourage Dispositions, Develop Behaviors, Foster Conditions | X | Invitations; Language; Expectations; | Dispositions; Behaviors; Conditions | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |

**DISPOSITIONS**

| X | Curiosity; Tolerance for Ambiguity; Persistence through Failure; Belief that “I am Creative” | Dispositions | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |

**Art Skill ≠ Creativity. Lego kits used as example- kits vs. free building. Adult coloring books- to what degree is coloring a creative activity? Activities can be relaxing and worthwhile for reasons other than creativity.**

| X | Invitations; Challenging Creativity Myths | Conditions; Challenging Creativity Myths | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |

**BEHAVIORS- Indicators of Creative Process, possibilities for what Creativity looks like. 16/36 slides defining and giving examples. Lego artists’ work used to illustrate aspects of idea generation: fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration.**

| X | Idea Generation; Experimentation & Risk-Taking; Play; Transdisciplinary Research; Questioning over Answering | Behaviors | Prompts Reflection | Research/ Theory/ Ideas |

**Group Share- Revisiting Reflection Exercise at presentation start. Extended discussion of Play.**

| X | Invitations; Play; Modeling | Conditions; Behaviors | Prompts Reflection; Prompts conversation; Inquiry-based/ Constructivist; Models approaches (of TFCI Codes at left) | Research/ Theory/ Ideas; Hands-on/ Active Engagement; Relationships & Support |
### Transdisciplinary research – by product of curiosity.

Shine a Light project - CMA partnered project for elementary students focused on illustrating and calling attention to a social issue. Video shot by Jen of a student explaining her process including research. Cindy asks teachers to react to how the student described and explained her process and project. Teachers comment on the video:

1. Student wasn’t phased by not knowing how to do something and went about figuring out how.
2. Student wasn’t phased by the idea of doing research for an art project.
3. Student connected prior knowledge and other research.
4. Student can articulate her process/thinking.

A teacher connects the video content to the "learner vs. knower" quote at the beginning of Cindy’s presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitations; Modeling; Expectations; Curiosity; Tolerance for Ambiguity; Transdisciplinary Research; Documentation &amp; Assessment; Conditions; Behaviors; Dispositions; Documentation &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>Content and/or grade-level specific; Inquiry-based Constructivist; Models approaches and strategies; Shows teachers how to document practice; Prompts Reflection; Prompts conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cindy parrots and builds upon their comments. Discussion arises about the "problem of parents" and other expectations about art class; people want to see "perfect" final products vs. seeing the thinking and process that went into their creation. How do we allow people to see that part of art education? Setting the stage for the importance of documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling, Questioning Over Answering; Tolerance for Ambiguity</td>
<td>Conditions; Behaviors; Dispositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group Share- Revisiting Reflection Exercise at presentation start. Extended discussion of Play. "Play = root of the creative process. Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi quote - "It is how we choose what we do, and how we approach it, that will determine whether the sum of our days adds up to a formless blur, or to something resembling a work of art."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitations; Play; Modeling, Interactions/Relationships</td>
<td>Conditions; Behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is the value of play? Stuart Brown quote from Play: How It Shapes the Brain, Opens the Imagination, and Invigorates the Soul: "In play we are safe to imagine situations and experiences we have never encountered before and learn from them."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitation; Play</td>
<td>Conditions; Behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shows Caine’s arcade video and prompts discussion of how Caine’s dad supported Caine’s creativity: 1) "He was supportive but didn't give him the easy out with the crane game. He was supportive but mostly hands-off...he didn’t try to make it better" 2) the dad "doesn't intervene, he allows" 3) Dad made so many materials available to Caine and the nature of availability of the materials-junkyard, shop. 4) Lets Caine define success for himself, "gets out of his way" without setting goals for him...lets the project evolve, 5) models being a lifelong learner by evolving his business, 6) Caine had the right conditions and supports. “Caine is our model for the week.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language; Routines; Invitations; Modeling; Time; Environment; Expectations; Interactions/Relationships</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Side conversation arises about the importance of boredom. Caine was initially bored from spending summers at his dad’s business. A teacher remarks that we should "let [children] get bored." Another teacher answers- "Let them get bored" Cindy agrees, "I feel very strongly that boredom is the precursor to creative action" Another teacher talks about how kids are always plugged in and on their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling; Interactions &amp; Relationships; Play</td>
<td>Conditions; Behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevant Content & Structure; Hands-on/Active Engagement; Research/Theory/ Ideas
devices. Cindy shares a personal story about saying no to the built-in screen option for their new car and banning the use of devices on car trips to prevent her kids from "missing the rainbow."

CONDITIONS provide the rich soil for creativity, covered in greater depth by Fred on Day 2

Reflection/Journal Exercise- Observing images of famous artists’ studios; 1) identify aspects of each space that might help foster creativity and 2) how the spaces are different from classrooms.

Wrap up: call back to ambiguity-shows gallery activity that asked visitors to give examples of things that are personally ambiguous, uncertain, or inexact.

Reflection/Journaling Prompt: Jen

Reflect on Cindy’s presentation: Connections with prior knowledge, how the presentation Extended your knowledge, and how Challenged existing ideas about creativity and teaching.

Define and evolve personal definitions of creativity and related dispositions, behaviors, and conditions throughout the course of the TFCI.

DAY 1, PM- 2015 TFCI Agenda and Descriptions

Presentation: Permeability Now- Todd

Ideas/ Theory/ Research

Activity/ Dialogue

TFCI Content Codes

TFCI Content Categories

TFCI Structure Codes

TFCI Structure Categories

Starts by polling the group (show of hands) for demographic makeup (grade and subject levels). References his work as teacher for high school students and adults (college and teacher PD).

Recaps conversation with an art teacher during his last visit to Columbus for art teacher PD; OTES process demoralized the teacher who unsure about continuing a teaching career.

Building on the OTES anecdote, Todd discusses the importance of having and continually refining a personal teaching philosophy even though it may run counter to district priorities.

Shows a clip of one of his students talking about a Yinka Shonibare work as part of a project unit. 2 years later in another art class, the student created an artwork that referenced the same Shonibare. The video tracked an idea/interest over time to show how it grew and evolved. It helped connect
aspects of the students’ cumulative visual arts education experience, illustrating the power of documentation.

Classroom as Permeable Space, -Ideas, People, and Projects need to be able to enter and leave the classroom as necessary. Classrooms are not self-contained universes.

**Offers Some Stipulations** (Cautions that this part of his presentation will get very "lecture-y"): 1) The disciplines were created to help us explore and understand the world; 2) The world is not made up of isolated entities or discreet/siloed bits of disciplinary information; 3) The world is an inherently integrated and transdisciplinary place, therefore, exploring the world is an inherently integrated and transdisciplinary undertaking; 4) Art is ALREADY integrated and informed by all manner of concepts and contexts.

Offers throughlines/“manifesto” that drives his practice: 1) Students are proactive/self-driven/empowered/integrated and experimental Learners + critical actors (at times, activists); 2) Contemporary artists don’t have teachers bossing them around all the time; 3) Process/Practice driven by being an Alert Noticer; 4) Process driven by Dialogue; 5) Teacher as a strategic suggester of lenses frames and strategies; 6) Engaging in authentic (trans)disciplinary practice; 7) Collaborative, non-hierarchical, social learning space; 8) Classroom as community with a sense of shared responsibility; 9) Classroom is a space in which both thinking and process are foregrounded.

**Shows an example of Gender Politics** Unit work that illustrates aspects of his manifesto in action. Unit driven by student-initiated conversations about and interest in current events. Relevant to students and teachers, provides opportunities/fuel for modeling socially engaged art practice, and creates a space for dialogue about these issues.

Introduces quotes from Pablo Helguera’s *Education for Socially Engaged Art*: 1) "What characterizes Socially Engaged Art is its dependence on social intercourse as a
factor of its existence” and 2) “The expertise of the artist lies, like [Paulo] Freire’s, in being a non-expert, a provider of frameworks on which experiences can form and sometimes be directed and channeled to generate new insights around a particular issue.”

6 Artistic Orientations presented to students to use as a lens for creating work based inspired by the concept mapping process: 1) Straight Observation, 2) Exploring Others’ Perspectives, 3) Experimentation, 4) Constructing Narratives, 5) Intervention, 6) Persuading the Audience/Viewer or HYBRIDS of these

Examples of student work- refining and building upon ideas- leading to a student's "kernel of an idea"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Invitations, Modeling; Routines; Language; Interactions &amp; Relationships; Idea Generation; Documentation &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Conditions; Behaviors; Documentation &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Models approaches and strategies; Inquiry-based/Constructivist; Prompts Reflection</th>
<th>Research/Theory/ Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Invitations; Routines; Expectations; Language; Experimentation &amp; Risk-taking</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Models approaches and strategies; Inquiry-based/Constructivist; Prompts Reflection</td>
<td>Research/Theory/ Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Modeling, Idea Generation</td>
<td>Conditions; Behaviors</td>
<td>Models approaches and strategies; Inquiry-based/Constructivist; Prompts Reflection</td>
<td>Research/Theory/ Ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentation: Assessment as Dialogue - Todd part 2**

After a stretch break the group reconvenes for the second part of Todd’s presentation for the day- Assessment as Dialogue- from grading to visualizing thinking/documentation. Assessment as metaphor?

Prompts small group discussion; come up with one thought and one metaphor for assessment. Sue's small group is at the table where I'm sitting and she shares a metaphor: Grading students' artworks is like trying to grade spiders making their webs. There's so much that goes into making the webs and the outcomes: the health/condition of the spider, the location where it will be made, environmental conditions, beauty vs. function, etc. The small group loves her metaphor.

Todd reconvenes the whole group and invites people to share thoughts and metaphors for assessment. A librarian from Sue’s small group volunteers Sue to go first. The whole room loves her metaphor, applauds and someone exclaims "beautiful!"
More sharing ideas about assessment:
A teacher remarks that assessment is ongoing. A 1st grade classroom teacher seems to feel the conversation is biased against more traditional assessment ideas and methods and exclaims, "I like assessment! It's about whether kids are 'getting' it or whether teachers are communicating effectively." Another teacher describes assessment as "sitting by the learner" and clarifies that assessment is not the same as testing.

Todd returns to presenting and prompts participants to examine physical examples of student work used as an assessment for the "Assessment as Dialogue" project. Students were tasked with answering:

1) What does a teacher look like? 
2) Who is a teacher? 
3) What are qualities of a crappy teacher? 

Students were to back up their responses by also answering:

1) What did you notice? 
2) What makes you say that?

Discusses ideas that catalyzed new ways of thinking about assessment for himself- 1) desire to open up "the one-way lens" of assessment, 2) students as contemporary art practitioners- being artists rather than just learning about them, 3) Olivia Gude's Skeptical Assessment Society, 4) Paulo Freire's conceptualization of teachers as cultural workers.

Wanted to create a feedback loop rather than a "problematic mirror" model for assessment; students using qualitative research methods to observe, analyze, and assess their English teacher. The teacher uses similar methods to assess his students- the assessments are ultimately used to create an evolving, collaborative artwork. Project unfolded in 3 phases:


Prompts questions and discussion about the project. A 1st grade classroom teacher raises the question about "Standards" and how they fit into this type of project and assessment. Another teacher remarks that the Ohio Standards for visual arts are broad and can be applied to many units of inquiry and projects (as are the National Standards).
A Music Teacher asks about how social justice-focused pedagogy might be applied at the Elementary level. Another teacher asks for a definition of social justice practice. Another 3rd grade classroom teacher wants to know how to apply these ideas in her classroom? Elementary teachers are feeling challenged about how these ideas might work their way into their classrooms. The 3rd grade teacher makes a connection to a lesson she taught about fossil fuels and solar power; her students were discussing an oil spill in the news and were really concerned.

Todd summarizes and reiterates (with some participants echoing/agreeing) that this type of practice should address issues significant to students and their communities rather than seek to solve them. Mentions guarding his own ideas and opinions as much as possible to let his students explore and arrive at their own conclusions. Wraps presentation.

Reflected Journaling Prompt- Jen

Asks everyone to reflect on 1) things you learned, 2) unanswered questions.

Breakout Session- Inquiry Groups

Jen divides the whole group into smaller inquiry groups. Inquiry groups are purposefully made up of a variety of participant demographic groups in hopes of generating a wide range of perspectives during discussions.

Inquiry groups each are led by a facilitator, who has a "provocation packet" of possible conversation starters if it doesn't happen on its own. Facilitators are asked to document the discussion.

Regroup- Turn & Talk, Group Share, Documenting “Sticky Ideas” on Padlet

Whole Group Share- Jen Documents some "sticky ideas" from the day on the Padlet. Ideas can be distilled to 1)
lifelong learners vs. knowers; 2) Art Skill ≠ Creativity; “Creativity is not being able to draw! Artists learn skills to express their creativity.” 3) need for and importance of documentation—process and thinking vs. summative grades. Other ideas shared by teachers: documentation can involve parents to make it easier and allow them to see the thinking; creating non-traditional incentives to encourage engagement; “Sometimes you have to go past modeling to explicit explanation of your chosen actions”; “I like the idea that I don't have to give up structure. In an unstructured school that is nice to know.”

Temperature & Forecast- Jen

| Passes out daily feedback sheet and gives an over view of the next day. | X | X | Modeling; Routines; Expectations; Interactions & Relationships; Documentation & Assessment | Conditions; Documentation & Assessment | Models Approaches & Strategies; Prompts Reflection; Shows Teachers How to Document Practice; Creates Community | Research/Theory Ideas; Hands-On/ Active Engagement; Relationships & Support |

TFCI Team Debriefing and Reflection- Jen

| Jen debriefs with Facilitators. Participants expected more hands on, less lecture-based sessions. Some liked the mix of video clips, lectures, and activities; a lot to think about. Many appreciated concrete examples of ideas in action in Todd's presentation- helped them grasp the pedagogy/concepts. Todd felt resistance from some teachers during the second half of his presentation, especially around the issue of standards. Inquiry groups had plenty to talk about and didn't need the provocations. | X | X | Modeling; Interactions & Relationships; Expectations; Documentation & Assessment | Conditions; Documentation & Assessment | Models Approaches & Strategies; Prompts Reflection; Creates Community | Research/Theory Ideas; Hands-On/ Active Engagement; Relationships & Support |